



Redes. Revista do Desenvolvimento Regional

ISSN: 1414-7106

ISSN: 1982-6745

revistaredes@unisc.br

Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul

Brasil

Batista Bandeira da Fontoura, Fernando; Tenório, Fernando Guilherme; Allebrandt, Sergio Luís

Historical context of production organizational forms: organizational and social repercussions

Redes. Revista do Desenvolvimento Regional, vol. 28, 2023, January-December

Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul

Santa Cruz do Sul, Brasil

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17058/redes.v28i1.17928>

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=552078284011>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc

Diamond Open Access scientific journal network

Non-commercial open infrastructure owned by academia



Historical context of production organizational forms: organizational and social repercussions

Fernando Batista Bandeira da Fontoura

Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul – Santa Cruz do Sul – RS – Brazil

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9484-8963>

Fernando Guilherme Tenório

Fundação Getulio Vargas – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4082-4410>

Sergio Luís Allebrandt

Universidade do Noroeste do Rio Grande do Sul – Ijuí – RS – Brail

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2590-6226>.

Resumo

O presente ensaio tem como objetivo analisar o contexto histórico das formas de organização da produção como elemento fundamental e estruturante de todas as dinâmicas das organizações e da sociedade, bem como fator que influenciou as relações organizacionais, com repercussões sociais e no estilo de vida das pessoas. Este constructo analisa as formas de organização da produção – desde as pré-industriais, passando pela massificação da sociedade industrial até chegar às possibilidades diversificadas, denominadas neste ensaio de pós-industriais, entendendo as contradições de cada macroperíodo histórico, sem nenhuma pretensão de definir esses períodos como “caixas” fechadas.

Palavras-chave: Organização da produção; Organizações; Sociedade.

Historical context of production organizational forms: organizational and social repercussions

Abstract

This essay aims to analyze the historical context of the forms of organization of production as a fundamental and structuring element of all the dynamics of organizations and society, as well as a factor that influenced organizational relationships, with social repercussions in people's lifestyle. This construct analyzes the forms of organization of production from the pre-industrial, through the massification of industrial society until reaching the diversified possibilities, called post-industrial in this essay –, understanding the contradictions of each historical macroperiod, without any pretension to define these periods as closed “boxes”.

Keywords: Production organization; organizations; Society.

Contexto histórico de las formas de organización de la producción: repercusiones organizativas y sociales

Resumen

Este ensayo tiene como objetivo analizar el contexto histórico de las formas de organización de la producción como elemento fundamental y estructurante de toda la dinámica de las organizaciones y de la sociedad, así como un factor que influyó en las relaciones organizacionales, con repercusiones sociales y en el estilo de vida de las personas. Este constructo analiza las formas de organización de la producción – desde lo preindustrial, pasando por la masificación de la sociedad industrial hasta llegar a las posibilidades diversificadas, denominadas postindustriales en este ensayo –, comprendiendo las contradicciones de cada macroperíodo histórico, sin pretensión alguna de delimitar estos períodos como “cajas” cerradas.

Palabras clave: Organización de la producción; organizaciones; Sociedad.

Introduction

In a sociological view, the production organizational forms, in a broad sense, had a strong influence on the historical development of humanity, in all matters of social organization. The central element of the entire infrastructure, whether in the chipped stone society or in the post-industrial society, is what Marxism calls the production process. In other words, what truly explains law, moral, religion, education, philosophy and anything else in society is the way it produces material goods (Barros; Dainezi 2014). “Every production process, Marx will say in Book I of Capital, is constituted of two elements: the work process and relations of production” (BARROS; DAINEZI 2014, 28).

The most remote production organizational forms were basically ancient slavery, feudalism, the vision of the classical economy linked to property and, currently, the predominant capitalist production. This essay, without intending to go deeper into history as such, will highlight the main effects of post-feudalism, with a predominance of handicrafts and the beginning of industrial production, as well as the current context of the forms of action as a form of production organizational.

For Marx (1985), everything that exists in society, in a materialist-historical view, is explained in terms of the forms of production organizational. More contemporary authors, such as Marcuse (1973), Horkeimer (1974), Horkeimer and Adorno (1985), dedicated themselves to studying the effects of an industrial society, in all material and cognitive aspects, as well as its impacts, which created a path unidimensional relationships, when Morgan (1996) even got mentioned that people have developed a Taylorism/Fordism of spirit.

In order to organize the discussion, without wanting to delimit closed “boxes” and the contradictions that the term “post” carries, this study identifies the three main macroperiods of development: the artisanal macroperiod, the industrial and, finally, the most controversial one – the post-industrial. As a closing, by way of conclusion, the essay will discuss current trends and blind spots, paraphrasing Ramos (1989), from organizational dynamics and thinking limited to the one-dimensional dichotomies of society today. All of this, due to not understanding, in general terms, all the multidimensionality of the forms of production organizational and their repercussions, including in human cognition.

The macroperiods of development

The epistemological analysis of the development of organizations and markets presupposes an understanding about macro periods of production organization. In this sense, it is identified that the organization of production, over time, was influenced by the economic system of capital accumulation and, also, by the development of organizations, according to historical macroperiods of production organizational.

Marx (1974) and authors from the classical economic schools, such as Ricardo (1982), Malthus (1982) and Smith (1996), contributed to the analysis of the relationship between capital and work. Classical economists were concerned with the notion of wealth centered on tangible production factors, whereas Marx focused on labor relations and social classes, contributing to the current view of “phenomena” (RAMOS 1996).

In order to understand organizational development and forms of organizational production, starting from a non-positivist ontology, understanding economic models figures like a fundamental starting point, since, nowadays, the crisis of the accumulation system is undeniable capital rigidity (HARVEY 1992; TOFFLER 1995; TENÓRIO 2007). Capitalist organizations are not immune to crises caused by regional, territorial, cultural and social issues. Regardless of size, companies have not developed a management structure prepared to compete with post-industrial possibilities. Management, hegemonically, focuses on efficiency and effectiveness based on the Weberian contribution, despite Weber being an author who analyzed society and influenced organizations, also linked to external theories and mass markets.

The external economies depended on the development of the industry, as well the internal economies depended on the resources and management of the company itself, the efficiency of its administration, in short term, its performance in the market, which stimulates new processes and fierce competition dynamics. Production relations, as well as OD (organizational development), had a historical evolution with numerous contradictions, mainly because organizations and organizational theories tend towards unidimensionalism and alienation in relations.

Organizational development occurred historically influenced by the emergence of industrial society, presenting unidimensional characteristics and linked to the industrial production model (MARCUSE 1973; HORKHEIMER; ADORNO 1985; HORKHEIMER 1974). In this context, the positivist worldview not only influenced production models, but prevailed in the behavior and organization of society as a whole, developing a kind of “Taylorism of the spirit” that also influenced schools and theories of administration (MORGAN 1996; RAMOS 1989).

However, at the end of the 20th century, globalization and innovation became protagonists of a new cycle, called “development”, understood as just economic growth, with some traces of flexibility in some cases. New technologies in transport, communications and access to information have strengthened interaction processes between organizations, increasing interactive complexity and the need to create environments that favor inter-company relationships. Thus, cities and regions began to provide strategic responses to the challenges generated by the new competitive dynamics, not only by offering new products and services, but

by creating complex and interactive environments aligned with territorialized Regional Development. However, Harvey (1992, 1) warns that:

[...]these changes, when confronted with the basic rules of capitalist accumulation, show up more as superficial-seeming transformations than as signs of the emergence of some entirely new post-capitalist, or even post-industrial society..

Despite Harvey's (1992) criticism, due to the need to review organizational paradigms based on growth, the term post-industrial "possibilities" is used when mentioning markets, given the accelerated changes in environments and organizations and the development embryonic of theories and actions of organizational development considered as alternatives for Regional Development¹, as can be seen through the aspects addressed Chart 1.

Chart 1. Past and present of organizational systems

ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS FROM PAST	ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS OF PRESENT
System based on fixed assets and capital accumulation	System based on change and innovation
System based on economy of scale	System based on economy of scope and customization
System based on conventional production factors: land, labor, raw materials and capital	System based on technology, information and knowledge
System based on paper money and the exchange of goods	System based on electronic transactions and capital flows
System based on mechanistic bureaucratic organizations	Adocratic system aligned with complex adaptive relationships
System based on the exploitation of labor as a commodity	System based on innovation and knowledge
System based on mass and scale production	System based on market relations
Planning, bureaucracy and control	Adaptive territorialized strategies
Taylorist-Fordist industrial accumulation system	Neo-Taylorist / Neo-Fordist or post-industrial accumulation system

Source: Elaborated by the authors based on: Bell (1977); Marx (1974); Harvey (1992); Toffler (1995); Barquero (2001); Agostinho (2003); Etges; Degrandi (2013).

With a view to elaborating reflections and proposing alternatives for development, involving interactions between the global and the regional, elements of social management and social enterprise are mentioned as alternatives for responding to flexible organization. The term “social” refers to the organization of production, as well as the analyzes that justify the discussion and the need to review the industrial paradigm for the post-industrial or, at least, neo-Taylorist and neo-Fordist paradigm, considered a transitional stage. The industrial model, as an economic and production organization model under the patronage of capital, is in decline, since there, we note na an increasing alignment towards flexibility strategies with a focus on customization environments. Thus, Toffler (1995, 253) states that:

¹ Despite using the expression “neo-Taylorist and neo-Fordist” as a way of production organization.

[...] even as big companies expands, the importance of companies as an institution shrinks. It is still too early for any of us to fully understand the power mosaics that are now rapidly forming and the long-term fate of the company. But one thing is certain: the idea that a handful of giant companies will dominate the economy of tomorrow is a cartoon-style caricature of reality.

There is a consensus regarding the recognition of the existence of transformations in the social and organizational environment, when analyzing the effects of the positivist model imbued in organizations through Taylorist standards, based on bureaucratic organization. Even, according to Toffler (1995), organizations based on a neo-Taylorist and neo-Fordist or even post-industrial model have also been suffering from the emergence of new organizational crises:

[...] with the emergence of the post-industrial organization [...] it can be said that organizational crises tend to increase and methods that start from the premise that companies are machines tend not to adapt to the current organizational complexity. What we see is a crisis that springs from the heart of the bureaucracy. High-speed change not only overloads its cubicle-and-channel structure, but attacks the deepest assumption on which the system was based. This assumption is the theory that it is possible to pre-specify that in the company. You need to know that it is an assumption based on the idea that organizations are essentially machines and that they function in a methodical environment. (TOFFLER 1995, 195)

It identifies the existence of reflection about the organizational forms and dynamics predominantly adopted in industrial society, hegemonically oriented towards consumption and capital accumulation, as well as towards mechanistic models aimed at a “development” based on growth. According to Toffler (1995, 16):

[...] the acceleration of change is not limited to affecting industries or nations, it is a real force that seeps deeply into personal lives, which force us to represent new roles and brings us face to face with the danger of a new and most disturbing psychological illness. [...] What is happening now, by all indications, is deeper and more important than the industrial revolution. In reality, a growing number of credible opinions assert that the present moment represents nothing less than the second great split in human history, comparable only in magnitude to the first great break in historical continuity, which was the passage from barbarism to civilization.²

Toffler (1995) presents conceptual and epistemic affinities, due to its rational terminology, converging with the criticisms made by authors such as Harvey (1992), Etges and Degrandi (2013), Barquero (1999) and Bell (1977). In this sense, the discussion on organizational development in an inter and multidisciplinary way is justified and not just focused on the vision of efficiency and operational effectiveness, based on essentially linear standards, although they are still predominantly used in applied social sciences. Some basic characteristics reinforce

² The citation reinforces the aspect of crisis in the accumulation system that started strongly in the 1970s, according to the literature studied.

this thought regarding the possible post-industrial society described by Bell (1973)³, when he portrays the emergence of new technologies and innovation, revolutionizing new development paradigms.

The Chart 2 summarizes the characteristics of the production organization macroperiods, starting from the pre-industrial model, characterized by the artisanal period, and having the craftsman as owner, with training based on local demands and with knowledge restricted to the family domain passed from generation to generation. The neo-Taylorist/neo-Fordist organization describes the characteristics of the accumulation regimes with the main organizational and territorial focus, including post-industrial possibilities. It is believed that the referred elements contribute to the analysis of accumulation regimes, changes in organizational and territorial environments, in addition to favoring the realization of a counterpoint to organizational theory, hegemonically positivist.

The neo-Taylorist/neo-Fordist term, in fact, would not be synonymous of post-industrial, but considered a transitional stage with some characteristics of flexible accumulation and social management, being the term post-industrial broader and presenting an economic and organizational reading of the production itself, fostered by social changes and their impact on regional development dynamics.⁴

The Taylorist/Fordist company has well-known characteristics mentioned by Harvey (1992), Etges (2005) and Tenório (2004; 2007), with a predominance of elements such as increased mass production and increased profits, aligned with social and organizational pathologies linked to worker motivation and the organization of industrial work. Neo-Taylorist/Neo-Fordist or post-industrial organizations could be identified as organizations aligned with the development of a region. They are addressed in this study as aimed at economic, social, cultural and environmental sustainability, with actions in multiple directions, as a counter-response to the hegemonic capitalist economic model. However, this is still not the reality that is generally observed today, as will be described in the final remarks, making a first critique of the critique of the term post-industrial, as already mentioned by Harvey (1992), using the term post-capitalist.

³ The concept was introduced by sociologist and professor emeritus at Harvard University Daniel Bell, in his work *The coming of post industrial society: a venture in social forecasting* (1973).

⁴ The national and international literature, nowadays, also discusses the fourth industrial revolution as a new historical and social paradigm, mentioning the technological and cognitive advances in the social and work organization, with emphasis on the connectionist society and advances in the area of nanotechnology, agroindustrial production, among various production segments. This essay is not concerned with closed classifications and classifying nomenclatures defining post-industrial, industrial or fourth industrial revolution, not disregarding the bibliography about the subject. For a critical approach, it is important to reinforce that the pre-industrial contains its opposite which is the industrial, in some historical period, the industrial contains its opposite, which is the craftsman, in some processes and also post-industrial possibilities with the beginning of flexibility processes, and the post-industrial or information society, as defined by Boltanski and Chiapello (2009), contains the most varied contradictions, since Harvey himself (1992) already warned of the utopia of the full post-industrial society. For these reasons, this study presents the macroperiods as a historical context, without major concerns with “box” definitions, which would be a contradiction in relation to the research objectives.

Chart 2. Macroperiods of development

STAGES	CHARACTERISTICS	PROPERTY AND TERRITORY
Pre-industrial	Craft production Rudimentary agriculture Earth as social power	Linked to the artifice Production and territorialized market Territory belonging to family and clans
Industrial Taylorist/Fordist	Planned and routinized production Mass production Capital as social power	Capital owner Production processes Transnational markets
Post-industrial or Neo-taylorist / Neofordist	Flexible accumulation Territorial management Autopoiesis, sustainability Innovation, change and knowledge as social power.	Property under investor globalized environment Multidimensional and multiscalar territories, processes and markets

Source: Adapted from Fontoura (2019); Harvey (1992); Toffler (1995); Etges; Degrandi (2013); Barquero (2001); Bell (1977, 1973); Tenório (2004); Marcuse (1973)

In the next topic, characteristics of the pre-industrial or craftsman macroperiod are presented.

Pre-industrial macroperiod or craftsman

The development focused on the origin of organizations was strongly influenced by territorial arrangements and socio-spatial formation, initially based on craft organizations, such as blacksmith shops, shoe shops and tailor shops. These presented formations with essentially rudimentary characteristics and lacking planned processes; the craftsman himself was the one who planned, executed and defined his means of production.

According to Toffler (1995), pre-industrial societies were based on agriculture, which one, was used to produce all consumer goods (food, clothing and materials for housing) were produced. With industrialization, this scenario changed, emerging a system dependent on capital and mass consumption. The approach to the macro-periods of production organization occurred at all scales, involving the international scenario, characterized by the fragmentation of production processes, from the migration of a pre-industrial phase to an industrial organization. That is, the periods of organization of production were developed under the influence of the development of capitalism itself, moving from a pre-industrial organization to an industrial one.

Toffler (1995) contributes with a historical analysis of capital flows and wealth formation, as mentioned by the Classical School of Economic, emphasizing that land was the first factor of economic power. With the chimney revolution, or industrial revolution, the capital continued to be considered material, consolidating itself through the physical investments of companies. In the post-industrial perspective, other forms of wealth flows are evident, strongly based on information.

According to the Regional Development, it can be observed that, in the pre-industrial macroperiod, the production and interorganizational relations were more territorialized, often presenting cooperation actions between companies, which also had relationships with the families that managed them. Silveira (2007) mentions the example of Santa Cruz do Sul, in its main segment (tobacco production), which underwent a process of techno-industrial revolution and transnationalization from 1960 onwards, migrating from a macroperiod of development – pre-industrial system (involving cooperation between families that own the companies) – for a globalized techno-industrial system. With the development of industrial society, Taylorism and Fordism developed as ways of organizing production and as a vision of markets based on growth, with a focus on gains in scale. Thus, Tenório (2011, 145) emphasizes that:

[...] to describe Fordism as a paradigm for production organization and work organization without mentioning Taylorism is to partially report this paradigm, since Fordism has an almost umbilical relationship with Taylorism. In fact, historically, before Taylor and Ford, other moments and other authors contributed to the development of forms of organizational management. A classic text of world economic literature that contributes to reinforce the idea that before Taylor, management forms of production had already been written is the book by Adam Smith (1723-90), *The Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776. In the book in the first part of this text, Smith discusses the division of labor, giving as an example the well-known case of the pin factory [...].

The pre-industrial macroperiod precedes the industrial, also described in the literature with a more sociological bias, having received various names, such as industrial, techno-industrial and consumer society. Regardless of the term used, it is observed that the industrial macroperiod developed a way of production organization that greatly influenced society and human cognition itself (in economic terms, for growth reasoning), as well as organizational environments, as described in next topic.

Industrial Macroperiod

After the craft or pre-industrial period, manufacturing organizations were emerged. These organizations were responsible for implementing the production lines, with a view to increasing productivity through serial production, based on the planning, bureaucracy and control triad, although the processes were, at the time, oriented towards certain specificities of different contexts, markets or products. According to Harvey (1992, 124),

[...] assembly-line technology for serial production, deployed at many points in the United States, had very weak development in Europe before the mid-1930s. The European automobile industry, with the exception of the Fiat plant in Turin, remained in its mostly a high-skill craft industry, (although corporately organized), producing luxury cars for elite consumers, being only slightly influenced by assembly-line procedures in the mass production of cheaper models before Second World War.⁵

⁵ The text is linked to the school of positioning, defending by Porter (1986).

The scientific management, according to Harvey (1992) and Schumpeter (1982), inserted in all facets of corporate activity under the “umbrella” of the positivist matrix, focused on the division and specialization of work, influenced the organization of work and the production organizational forms. This matrix continued the cartesian model of the 17th and 18th centuries, based on rationality and the division of parts, which was also the apex of the model of organization of society, and in the training of specialized people in search of factual determinism.

The different facets of social activities, such as doctor, dentist, lawyer, administrator, counter, in addition to the divisions of the organizational environment in the workplace, including the basic areas of Administration: Marketing, Production, Materials, Finance, Human Resources and Product Development, based their strategies on feuds in order to achieve bureaucratic corporate rationality (Harvey 1992).

Marx (1985), in his work *The Capital: critique of political economy*, he makes the following statement regarding the impulse of manufacture and the territorial division of labor:

[...] the territorial division of labor gains momentum with manufacture, which explores all its particularities and that the origin of manufacture and its formation, from handicrafts, required several different professions to produce a commodity. On the other hand, it starts from the cooperation of professionals of the same type and divides their work into several particular operations, which will be performed by specific workers. But whatever its particular starting point, its final figure is the same, a production mechanism, whose organs are human beings. No matter whether the manufacturing execution is composed or simple, it still depends on the manual skill of the workers. (MARX 1985, 278).

This production model, linked to the theories of Scientific Management, provided the emergence of new markets from series production, praising manufacturing companies based on the model of production and mass consumption. Harvey (1992) mentions the year 1914 as a symbolic starting date, when Henry Ford introduced the “eight hour day and five dollars as a reward” for workers on the automatic assembly line. Tenório (2007) highlights the Fordism, between 1900 and 1985, as a form of hegemonic organization of capitalist production. With the Taylorist/Fordist⁶, dominance, based on the assumptions of Scientific Management, organizational and OD studies moved away from the territorial aspects of development, basing themselves on the process of accumulation and mass consumption. In this sense, Tenório (2004, 31) declares that

Rational action in relation to ends has merited, mainly since Taylorism/Fordism, a constant search for paradigms that justify instrumental action within formally organized social systems. This demand, however, has not allowed the agents of the process,

⁶ Harvey (1992) is enlightening by presenting the Taylorist model, “studies of times and movements”, combined with the Fordist production model, which can also be understood as an economic model, a lifestyle based on the accumulation of profits, mass customization and consumption. Tenório (2004, 61) explains that Fordism can be studied as a model of production organization or like a system of capital accumulation.

administrators and administered, to develop their functions in an emancipating way.

Tenório's statement (2004) is related to the defense of dialectical thinking that organizations hegemonically based on positivist models no longer have the conditions to maintain themselves, as their daily dynamics often support naive positions regarding the ability to understand all the relationships in today's society. This process generates impacts in the organizational environment, which even prevent the use of effective strategies for the long-awaited economic result with a unidimensional purpose, in addition to the fact that the spectrum of multidimensional factors in the development of the organization of the modes of production makes them hostages of a “epistemological myopia”, of an organizational culture dictated by organizational myths that are fragile and inconsistent with the contemporary reality of the market.

In the 1980s, in Brazil, the so-called Strategic Positioning School (Porter 1986) gained strength, widely discussed in academy and disseminated in organizations with a focus on strategy and competitiveness. In this school, the competitiveness of organizations would be based on their positioning in relation to the competitive environment, based on an economic and marketing reading.

The Strategic Positioning School starts from the premise that, if a company does not focus on a strategic positioning and deliberate its management and planning based on it, it may become vulnerable and weakened in terms of its development. For Porter (1986), the strategy is a broad subject, and can be understood as an analysis of the competition and a positioning, that is, as a plan, a pattern of behavior, from a market perspective or aligned with lasting competitiveness. (Ferraz; Kupfer; Haguenauer 1997).

In this school, beyond the five competitive forces, Porter (1986) defends the existence of three competitive strategies as a form of positioning: cost leadership, positioning through differentiation and focus. The three perspectives basically define that a company has to position itself in the competitive market, being cost leadership, differentiation or focus on the possibilities of its market positioning.

It can be inferred that the cost leadership strategy would be closely aligned with the Taylorist/Fordist model of accumulation, as it bets on mass production and the reduction of total costs, aiming at market competition. However, Yunos (2008) defends the cost strategy, not with a bias towards mass consumption, but as a possibility to serve social classes with lower income within a plan with a “social objective” for the company, considered as a new form of organizational dynamics strongly involving the social perspective. Yunus contributes to an analysis beyond the simple mention of the economic, social and environmental triad. In this point, the socio-environmental dimension must also be included in the company's goal, enabling new contours for a more flexible capitalism.

The differentiation strategy is based on customization, influencing differentials and increasing prices. In the focus positioning, the company would invest in market “niches”, when products can be associated with flexible production environments with the inclusion of differentiation for different markets, as opposed to series production (Tenório, 2005). According to Harvey (1992) and Tenório (2005), the company that seeks differentiation may already be in a process

of flexibility, with investments in research and development, with the dissemination of technology, even if in an embryonic way – not focusing only on fixed capital.

According to the authors Ferraz, Kupfer and Haguenaue (1997), competitiveness and strategy are related to technical efficiency in the company's performance characteristics, having market share as an indicator. The authors define competitiveness associated with space and time, just right, it becomes to be considered as “[...] the ability to formulate and implement competitive strategies, which allow the company to expand or maintain, in a lasting way, a sustainable position in the market”⁷ (FERRAZ; KUPFER; HANGUENAUER 1997, 1).

It is observed that the organizational strategy must be seen in a broader sense, not only focused on market share and on the flexibility and customization strategy, but especially on the mass production model defended by Taylorism/Fordism. From the end of the 20th century, the strategy is based on interrelated and dynamic contextual factors due to the

[...] the intensive exchange that takes place in the company-environment interaction, making the knowledge generated to be considered an input that supplies the elaboration of organizational strategies. It also serves as a reference for the environment to be updated and modified, promoting changes so that the flow of life of economic systems continues to transform and evolve in a continuous and uninterrupted cycle of change based on new organizational constructs. (WITTMANN; LUBECK; NELIS 2013, 132)

The existing interactions between organizations and the environment, motivated by the process of industrial organization based on the rigid accumulation of capital, despite having made possible a series of technological advances, also provoked a dependence on systematization and organizational mechanization, causing an impact on society as a whole.

Benko (1999) develops the analysis that the hegemonic industrial organization model, based on Taylorism/Fordism with a focus on increasing profitability and capital accumulation, hindered policies consistent with Regional Development, due to a series of multidimensional problems, because, according to him,

There were problems with the rigidity of long-term, large-scale fixed capital investments in mass-production systems, which greatly impeded flexibility and assumed stable growth in invariant consumer markets. There were problems with rigidities in markets, allocation and labor contracts. (BENKO 1999, 135)

These statements already showed the effects of a vision based solely on economic growth, as it is understood that organizations based exclusively on capital accumulation and cost calculations, from the location project to the general planning of their business activities, present difficulties in carrying out the

⁷ Business competitiveness is no longer only linked to market issues, market share. But, in the long term vision, the company has to think about all the development possibilities and the region in which it operates. This view is also aligned with the positioning school advocated by Porter (1986). The term sustainable was used dialectically, it is not about environmental sustainability, but it represents a series of issues, including environmental ones, within a social and territorial vision.

development of flexible and complex processes. In this perspective, Harvey (1992, 140) points out:

[...] flexible accumulation, as I will call it, it's marked by a direct counterpoint to the rigidity of Fordism. It relies on the flexibility of work processes, labor markets, products and consumption patterns. It is characterized by the emergence of entirely new sectors of production, new ways of providing financial services, new markets and, above all, highly intensified rates of commercial, technological and organizational innovation. Flexible accumulation involves rapidly changing patterns of uneven development, both across sectors and across geographic regions, creating, for example, a vast movement in employment in the so-called "service sector". (Emphasis in original)

According to Tenório (2004), organizations began to act according to diversified demands, relativizing the worker's excessive specialization to value a versatile and multifunctional qualification, as well as replacing technobureaucratic management with a collaborative management perspective. Etges (2005) points out that, in the period of flexible accumulation, the international division of labor acquires new contours, evidenced by investments in large production complexes located in the "best territories", in a vertical manner. However, the globalization process and the crisis in the Taylorist/Fordist system brought the need for society to seek new development alternatives aimed at sustainable environments, not only from an economic perspective, but also from an environmental and social perspective.

With the emergence of post-Fordist or post-industrial organizations, there is an urgent need for a broad review of positivist models of management and OD. Endogenous development, the territorial management approach and the socialization of organizations are alternatives presented in the studied literature, with a significant impact on organizational dynamics and strategies, as already mentioned by Harvey (1992) and exemplified by the automobile industry. In this context, we discuss the possibility of organizing post-industrial production and the impacts on territorialized organizational development, knowing the cognitive incompleteness of the term and the controversy surrounding the use of the term "post" in general terms.

Post-industrial or neo-Taylorist/neo-Fordist macroperiod

In national and international literature, this macroperiod is variously called: post-industrial, post-Fordist or even post-capitalist (Bell 1977; Harvey 1992; Toffler 1995; Tenório 2004; Ramos 1989; Morgan 1996). In this essay, the term post-industrial or neo-Taylorist/neo-Fordist is used, in order to understand that Fordist and Taylorist processes are still dominant and to avoid diverting the focus from de-industrialization or the end of Taylorism and Fordism. On the other hand, it is recognized that there is a crisis in this production model and in its theoretical-methodological unidimensionality, when analyzing the organizational dynamics of the century XXI (MARCUSE 1973).

Neo-Fordism can be understood as a transition between Taylorism and Fordism characteristic of the industrial macro period, with possibilities for more

flexible and territorialized organizational arrangements. However, Tenório (2011, 141) warns about some post-Fordist concepts still rooted in the Fordist system:

[...] concepts that the fad of flexible contemporaneity does not allow to be perceived, hiding indicators of the permanence of a Fordist practice disguised, many times, as modern, current. The proposed thesis is that post-Fordism contains Fordism. That is, Fordism is not replaced by post-Fordism, since the latter contains, according to the unity of opposites, the law of dialectics, Fordist elements, substances that will be represented by means of a continuum. Thus, the apparent antithetical situation does not occur, since post-Fordism understands its opposite, Fordism.

The post-industrial macroperiod is the most difficult to be characterized, as it is an economic and social process still in formation, with difficulty in understanding due to the social, cultural and psychological paradigms of a mass pre-industrial and industrial production organization, with positivist assumptions of linearity, Cartesianism, unidimensionalism, unicausism, evidenced by factual determinism and mechanistic and homogenizing thinking. (FONTOURA;2019).

Tenório (2011) points out that it is through the dialectical view of the unity of opposites that post-Fordism presents itself as an alternative for a possible organization of post-industrial production. The author states that rigid models of production and management no longer meet the diverse demands and social and market changes of the 21st century XXI, because,

[...] Post-Fordism, or the flexible model of organizational management, is characterized by the integrated differentiation of the organization of production and work under the trajectory of technological innovations towards the democratization of social relations in organizations. Conception that contradicts the Fordist one in that it is based on the forecast of a growing market, which justified the use of specialized equipment in order to obtain economies of scale. Now flexible equipment is emerging whose purpose is to serve a differentiated market, both in quantity and in composition. (TENÓRIO 2011, 162)

In the post-industrial era, society presents polymorphic and polycentric discontinuities involving the organization of production and the different social environments, including cultural aspects and family organization. Toffler (1995, 253) discusses the effects of the industrial revolution on the family and on companies, emphasizing that it

[...] took away many of the functions of the traditional family, society's other key institution. Education went to the schools, care for the elderly went to the state, work moved to the factory, and so on. Today, since many of its functions can be performed by small units armed with high-powered information technology, the big business is similarly being stripped of some of its traditional reasons for being. The family did not disappear after the industrial revolution, but it became smaller, assumed more limited responsibility and lost much of its power compared to other institutions in society. The same is happening to big business as we move out of the smokestack era dominated by Brobdingnagian companies.

Toffler (1995) mentions that there are some important organizational characteristics in the post-industrial perspective that integrate this new way of

production and economic organization, such as: the use of information technology and biotechnology; flexible accumulation; the use of niche markets; changes in the environment and working hours; and the demassification of the media. Despite the production organization being an economic and social process that is still in formation, it is noticed that there are several characteristics described by Toffler (1995) in dialectical analyzes carried out by Tenório (2004), especially with regard to more flexible organizational processes, although there are criticisms of the commodification of diversity, based on Boltanski and Chiapello (2009).

In this perspective, organizational development consists of a contradictory process, with reflections on the forms of accumulation and organization of production and society, and its complexity is not considered when based on positivist analyzes based on a fragmented and unidimensional view. It is necessary to recognize the advances obtained by positivism since Auguste Comte, especially in intra-organizational technological and productive terms, but it is worth noting the possibility of launching a multidimensional look at the DO, touching discussions on structure and superstructure with the possibility of territorialization of organizations through a process of disruptive changes in operational, tactical and strategic terms.

The analysis of the production organization macroperiods enables the historical contextualization and understanding of the main social and organizational changes that occurred, with predominant characteristics in each period, from a dialectical perspective and of totality. Tenório (2011) states that post-Fordism contains characteristics of Fordism and that these elements are interactive, including post-industrial possibilities of analysis about organizational development and markets, with trends towards economies of scope, including family production, small-scale and even artisanal. The importance of analyzing the macroperiods of development is described by Ramos (1989), mentioning the psychological effects of the modes of production, in addition to the historical characterization and impacts of the direct organization of production already described by Marx:

There is merit in both Horkheimer's and Habermas' works insofar as they endeavor to demonstrate the basic error of Marx's view of reason as an attribute of the historical process. Both would question the assumption that the unfolding of productive forces, by itself, would lead to the advent of a rational society. Horkheimer seems to demonstrate that, from the moment reason is displaced from the human psyche, where it should be, and is transformed into an attribute of society, the possibility of social science is lost. Habermas emphasizes the circumstance that, in advanced industrial societies, their productive forces are ultimately political compulsions shaping all human life. (RAMOS 1989, 19)

Historical contextualization consists of a critical and reflective contribution that can influence dynamics and organizational studies, as well as the development of companies. Gurgel and Justen (2015, 199) highlight the importance of recognizing the historicity of the phenomena when analyzing the historical context of the development of organizational theories from the perspective of “[...] seeking to provide answers that guarantee the fulfillment of the system's needs at each historical cycle. They seek to meet the determinations of capitalism, offering solutions, at the company level, to each challenge posed”.

In this historical context of development of international capitalism, organizational studies aligned with the development of society and forms of organization of production originated, in epistemological terms, linked to rigid accumulation and unidimensional positivism, due to the instrumentality evidenced in the theories and dynamics of organizations (Fontoura and Wittmann, 2016; Fontoura 2019; Fontoura; Tenório 2020), Tenório, 1998).

By way of conclusion

As described throughout this essay and in a perspective of critical studies, it is of fundamental importance to understand the historical context in the case of the development of organizations and their impacts on society, since they influenced the production organizational own form, mainly in the industrial macroperiod, presented in this study.

On this journey, a decline in the way organizations are structured is evident, which were hegemonically based on mass production, requiring, especially today, more and more, new adaptive formats, accelerated with the advent of the Covid-19 pandemic.

These new formations include expanding innovation processes, flexibility, meeting regional demands, people management. Balancing the economic vision and the externalities of organizations in terms of social and environmental aspects are also increasingly pressing challenges, which requires the development of new concepts of competitiveness and a multidimensional worldview in organizations and people.

How to develop a more holistic view, focused on society and not on rigid models rooted in a mass industrial dynamics of decades of historical development? There is a tension here in relation to the production organizational forms that seems to be a research agenda for critical organizational studies and for the science of Regional Development, since management schools are still basically positivist.

This analysis is difficult to understand in a dichotomized society in general terms, including in political terms, and these issues are disseminated in all aspects of difficulty in understanding structuring factors, as described in Cepal reports, for example, the work *Pacts for equality* (2014), questioning the importance of a vision of development that increasingly embraces the economic, but also the social and environmental aspects, in line with the difficult question of thinking about the common good.

In other words, this shortsightedness of a structuring analysis, which appears in forms of business organization, also appears in the scope of society in general, by yielding to purely economic thinking and focused on idealized needs and not on diverse and adaptive possibilities. Indeed, dichotomous views predominate, often shallow, too simple and one-dimensional for complex, multidimensional, multifactorial and multifaceted issues of society.

In an attempt not to fall into fads, this essay stimulates thought through an initial historical context, highlighting the rupture of the hegemonic industrial model, without logically defending the end of industry, just the need to not have industrial thinking in all relations as only possibility.

In this path, the term post-industrial appears, without delimitation of closed “boxes”, but as a movement not to keep creating terms all the time, as fads, since the changes mentioned in this study are evidenced in the international literature, as highlighted in this essay, since the 2000s, only a few processes have accelerated due to human evolution, technology and the moment we live in due to the entire political, economic and health context, worldwide, with repercussions on international demand and relations of production, where manuals tend to be less and less effective.

REFERENCES

- AGOSTINHO, M. E. **Complexidade e organizações: em busca da gestão autônoma**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.
- BARQUERO, V. **Desenvolvimento endógeno em tempos de globalização**. Porto Alegre: Fundação de Economia e Estatística, 2001.
- BARROS, C.; DAINEZI, G. F. **Devaneios sobre a atualidade do capital**. Porto Alegre: Sanskrito, 2014.
- BELL, D. 1977. **Las contradicciones culturales del capitalismo**. Madrid: Alianza, 1977.
- _____. **The coming of Post-Industrial Society**, 1973
- BENKO, G. **A ciência regional. Oeiras**. Portugal: Celta, 1999.
- BOLTANSKI, Luc; CHIAPELLO, Ève. **O novo espírito do capitalismo**. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2009.
- CEPAL, N. **Pactos para a igualdade: rumo a um futuro sustentável**. Síntese, 2014.
- ETGES, V. E. **Desenvolvimento regional sustentável: o território como paradigma**. *Redes*, v. 10 n. 3, 47-55, 2005.
- ETGES, V. E.; DEGRANDI, O. J. Desenvolvimento regional: a diversidade regional como potencialidade. **Revista Brasileira de Desenvolvimento Regional**, v. 1 n. 1, 85-94, 2013. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7867/2317-5443.2013v1n1p085-094>
- FERRAZ, J. C., Kupfer, D., Haguenuer, L. **Made in Brazil: desafios competitivos para a indústria**. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1997.
- FONTOURA, F. B. B.; TENÓRIO, F. G. Desenvolvimento Organizacional Multidimensional: uma perspectiva crítica para os estudos organizacionais. **Redes**, v.25, n. 2, 590-609, 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17058/redes.v25i2.14549>

FONTOURA, F. B. B. **Desenvolvimento Organizacional Multidimensional: Uma perspectiva crítica para o estudo de organizações Familiares**. 2019. 181f. Tese (Doutorado em Desenvolvimento Regional) – Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul, Santa Cruz do Sul, 2019.

FONTOURA, F. B. B.; WITTMANN, M. L. Organizações e desenvolvimento: reflexões epistemológicas. **Revista do Cepe**, 43, 101-118, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17058/cepe.voi43.7427>.

HARVEY, D. **A condição pós-moderna**. São Paulo: Loyola, 1992.

HORKHEIMER, M. **Teoria crítica**. Buenos Aires: Amorrurtu, 1974

HORKHEIMER, M.; ADORNO, W. T. **Dialética do esclarecimento**: fragmentos filosóficos. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1985.

MALTHUS, T. R. **Ensaio sobre população**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1982.

MARCUSE, H. **A ideologia da sociedade industrial**: o homem unidimensional. (G. Rebuá, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1973.

MARX, K. 1974. **O capital**: crítica da economia política. Rio de Janeiro. Civilização Brasileira.

MORGAN, G. **Imagens da organização**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1996.

PORTER, M. **Estratégia competitiva**. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1986.

RAMOS, A. G. **A nova ciência das organizações**: uma reconceituação da riqueza das nações. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1989.

RAMOS, A. G. **A redução sociológica**. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 1996.

RICARDO, D. **Princípios de economia política e tributação**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1982.

SHUMPETER, J. **A teoria do desenvolvimento econômico**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1982.

SILVEIRA, Rogério Leandro Lima da. **Complexo agroindustrial do fumo e território: a formação do espaço urbano e regional no Vale do Rio Pardo-RS**. 2007. 578f. Tese (Doutorado em Geografia) - Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2007.

SMITH, A. **A riqueza das nações: investigação sobre a natureza e suas causas**. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1996.

TENÓRIO, G. F. A unidade dos contrários: fordismo e pós-fordismo. **RAP**, v. 45, 4, 1141-1172, 2011. Disponível em: <https://bibliotecadigital.fgv.br/ojs/index.php/rap/article/view/7030/5589>.

TENÓRIO, G. F. Gestão social: uma perspectiva conceitual. **RAP**, v. 32, n. 5, 7-23, 1998.

TENÓRIO, G. F. **Tecnologia da informação transformando as organizações e o trabalho**. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2007.

TENÓRIO, G. F. **Tem razão a administração?** Ensaios de teoria organizacional. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2004.

TENÓRIO, G. F.; CANÇADO, C. A.; PEREIRA, J. R. Gestão social: reflexões teóricas e conceituais. **Cadernos EBAPE**, v. 9, n. 3, 681-703, 2011

TOFFLER, A. **“Powershift”, as mudanças de poder: um perfil da sociedade do século XXI pela análise das transformações e natureza do poder**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1995.

WITTMANN, M. L.; LUBECK, R. M.; NELSON, M. V. “Uma visão não linear da estratégia pelo prisma da complexidade”. **Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração**, 7(4), 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12712/rpca.v7i4>

YUNUS, M. **Um mundo sem pobreza: a empresa social e o futuro do capitalismo com Karl Weber**. (J. A. Saad; H. A. R. Monteiro, Trad.). São Paulo: Ática, 2008.