

1 Non-Conventional Organizations -the Messengers of the Future 2 in the World of Organizations and Management

3 Gergely Nemeth¹, Zoltan Csigas² and Gergely Nemeth³

4 ¹ Corporate Values

5 *Received: 7 April 2015 Accepted: 4 May 2015 Published: 15 May 2015*

7 **Abstract**

8 This study offers a pioneering description of non-conventional organizations (NCOs),
9 enterprises which the authors suggest provide potential templates for the structure and
10 operation of organizations of the future. Using established definitions of what constitutes an
11 entrepreneur, the authors establish two criteria by which an organization might be judged as
12 being an NCO, including the notion of ?absolute uniqueness? and, according to the
13 evolutionary model, the ability to pass on their non-conventional solutions to organizations of
14 the future. The authors identify NCOs of the past and propose candidate NCOs of the present.

16 **Index terms**— forms of business enterprises, patterns of entrepreneurship, non-conventional organizations,
17 organizations of the future.

18 **1 Introduction**

19 hat will the organization of the future look like? This is a question we often pose to business leaders, but very few
20 of them take a visionary leap and look beyond the next few days and months in an attempt to reveal the future
21 of their organizations or of organizations in general. We, as organizational development consultants, continually
22 direct our clients towards better, more effective and more "modern" organizations. But what do we mean by
23 "modern"? Though we are charged with offering inspiring and innovative solutions, just how innovative are
24 they? Most of our clients want to be shown solutions that work, solutions that, moreover, have proven track
25 records. This inherent conservatism in approach may produce better organizations for the present, but will such
26 "conventional" solutions produce organizations best prepared for the world of business in ten, twenty or fifty
27 years' time?

28 While preparing the Organizational Development World Summit 2010 in Budapest, the authors got closer
29 to understanding how the organization of the future might look (Németh, 2009). In this article -which might
30 be regarded as a theoretical introduction to the study of future organizations -we review our approach to the
31 exploration of the structure and functioning of future organizations, and we introduce our central concepts that
32 might serve as a basis for further thinking. This event served as the global meeting of organizational development
33 professionals, connecting a wide range of professional disciplines and societies. Alongside the objectives of mutual
34 inspiration, knowledge sharing and networking opportunities, the event also had an "historical" goal. We wanted
35 to analyze how the organizational development profession -and indeed organizations themselves -has evolved over
36 time, from the origin of the profession in the late 1940s, to current practices and on to the foreseeable future.
37 The non-conventional organization (NCO) program was specifically established to explore the future of our
38 practice and of organizations. To facilitate this exploration, we spotlighted some inspirational organizations at
39 our conference, organizations that are outstanding in terms of performance, sustainability and many other criteria.
40 In short, we endeavoured to identify those organizations that are trendsetters and that can serve as blueprints
41 for not only today's managers but also for current and potential entrepreneurs -as well as for consultants, as the
42 agents of change -in terms of their structure and their operation.

43 How can we peer into the structure and operation of future organizations? There are several widely used
44 methods for predicting the future of organizations and plotting its possible variants. These methods are mostly

1 INTRODUCTION

45 based on strategic planning processes (Loveridge, 2008; ??ostanzo & MacKay, 2009; Mintzberg et al, 2002). There
46 are up to forty accepted methods at present according to the methodological handbooks (e.g. Glenn & Gordon,
47 2009; Jackson, 2011), and all these essentially follow the main steps of the general foresight paradigm delineated
48 by Voros (2003). Despite the wide methodological palette available and the economic and social necessity to
49 elucidate the future of business (e.g. Slaughter & Bussey, 2006), studies on the future of organizations have still
50 applied only a very limited range of the available approaches and methods.

51 In the last few years, most descriptions of future organizations have been founded on scenario-based studies
52 (e.g. Laubacher & Malone, 1997; Gray & Hovav, 2007). These studies were based on identifying major determinant
53 forces (or "drivers") in different business fields and aimed to describe those organizational, leadership and
54 operational models that could provide efficient, sustainable operations in the predicted business environment
55 of the future.

56 In the 2007 Pricewater house Coopers study Managing Tomorrow's People, which attempted to forecast the
57 nature of business and of organizations in 2020, the most probable future scenarios were examined based on the
58 possible interactions of four antagonistic pairs of "global forces". These four pairs were business fragmentation
59 vs. corporate integration, individualism vs. collectivism, globalization vs. reverse globalization, and the axis of
60 technological penetration: "I control technology" vs. "Technology controls me". Based on these, three feasible
61 economic realities were conceptualized, together with the associated corporate metaphors. The so-called "blue
62 world", which combines the fulfilment of integration and individualism, will probably be ruled by monumental,
63 hierarchical corporations ("Corporate is king"), while the "green world", emerging from the combined forces of
64 integration and collectivism, will be characterized by companies organized along different values ("Companies
65 care"). In the "orange world" of fragmented businesses the competitive advantage of "Small is beautiful" will
66 be typical, and these small enterprises will emerge from the constantly changing social networks of individual
67 employees. The PwC study describes the management practices of each corporate form in detail, and this way
68 it gives quite an accurate picture of the prospective inner structures of the organizations.

69 The well-known disadvantage of this approach lies in its weakness in incorporating unusual and unexpected
70 changes and the dynamic nature of the future (Schwarz, 2009). The hypothetical future cannot be any more
71 diversified than that allowed by the creativity of the researchers composing the scenario. Just as in the case of
72 Ashby's Law (1958), we cannot disregard certain frameworks. Another possible method of delineating the future,
73 including the future of organizations, is through extrapolation of trends occurring in the present. Applying this
74 approach we can only forecast the continuation and strengthening of currently existing processes (e.g. Cetron &
75 Davies, 2010; Feldman, 2010).

76 We may base our presentation of the structure and operation of future organizations on the predictions
77 and assumptions that have already been presented in the literature on management science (e.g. Hesselbein
78 & Goldsmith, 2009). Even without an exhaustive review, we are able to summarize those key characteristics
79 identified by contemporary academic authors and current business leaders of organizations that might best survive
80 in both the current business environment and, moreover, proliferate in the business environment of the future.
81 Three such characteristics are flexibility, agility and the preparedness for continuous change. These characteristics
82 make assumptions about future organizations based on the continuation of diversified environmental states (which
83 are almost unpredictable even today) and the necessity of corporate adaptation to these states. Another approach,
84 which emphasizes the importance of individual and corporate identity as a stable point (often originating from the
85 actual inconsistency of the environment believed to be constant), makes strong assumptions about the corporate
86 culture of future organizations. The authors forecast the emergence of organizations that have a strong inner
87 identity (rather than those characterized by processes that permit flexible, continuous inner changes): such
88 organizations provide an extraordinarily stable environment to their members.

89 While preparing our research, we decided that in addition to a combination of academic knowledge and
90 extrapolation methods based on contemporary mainstream trends, we should also incorporate the idea of organic
91 development into our approach.

92 IV. Discussion -Who is the Entrepreneur that can Create Something Truly Exceptional?

93 A full review of the literature pertaining to this question, which is almost big enough to fill a library on
94 its own, is beyond the scope of this paper; however, we might provide a short summary of the identity of
95 such an entrepreneur limiting ourselves to the outstanding work of Urban (ed. 2010) and a selection of other
96 important analyses (Salgado-Banda, 2005; Audretsch et al, 2010; Dabkowski, 2011). According to Schumpeter
97 (1934/1980), an entrepreneur is a person who is an owner of a small business in an competitive environment
98 who manages to create a better management system, and who introduces new, innovative products and processes
99 ??Gray, 2002, p61). Entrepreneurs are individuals who operate an enterprise in the profit or non-profit sector
100 and whose business behavior is characterized by innovation, growth, taking risks, reorganizing resources, and
101 creating workplaces (Schumpeter, 1934;Knight, 1921;Bolton, 1971;Stanworth & Gray, 1991;Storey, 1994).

102 In a broader framework, entrepreneurs are individuals who operate a business enterprise and are growth-
103 oriented. Their management capabilities and their focus on setting and achieving goals create added value
104 to the customer, conferring a competitive advantage on their enterprises. Schumpeter (1934) also defines the
105 entrepreneur as an agent of change, one who combines the concept of a product or service, or the use of the
106 available resources, in an innovative way (e.g. Schultz 1975). This latter definition is a particularly fruitful one
107 for the authors in the context of the evolution of organizations.

109

2 The Basis of the Evolutionary Approach

110 The evolution of operational dynamics in the corporate world is believed by some authors to follow similar
 111 principles to evolutionary biology. In a given niche (where a market segment is equated to an ecological
 112 niche) the organizations (the "living creatures") compete with each other to survive and proliferate (expressed
 113 in terms of making a profit, realizing business goals, etc.). Those organizations having characteristics that
 114 provide a competitive advantage in the market place and which can best adapt to the prevailing environmental
 115 circumstances are better able to prosper (Kieser & Woywode, 2006). A new idea, either for a product or for the
 116 modus vivendi of the organization, can create added value and thus provide a competitive advantage. László
 117 Mér? (2007) gave the name mónto these organizational phenomena. In our approach, being an NCO is a mónto, or
 118 a combination of a number of them (a mónto-pattern), which differs from the organizational mónto-pattern specific
 119 to the given period of time.

120

3 VI. Non-Conventional Organizations:

121

Tracking Imperceptible Organic Development

122 While preparing for the conference, we were looking for existing organizations which already have in place
 123 operationalpractices that we predict will be successful in the future, either the methods these organizations
 124 use or their organizational structure. We were looking for organizations that seemed to be able to successfully
 125 "pass on" their advanced, unorthodox practices to future generations of organizations. Both the existence of
 126 unorthodox practices and the ability to pass them on were defining characteristics in our view. We termed these
 127 exemplary, inspiring organizations non-conventional organizations (NCOs). We were looking for organizations
 128 and organizational practices which can be considered in the eyes of the futurists as "weak signals" or "future
 129 signs" (Ansoff, 1975; ??iltunen, 2010).

130 Since we had to conduct a complete search process, we had to provide a precise definition in order to be able
 131 to identify such non-conventional organizations. While formulating this definition, constantly interpreting it and
 132 working on its premise, we encountered many and mostly unforeseen questions. The process of considering and
 133 attempting to answer these questions took us significantly closer to establishing and forming our own ideas and
 134 expectations regarding the organizations of the future. a) Our definition consisted of two criteria i. First criterion
 135 a. The organization must show an above-average performance, or have the potential for such performance in
 136 its own field of operation or industry. ii. Rationale for the first criterion Those organizations that exhibit poor
 137 performance in their current environment, that are not successful, and that lack the potential for success in
 138 the future, are less likely to survive to a future time. After exhausting their reserves and losing their investors,
 139 they will struggle to remain participants in the present: they also lose their ability to pass on to the future the
 140 advanced practices they were using. Thus, they will not play any role in the future; we cannot use them as
 141 exemplars. The evolutionary process makes its selection.

142 iii. Our dilemmas regarding the first criterion 1. Our first dilemma emerged from the interpretation of the
 143 word "organization", specifically whether we should include project teams which were specifically established to
 144 achieve a single concrete goal. For instance, should we consider the election campaign organization of Barack
 145 Obama -which we regarded as being non-conventional because of their creative use of statistical methods and
 146 the Internet -an "organization"? Is it necessary for an organization to work continuously? In our opinion it is
 147 not, and we made our decision accordingly. We believe that these one-time or transient organizations can also
 148 serve as extraordinarily inspiring examples for the organizations of the present and future; they can pass on
 149 their characteristics to the future simply by being memorable, embodied in the mónto established and created by
 150 them. 2. In our initial definition we only used the word "success". But by which criteria can an organization be
 151 considered successful? If it is financially successful? If it endures? (and, in this case, how long must it endure?)
 152 It seemed logical to establish several parallel success criteria, but to use them in a search process seemed to be
 153 impossible.

154 In addition to the difficulty of defining success as a business concept (especially given the "cult of success"
 155 characteristic of the present day and the speed at which information and efficient solutions spread), we also
 156 assumed that the modern operating methods of those organizations considered successful are actively imitated
 157 and adapted by competing companies. As such, they would not fit our next criterion. They are no longer
 158 the "new" innovative thinkers, rather they are determinative agents of already existing trends: they have
 159 become trendsetters. These organizations might be considered the "NCOs of yesterday". In connection with
 160 this dilemma, we will mention as examples the car manufacturers Toyota and Ford. Ford were pioneers in the
 161 field of standardized production, in the use of the assembly line, technological sequence, etc. Toyota, on the other
 162 hand, can be considered one of the NCOs of the 1970s and 1980s because of their development of a number of
 163 innovative methods, such as lean, Just in Time, kanban systems, value-oriented management, 5S, etc. (Likert,
 164 2004; Spear & Bowen, 1999; ??ikert & Hoseus, 2008; Hirotaka et al., 2008). Both organizations incorporated some
 165 unusual, sometimes unique solutions in their time; however, the adaption of those solutions is already remarkably
 166 widespread in the corporate life of our days. There are some organizations, for example Google, that have built

167 themselves up by combining some of their new, innovative móns and some older ones, in doing so establishing a
168 highly successful organization (Iyer & Davenport, 2008;Hagi & Yoffie, 2009).

169 Consequently, and as a compromise, we resolved to use both high performance and the potential for high
170 performance in our definition. We defined performance by the evident or potential achievement of the goals set
171 by the organization. We assumed that those organizations that could achieve their own goals would be able to
172 endure. Performance, on the other hand, does not necessarily mean financial success or satisfied customers and
173 employees. For example, we considered the Hotel Panda in Budapest a good example of our definition. This
174 three-star hotel works almost exclusively with employees with some sort of learning or physical impairment. The
175 enterprise works, in the sense that it has endured; it offers a service to its clients and provides a job for its
176 employees. We can consider it a well-performing organization, but not necessarily, in today's common meaning
177 of the word, successful; for example, there is no Hotel Panda chain. iv. Second criterion Success and the related
178 dilemma of imitation have a direct and close relationship in the second criterion for our definition.

179 The abovementioned high performance of an organization must be reached by an unusual, nonconventional
180 method of operation, by value proposition, a unique business model and management, or by a unique process
181 system.

182 During our research, simply having a unique product or service was not in itself enough to achieve the status
183 of NCO. v. Rationale

184 We wanted to capture the essence of nonconventionality in this point. The list is only for guidance, but it also
185 represents our own open approach we wanted to apply during our search. We found it important that innovation
186 be a central element of the operation of the organization, that is, it had to unequivocally contribute to the high
187 performance or make high performance possible.

188 4 vi. Our dilemmas regarding the second criterion

189 We faced two serious dilemmas during our research created by the second part of our definition. The first one
190 is the previously discussed question of uniqueness, of novelty, that underpins the organization's success. For
191 example, can we consider the web-based commercial models of eBay or Amazon.com unique? Is the business
192 model of Anytmeeting.com unique in that it provides all the necessary systems for its clients to hold webinars
193 completely free of charge? Is the idea of "full vertical ownership" (motivational share options available for the
194 whole employee group) special? These solutions are interesting but clearly not unique. Webshops and business
195 models based on free services are widespread these days, but in the 1980s and 1990s these models were NCOs.

196 The dilemma of judging "uniqueness" can be resolved into several questions. The first question is the one
197 illustrated by the examples above, that is, the question of "absolute uniqueness": Does the organization show
198 an attribute or characteristic that we have not seen before? The second question is whether the organization
199 exhibits a unique characteristic combination (món-combination). For example, does it make Radical Inclusion,
200 the boutique consultant company, which is conventional in many aspects, "unique enough" in the way they apply
201 fully virtualized internal co-operation processes? Looking for the answer to this question leads us, theoretically
202 at least, to the next question, which is to identify the typical móncombinations of an era (in terms of the variables
203 of time, geography, economy, or the ecosystem of an enterprise). How unique should an NCO be? Answering this
204 question completely reaches far beyond the scope of this article, but it may be worthwhile to have a look at how
205 we might begin to tackle it. For example, one recent analysis identified the typical characteristics of a successful
206 start-up and its typical development curve, highlighting the optimal structure of the group, the business model,
207 and its financing ??Marmer et al., 2012). Such an analysis could help us recognize successful start-ups that do
208 not fit the typical móncombination or "conventional" model.

209 The uniqueness of the móncombinations, based on the evolutionary approach, must be defined in relation to the
210 environmental conditions of the given organization. Those current surveys presently known to us concentrate on
211 the ranking of the business environment (e.g. cities, countries, industrial branches) along the lines of a specific
212 viewpoint-system rather than on a differentiated comparative analysis. To our knowledge, there have only been a
213 few case studies in which the characteristics of successful organizations in a given environment have been studied.
214 In an analysis that examined Israeli start-ups ??Chorev & Anderson, 2013), business factors were categorized
215 according to how important they were to the ecosystem and to the startups' ultimate success. Among the most
216 important factors were strategy, the business "idea", marketing, and the loyalty and expertise of the employees;
217 less important ones were judged to be management, public relations, and research and development; the least
218 important ones were the economic and political environment (Magos & Németh, 2014).

219 Our second dilemma about the second criterion was in judging whether non-conventional character is central
220 to the organization, or more precisely whether the uniqueness we believed to have identified in the organization
221 did indeed significantly contribute to its performance. Is the unique, regularly changing management structure of
222 the counselling company Vialto (which is based on the controlled rotation of the senior circle) a central element
223 of their success? Do the logistics innovations of the Indian company Akashaya Patra, which provides food to
224 children to help them perform better at school, play a significant part in the company's work? To what extent
225 do the spiritual teachings followed by both the founders and healers of the Aravind Eye Hospital contribute to
226 the operational efficiency and celebrity of the hospital? Based on the correspondence with the people involved
227 and the documents that we collected, we decided that the answer is in the affirmative in each case.

228 **5 VII.**

229 **6 Conclusion**

230 In summary, we were looking for organizations that have introduced a significant degree of innovation in some field
231 (or fields) of their operation, but do not yet have a large number of followers applying this innovation. Our search
232 focused on mutations, positive deviations from the ordinary, and exclusively ones that are capable of survival.
233 In addition, the organization must demonstrate its uniqueness not only in its phenotype but in its genotype as
234 well, on the level of the organizational DNA (Morgan, 1998;Neilson et al, 2003;Bray et al, 2011;Baksin, 2012).
235 We were looking for organizations that were already employing the potential operational methods of the future
236 organizations and that show the potential to be effective, indeed successful, in the future with the help of these
237 methods.

238 In order to classify those organizations we found, we established a 2x2 matrix categorization system (this can
239 be viewed at the end of this article, complete with examples). One of the dimensions in this matrix was the
240 organizational phenomenon, expressed either as an introverted or extroverted factor. For example, a HR process
241 or a development in organizational culture is an introverted factor; on the other hand, a development valuable to
242 the clients of the organization, e.g. self-service or wandering in the warehouses of IKEA, are extroverted: these
243 reach over the boundaries of the organizations. Our other chosen dimension for the matrix was whether the
244 organizational phenomenon/innovation affects value creation directly or indirectly. Using the examples above,
245 the introduction and operation of an innovative talent-management system does not provide a direct contribution
246 to the value creation, rather it contributes indirectly; on the other hand, in the IKEA example we can definitely
247 speak about a direct contribution, although we have highlighted only one element of the value-creation chain
248 (Porter, 1995).

249 **7 a) Detour: Tracking down the non-conventional organizations**

250 In the preparation phase of our research we mainly used as sources of information to reveal NCOs Internet
251 forums, innovation webpages, community networks, industrial sources, and recommendations from fellow
252 consultants. After identifying interesting candidates, we tried to clarify through personal contact whether the
253 given organization matches our research criteria and also whether they might wish to join our conference program.
254 Eventually, we identified just over a hundred possible NCO candidates. During the analysis of our research we
255 found several possible explanations for this relatively low number of NCO candidates.

256 It is conceivable that we established a definition which was too strict, even in its current modified form. We
257 might have been able to include more organizations as candidate NCOs by leaving out the first criterion. However,
258 this would have meant us discarding the importance placed on the evolutionary aspect.

259 During our research, we also identified the difficulty in acquiring information as a main obstacle. Our research
260 team found it particularly difficult to gather sufficient information and impressions related to our first criterion.
261 Notwithstanding the practical difficulties, we finally came to the conclusion that the number of NCOs is indeed
262 quite small. Whether this small number means that we should be concerned for the flexibility and endurance of
263 present or future organizations is a pertinent question, but one that we cannot begin to answer in this current
264 article.

265 **8 . Radical Inclusion**

266 Radical Inclusion is a consulting company that provides services to organizations anywhere in the world. Their
267 main field of service is the reform and improvement of work processes through the introduction of tools for virtual
268 cooperation, and the support subsequently given for the professional application of these tools. However, the true
269 nonconventionality of Radical Inclusion does not lie in the service it provides, but in the way their own internal
270 operation has perfected this virtual cooperation. The members of the five-strong team of the company live in four
271 different countries. They have no personal contact with each other in their everyday work; they communicate
272 through different technical solutions (e.g. Skype, phone, AIM, cloud-based document libraries, forums). They
273 have built up their shared virtual work surface according to a definite system, and there you can find a virtual
274 client space, a coffee room for joint relaxation and inspiration, as well as their personal work surfaces. According
275 to the founders, in the first year following the foundation of the company they met up only virtually and never
276 face-to-face .

277 The key element of the company's strong performance, in addition to the virtual or blended work processes
278 they offer, is their own special modus vivendi, which gives them maximum credibility in the eyes of their clients
279 in the field of virtual organizations.

280 ii. NESsT During our research, the global organization NESsT also caught our attention by virtue of its
281 distinctive operating model and the philosophy that lies behind it. Combining the models of venture investment
282 and philanthropy, the organization applies the approach of "Venture Philanthropy". Using this approach they
283 support social enterprises, that is, organizations working for social objectives. However, their support is not
284 limited to financial aid; NESsT handles the money given for good purposes as investments. Through a wide
285 range of consulting services, experience sharing and other tools, it builds on the initial success of the investment
286 so that the clients' social objectives are sustainable, as well as ensuring the initial investment is financially

287 worthwhile. The combination of the two operational models -venture investment and philanthropy -makes this
288 organization unique.

289 We determined that NESsT was successful by virtue of the steadily growing number of organizations they
290 support and the growth of the capital available for this support.

291 iii. Mumbai Dabbawalas This Mumbai-based food distribution company employs several thousands of couriers,
292 most of whom are illiterate or lacking basic educational skills. With their help they deliver daily more than two
293 hundred thousand home-cooked meals in lunch boxes from the residence of their clients where they are prepared
294 to work places and schools all around the city, often to places which lack an address or telephone number (e.g.
295 construction sites). They also do this with such punctuality and reliability that they can manage to compete
296 with the services of professional logistic companies that employ high-tech equipment. Their reported error rate
297 is 1 in 1,000,000, equivalent to the results of the six sigma methodology. The success of these food couriers,
298 evidenced not least by the winning of numerous international prizes and invitations to give presentations at
299 countless conferences, is based on the efficient inner organization, trust and strong loyalty. In the maintenance
300 of the system the common ownership and the equitable share of wages within the organization, which has a flat
301 management structure despite it having 5000 members, plays an important role (Covell, 2009).

302 9 c) The non-conventional organizations of the recent past

303 During our research, we identified several organizations whose unique operational models and special practices
304 have already been copied by other organizations. We have not included these organizations in our research, but
305 some of them are worth mentioning as the trendsetters of yesterday. Studying their examples can guide us in
306 understanding how the NCOs of today might affect the world of the organizations of the near future.

307 10 i. Amazon.com and ebay.com

308 These two companies have remained pioneers in e-commerce over the last couple of decades. They have established
309 the world's biggest webshops and social "marketplaces" (Darren, 2004;Ho, 2008). Virtual commerce is an orthodox
310 solution today; however, the success of these organizations raises the question as to which new commercial
311 platforms we might see in the years to come.

312 11 ii. Zara (Inditex group)

313 The world-famous clothing retailers achieved an industry-level competitive advantage by shortening the design
314 and production cycle for their merchandise. In contrast to other retailers whose seasonal collections are typically
315 planned one year in advance, this shorter cycle has allowed Zara to keep their customers' interest by offering them
316 fresh collections in the same season (Ferdows et al., 2004). Control of the entire production process, from the
317 design stage to the clothes hitting the shops -a kind of democratization of the fashion industry -has played a key
318 role in the success of the Inditex group (Bonnin, 2002). Zara was able to step out of the circle of expectations and,
319 in the vernacular of the time, "think outside the box". Which will be the next box that high-output manufacturers
320 leave behind?

321 iii. Southwest Airlines (SWA)

322 Southwest Airlines was the pioneer of the budget airline business model (Raynor, 2011;Kaplan & Norton,
323 2004). To offset the loss of revenue from sales of cheaper airline tickets, the company cut back on extra services
324 (in-flight meals, waiting rooms, etc.). Although these steps might first have appeared as a loss in value for the
325 passengers, the airline was able to increase the number of flights per day on a given route and also fly to more
326 destinations, thereby increasing the interconnectivity of their network. Their operational model has since been
327 copied by several other airlines. The example of Southwest raises the question as to where the boundaries of
328 services lie: which are the elements of service that will no longer be provided free of charge in the next few years?

329 iv. NetFlix

330 The NetFlix organization has an original way of managing its talents and high-performing employees. It
331 places great emphasis on its corporate values, aligning selection of new employees with these values and making
332 them clear to new recruits; these values also permeate the workplace. The organizational culture is founded on
333 understanding and logic rather than being rule-based. In the terminology of transactional analysis, NetFlix treats
334 its co-workers as "adults" and it counts on their intelligence, encouraging their creativity in an inspirational and
335 supportive atmosphere, instead of just expecting them to adapt to certain rules (as "children"). There are no
336 performance bonuses; on the other hand, the workers can work in excellent, comfortable premises ??Mc Cord,
337 2014). ¹

¹© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 1: W © 2015

338 [Toyota and Ford] , ; Toyota , Ford .

339 [Marmer] , Marmer .

340 [Stanworth and Gray ()] , J Stanworth , C Gray . 1991. Bolton 20 Years On, Paul Chapman, London.

341 [Kaplan and Norton ()] , R Kaplan , D P Norton . 2004. *Strategy Maps*. HB press.

342 [Hesselbein and Goldsmith ()] , F Hesselbein , M Goldsmith . *Organizations of the future* 2009. Jossey-Bass Publishing. 2.

343

344 [Urban ()] , B Urban . *Frontiers in Entrepreneurship* 2010. Springer-Verlag.

345 [Voros ()] 'A generic foresight process framework'. J Voros . *Foresight* 2003. 5 (3) p. .

346 [Covell ()] 'Achieve six sigma the Mumbai way'. S Covell . *Supply Management* 2009. 14 p. .

347 [Bonnin ()] A R Bonnin . *The Fashion Industry in Galicia: Understanding the 'Zara' Phenomenon*, 2002. 10 p. .

348 [Cetron and Davies ()] M J Cetron , O Davies . *Trends Shaping Tomorrow's World: Forces in the Natural and Institutional Environments*, 2010. 44 p. .

349

350 [Németh ()] 'Changing the mindset of the entrepreneur -Non Conventional Organizations'. Gergely Németh .
351 *Erdei Ferenc Science Conference Book*, 2009. 2009. p. .

352 [Chorev et al. (ed.) ()] Sch Chorev , A R Anderson , L A Constanzo , R B Mackay . *Success in Israel High-Tech Start-ups; Critical Factors and Process. Working paper 10*, L A Constanzo, R B Mackay, Szerk (ed.)
353 (Cheltenham) 2006. 2009. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. (Handbook of Research on Strategy and
354 Foresight)

355

356 [Porter ()] *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*, M Porter . 1995. New York:
357 The Free Press.

358 [Baksin ()] *Corporate DNA*, K Baksin . 2012. (Routledge)

359 [Spear and Bowen ()] *Decoding the DNA of the Toyota Production System* Harvard Business Manager, S Spear
360 , H Bowen . 1999. 1999 september.

361 [Raynor ()] 'Disruptive innovation: the Southwest Airlines case revisited'. M E Raynor . *Strategy & Leadership*
362 2011. 39 p. .

363 [Effect within the organization Semco; Vagas.com; Statoil; NetFlix Mumbai Dabbawalas] *Effect within the organization Semco; Vagas.com; Statoil; NetFlix Mumbai Dabbawalas*,

364

365 [Gray ()] 'Entrepreneurship, Resistant to change and growth in small firms'. C Gray . *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 2002. 2002. 9 (1) p. .

366

367 [Salgado-Banda ()] *Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth: An Empirical Analysis*, H Salgado-Banda . 2005.
368 Mexico City: Banco de Mexico. p. . (Research Paper)

369 [Kieser and Woywode (ed.) ()] *Evolúciós megközelítés*, A Kieser , M Woywode . Kieser, A -Ebers, M (ed.) 2006.
370 2006. p. .

371 [Loveridge ()] *Foresight: The art and science of anticipating the future*, D Loveridge . 2008. Routledge, London.

372 [Slaughter and Bussey ()] *Futures thinking for social foresight*, R A Slaughter , M Bussey . 2006. Tam Kang
373 University Press & Foresight International.

374 [Glenn and Gordon ()] J C Glenn , T J Gordon . *Futures Research Methodology Version 3.0, The Millennium
375 Project (NO)*, 2009.

376 [Gray and Hovav ()] P Gray , A Z Hovav . *The IS Organization of the Future: Four Scenarios for 2020;
377 Information Systems Management*, 2007. 24 p. .

378 [Audretsch, D.B. -Falck, O. -Heblick, S. Lederer, A. (ed.) ()] *Handbook of Research on innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Audretsch, D.B. -Falck, O. -Heblick, S. & Lederer, A. (ed.) 2011. Edward Elgar Publishing.

379

380 [Hiltunen ()] E Hiltunen . *The future sign and its three dimensions*, 2008. 40 p. .

381 [Mccord (2008)] 'How NetFlix Reinvented HR'. P Mccord . *Harvard Business Review* 2014. January-February
382 Issue pp3-8.

383

384 [Morgan ()] *Images of Organization*, G Morgan . 1998. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

385

386 [Ho ()] 'Inter-brand comparison of online auction markets'. J K Ho . *Electronic Commerce Research* 2008. 8 (2) p. .

387

388 [Magos and -Németh ()] A Magos , G -Németh . *A vállalkozói kultúra fejlesztése nagyban in: Lukovics M. -B. (szerk.) 2014: A területi fejlődés dilemmái. SZTE GTK, Közgazdaságtani Doktori Iskola*, (Szeged) 2014.

389

389 [Ansoff ()] 'Managing strategic surprise by responding to weak signals'. I H Ansoff . *California Management Review* 1975. 18 p. .

390 [Feldman ()] 'Managing the Organization of the Future'. M S Feldman . *Public Administration Review* 2010. 70
391 p. .

392 [Rendell ()] *Managing tomorrow's people -The future of work 2020*, M Rendell . <http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/managing-tomorrows-people/future-of-work> downloaded: on 2010.02.17 2007.

393

394 [NESst; SWA; Amazon; Ebay] *NESst; SWA; Amazon; Ebay*,

395 [Dabkowski and ; Darren ()] 'Network Studies & Analyses No.427 -Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth: An
396 Investigation into the relationship between Entrepreneurship and total factor productivity growth in the EU'.
397 A Dabkowski , F ; Darren . *The Impact of E-Commerce Strategies on Firm Value: Lessons from Amazon.com*
398 and Its Early Competitors, (Warsaw) 2011. 2004. 13 p. . (Journal of Business)

399 [Jackson ()] *Practical foresight guide, Shaping Tomorrow*, M Jackson . 2011.

400 [Ferdows et al. (2004)] 'Rapid-Fire Fulfillment'. K Ferdows , M A Lewis , J A D Machuca . *Harvard Business*
401 *Review* 2004. 2004 November.

402 [Ashby ()] 'Requisite Variety and its implications for the control of complex systems'. W R Ashby . *Cybernetica*
403 1958. 1958. 1 (2) .

404 [Iyer and Davenport (2008)] *Reverse Engineering Google's Innovation Machine* *Harvard Business Review*, B Iyer
405 , T H Davenport . 2008. 2008 April.

406 [Knight ()] *Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit. Hart, Schaffner, and Marx Prize Essays*, F H Knight . 1921. Boston
407 and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

408 [Mintzberg et al. ()] *Safari Strategy: The Complete Guide Through the Wilds of Strategic Management*. FT, H
409 Mintzberg , B Ahlstrand , J Lampel . 2002. 2007. Budapest: Tericum Kiadó. (A pénz evolúciója)

410 [Schumpeter ()] J Schumpeter . *Business wargaming: developing foresight within a strategic simulation*,
411 Cambridge, J O Schwarz (ed.) (MA) 1934. 2009. Harvard University Press. 21 p. . (Theory of Economic
412 Development)

411 [Bolton ()] *Small Firms ± Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Small Firms*, J Bolton . 1971. HMSO, London.
412 4811.

413 [M ()] *Startup Genome Report Extra on Premature Scaling* Downloaded from <http://blog.startupcompass.co/pages/startup-genome-report-extra-on-premature-scalon2014.12.20> 2012.

414

415 [Hirotaka et al. (2008)] 'The Contradictions That Drive Toyota's Success'. T Hirotaka , O Emi , S Norihiko .
416 *Harvard Business Review* 2008. 2008 June.

417

418 [Neilson et al. ()] 'The Four Bases of Organizational DNA'. G Neilson , B A Pasternack , D Mendes .
419 *Strategy+Business (Booz & Company* Winter 2003. (33) .

420 [Bray et al. ()] *The Innovator's DNA*, N Bray , H -Gregersen , C M Christensen . 2011. Harvard Business Review
421 Press.

421

422 [Schultz (1975)] 'The Value of the Ability to Deal with Disequilibria'. T W Schultz . *Journal of Economic*
423 *Literature* 1975. September. American Economic Association. 13 (3) p. .

424

425 [Likert and Hosues ()] *Toyota culture*, J Likert , M Hosues . 2008. McGraw-Hill Professional.

426

427 [Likert ()] *Toyota way*, J Likert . 2004. McGraw-Hill Professional.

428

429 [Storey ()] *Understanding the Small Business Sector*, D Storey . 1994. Routledge, London.

430

431 [Hagiu and Yoffie ()] 'What's Your Google Strategy?'. A Hagiu , D B Yoffie . *Harvard Business Review* 2009.
432 2009 april.

433

434 [Laubacher and Malone ()] *Two Scenarios for 21st Century Organizations: Shifting Networks of Small Firms or*
435 *All-Encompassing "Virtual Countries"?*, R J Laubacher , T W Malone . 1997. (, Web-documentum)