

Creating Responsible Organizations through Self-Management

Neeta Baporikar

Consultant & Independent Researcher, Maharashtra, India
Email: neetajb@rediffmail.com

Abstract—Organization can be defined as the phenomenon of human association to achieve different purposes and goals. However, since organizations consists of human beings we end up in ‘crisis’, of low productivity, high turnover, disgruntled employees, demotivated workforce and worst fraudulent management, in the absence of a human as a conscious creator of himself, the organization and also society. We also notice that as organizations grow and become big, they become highly bureaucratized, if not a toxic and risky society. Putting technology, finance and systems above self or not in accordance with natural principles, is going to endangering human being and health. New inventions and technological progress do not bring true well-being, neither do not develop a person’s inner potential, which is the greatest potential of a socially responsible society. Hence, adopting a qualitative approach with in-depth literature review method, paper deliberates on creating responsible organizations through self-management.

Keywords—consciousness, goals, management, organization, potential, productivity, society, technology, well-being

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizational progress is in a ‘crisis’, or cycles in the absence of a human as a conscious creator of himself, the organization and also society. Every day we can see scenes that remind us that the organization has become bureaucratized, if not a toxic and risky society. A human puts technological processes, robots, AI, and other devices and substances into systems that are not in accordance with natural principles, thereby endangering himself and his health. As a result, we can talk about a ‘crisis of organizations’, society and the impoverishment of human potential. New inventions and technological progress do not bring true well-being, as they do not develop a person’s inner potential, as the greatest potential of a socially responsible society.

As an example of developed, open, natural, conscious functioning, we present the great mind of the genius Tesla (2013), who equated physical work with mental work and devoted his entire waking life to thinking. It is deep thinking that conditions the openness of heart and mind, which can be linked to people’s love and freedom for themselves, compassion and solidarity for others and with the general culture. This was already pointed out by Beck

(2001): “We act, so to speak, in our own absence...”. But perhaps it is the presence of a human that is the force that we are all so immeasurably looking for, and it is precisely this force that man himself can control with his conscious presence and action, but with a lot of his own motivation.

We notice a lack of reflection and responsible behavior in organizations that impoverish our Slovenia and the entire planet. But we perceive the epochal changes that are happening today in us, our loved ones, organizations and in the world in general. And within all these changes are current transitions in digital, transition to paperless, transition to process automation. Many organizations run many projects where they actually want to automate and control everything, even people! But people are considered to be involved in the natural evolution of the life cycle, as they are part of nature and subject to natural laws and principles of action. Humans too often try to influence natural laws, but we are not successful in this transformation, because in practice they result like a boomerang or a butterfly effect. A human, despite ‘modern’ technology, cannot change Nature. It is given to the human to be mentally active, and there is his power for self-reflection, which somehow by nature creates the consciousness of action, of his production. It is the conscious behavior of a human that we can posit as our assumption that this is the key that is being sought for the organization of the future, which is actually already here.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Organization Concept

Organization can be defined as the phenomenon of human association to achieve different purposes and goals. Different authors define the organization according to their feeling, understanding and deepening. There are many definitions. We note that, despite the development, a clear definition of the phenomenon we call organization has not yet been developed. When reviewing the literature, we found many interpretations, but the simple and meaningful definition given by Ivanko (1982) is very close to us: “The organization is a whole”. Most organizational problems cannot be solved by any scientific discipline, so he suggests that knowledge be combined in interdisciplinary studies in organization theory. Ivanko (2004) later adds to

her definition: "Organization is a conscious activity that is carried out and maintained by the will of people in order to create a whole out of multiplicity". The authors note that organization is a young science with a long past and a short history (Ivanko, 2015; Ovsenik, 1999).

We are studying a person in an organization, so we cannot ignore the definition of Lipovec (1987): "An organization is a composition of mutual relationships between people". Mayer (1994) wrote a very comprehensive and meaningful definition for which I myself am very enthusiastic: "It is a system in which people, in the process of creative cooperation, realize their ideas in the direction of greater spiritual well-being". Ovsenik (1999) has been researching organizational throughout his life. thought and human activity in the organization and already at the beginning of his studies he gave a thesis or an equation on which our research is based: "Organization = relationships between people". Later, the definition was upgraded by Bukovec (2009) by adding the direction of action: "Target-oriented relationships between people". In the conclusions of his research, Ovsenik (1999) distinguishes between "organization" or "self-organization" as a natural phenomenon and "Organization" as social or social institutions.

Vila and Kovač (1997) find that there is a great emphasis on definitions and they are aware of the dimensions of the organization phenomenon, which enables a gradual entry into the understanding of this field. However, they very rationally define the organization with three attributes: "subject, structure and process". A comprehensive view of organizational science, with an attempt to outline the origin and development of organizational thought, is presented to us by Ovsenik (1999). He defines the origin of organization from the Greek word "organon", which means a tool, and "organizers", which means to form something into a whole, so that it functions as the human organism functions. Ovsenik (1999) explains meaningfully and vividly with the definition: "Organization is an analog circular process that turns again and again in a circular-spiral process". "Humane organization should be understood as a living system", said Capra (2002). A flexible organization is necessary in a dynamic environment, Ambrož and Lotrič (2009) also note: "A modern organization opens up to the environment, is flexible, encourages risk and is less and less supported by rules and procedures that inhibit rapid adaptation to new circumstances". The above definition aware of the interconnectedness of organizations, Ovsenik (1999) add further: "In the modern business world, the image of an organization that functions as a system is increasingly present."

Malić (1976), as a physicist, distinguishes: "spontaneous and mental (conscious), potential, relative and absolute organization". He emphasizes that the organization is like an organized state and it is necessary to properly understand all mutual relations. He defines the mental organization as a highly organized conscious system that is highly creative and gives a person a full life, both physically and mentally. It defines formulas for all

forms of organizations, but unfortunately not for the mental organization.

Post-modern organization presents Vila (2000) with defining an undefined organization: "The organization of the 21st century does not have definite outlines and form.". However, we cannot ignore Kljajić's (1994) views on organization: "Technology, especially informatics, and the evolution of the human psyche will allow us to go beyond classical forms of organization.". On this path, Kljajić (1994) gives us a brilliant guide to thinking: "Minimal effort maximal comfort.". By this we understand that we must pursue simplicity, even though we are researching a system that we call it 'Organizational Life'.

Self-management defines Lipovec (1987) as direct management. With this, a human not only changes the natural substance, but in this natural process he realizes his conscious goal and submits his will to it. He emphasizes that in the process of work it is not enough for a person to exert only his organs, but both attention and will are needed. Ovsenik (1999) talks about the dynamics that go from spontaneous self-organization through consciousness to socio-organization. He points out the lively development in the world, which brings too much concentration of content and problems, and as a result enables serious mistakes and unnoticed (self)-deceptions. A human being is the only creative creature, if he is socially responsible or on contrary, destructive if he is not socially responsible (Mulej, Merhar, Žakelj, Zore, Hrast, Toplak, Slapnik, Rašič, & Ambrožič *et al.* 2019).

Morgan (2004), however, notes that organizations are shaped not only by their environment, but also by the conscious and unconscious forces of members who control society. Capra (2002) is convinced that people in the organization resist change, but people do not actually resist change, they resist the imposition of change, especially if the change process is directed from a "top-down" direction, better known as "re-engineering". He emphasizes that it is necessary to understand that the process of change is a natural process. And he goes on to say that processes can be learned from living systems, and once we understand them, we begin to change them. It is an analogy of living systems and their adaptability, diversity and creativity to organizational practice.

B. Concept of Consciousness

We encountered reflection as conscious reflection in the "The Sine Curve" model (Ovsenik, 1999). We can say that a person is able to control his activity through a feedback loop called self-reflection or contemplation. Kant (1999) was already aware of this fact: "The objects of our cognition are not things in themselves, but are products, and in the creation of these only our consciousness plays an important role.". Kant (1999) may have wanted to warn us against Nature. Because man can consciously use his mind at any moment, which allows him a mental process, but unfortunately Nature cannot.

Beck (2001) argues that past risks gain power for the present and act as a cause for the future, warning: "... the center of risk consciousness is not in the present but in the future.". He critically states the spectrum of different practices of modern society, with different effects,

blunders, frauds, mistakes that have or will have serious consequences. These, however, are not in the form of an open, but in the form of a silent revolution, as a change in everyone's consciousness. Capra (1986) also announces a new vision of the conception of life, spirit, consciousness and evolution, which corresponds to a holistic approach to human health and treatment.

What about on a biological, human level, can we change genes through conscious action? Ridley (2002) gives the answer: "Genes can be changed by willing, conscious action, by free will." This can also explain free will, which is not in the 'mould' of the genome, but in human functioning as a whole. The pioneers of the autopoiesis phenomenon, Maturana and Varela (1998), understand their knowledge of living systems as the processes that create them, not just the relationship to the environment. We understand the message of the power of awareness and the importance of this uninterrupted simultaneity of being, doing and knowing. Everything rests on the constant consciousness of man in the phenomenon of cognition, which, however, cannot be conceived with solidly surrounding facts or objects.

Philosopher and anthropologist Trstenjak (1985) considers a human as a system, and not a statically simple one, but as a dynamic open system, within which organic systems operate, which are characteristic of the biological world and are mutually interdependent. It continues with the perceptual systems that are characteristic of humans, to form an internal model of the external world through the sense organs and act expediently in doing so. Therefore, a human has a reflex system for perceiving his own perception, which creates consciousness and also is capable of conscious action. This is reflected in the social system, where several individual systems are combined into an overall social system. Mulej *et al.* (2019) added, that the socially responsible economy strongly impacts the Earth's ecologically environment. They are becoming aware of the destructive influences of the neoliberal paradigm which is solely focused on the economy of the capitalistic profit of management.

The reference point is in consciousness and in human reflection, which is set as a fundamental constitutive social phenomenon (Maturana & Varela, 1980). Pavuna (2017) discovers and presents his findings that holistic coherence is a non-local method of energy resonance, which is a support for a unique person who consciously perceives the holistic re-centering of himself. Structural changes in the network are a cognitive process that enables the rise of conscious experience and conceptual thinking. So that life is never separated from matter, even though its fundamental characteristics are immaterial. It assumes that a systematic understanding of life can also be extended to the social aspect - that is, to the aspect of viewing the inner world or the self-reflection of consciousness, which contains multilayered and inseparable characteristics. He adds that a systematic understanding of the reflection of consciousness and the social network can promote an important elucidation of the dynamics of organizational learning (Capra, 2002).

Jantsch (1980) states that the system cannot be described with the term "self-sustaining" because it is in constant dependence on the environment, where energy and information are changing. The exchange can only be maintained by the system itself, only if the internal state of the system is in balance, otherwise, all processes would stop working. He adds that it is information that creates new information, which is also a motive for consciousness self-organization. Concern that the organization has not yet surpassed the mechanistic paradigm of the 17th century, which can represent a major problem for the further development and evolution of nature, the world, man and humanity. He concludes that human consciousness tries to meaningfully develop itself. In this way, development would not take place in a spontaneous evolutionary way, but a person would develop planned, evaluate himself, in the area of his consciousness and his own thought (Ovsenik, 1999).

In the light of philosophical thinking, Aristotel (2002) states that everyone must be co-aware in addition to their own awareness, and this can only be achieved through co-existence, which is present during joint reflections and conversations. The Dalai Lama XIV (2000) adds that inner peace is the path to genuine happiness that involves a great deal of compassion and develops a conscious concern for fellow human beings. Take care for fellow human beings led to the creation of the definition that life itself manifests itself in four and possibly more dimensions as "Agape and Coherent Action" (Balažic Peček & Bukovec, 2020). The new definition is given as a challenge to all researchers of life and human consciousness in the organization to give feedback if the definition is ripe for practical action to co-create an autopoietic world or a world of consciousness socially responsible a human.

C. Concept of Self-Creation in Society

This a natural phenomenon of self-production, self-functioning or self-organization, which is found in all biological systems, and also within humans. The Chilean biologists Maturana and Varela (1980) were the first to talk about the phenomenon at the beginning of the seventies of the last century, when they discovered that a self-renewing balance takes place in the cell, like circular-closed organizations, which are characteristic of living organisms. They typically have built-in natural principles that maintain and self-regulate them. Calling something autopoietic is like saying 'it is a living thing'. This concept was then transferred by analogy to the designation of the supposed self-organization of complex business, ecological, social and other systems.

Autopoietic processes are fundamental to the functioning of humans and also human organizations, societies and, last but not least, civilizations, because it is a circular life principle or the (co)evolution of the life circle, which is realized in self-organization. However, scientists investigating this phenomenon in more detail have discovered that these living processes are inhibited by a wide variety of molds. Already Maturana and Varela (1998) perceived that we live in a world of established cultural traditions and restrictions that direct us to what and how we see, feel, act and conceal, which limits our natural

process of creation, so we cannot talk about progress society, if people are not allowed their natural endowments.

It is evident that the modern way of life is a system in which we are embedded as living beings with natural liveliness and creativity. In the researches and reflections of Peček (2019) points out that although we think that there is liveliness in us, in reality it is often absent. We act like machines, more or less unconsciously, only according to the habits and beliefs we internalized in early childhood and youth. Life is more or less unconscious and represents the mechanical repetition of learned behavior patterns. We have distanced ourselves from nature, ourselves, work and our health, and in doing so we are losing our natural harmony and alienating ourselves from our own innate aliveness and from each other.

Many researches have sought and are still researching not only biological, but also social, organizational and societal integrity. Lauc (2000) put forward the thesis: autopoietic a human is socially rational, natural, efficient, moral, creative, capable of feeling, acting self-organizingly and also self-referentially. On the other hand, he presented an allopoietic a human who is born as an autopoietic being by Nature, but if he lives in a predominantly allopoietic environment, he becomes more and more allopoietic: bureaucratic, inhumane, immoral, uncreative and unfree.

Capra (2002) notes that a key definition of life is that a living network is constantly creating or rearranging itself by transforming or shuffling its constituents, thus experiencing continuous structural change in its network pattern of organization. While Morgan (2004) adds that organizational theory has thus become a kind of biology, with the distinctions between relationships between molecules, cells, complex organisms, species and ecology paralleling the individual, groups, organizations, populations of organizations and their social ecologies. He notes that many theorists have come up with a new understanding of the organization's functioning and factors influencing the well-being of organizations. Frankl (2016), in his psychotherapy practice, explains examples of the loss of meaning in our dehumanized age, in which man is not taken into account in all his dimensions. While Maturana and Varela (1980) explain with the theory of autopoiesis that the cognitive process is crucial for a person to know and realize that his ability to know depends on the biological integrity, as well as the mental-cognitive process.

This is exactly what we can achieve if we look at quantum systems from which the concepts of mutual correlations and co-dependencies arise, which are quite new in business organizations, but very original. Self-organization in autopoietic systems is a self-emerging process with an ever-higher consciousness of all participants and leaders. If we can reach the quantum level in the organization, we can be successful at a higher level as well. By focusing on the natural development and improvement of a human in the internal and external process, we could improve the environment and,

as a result, achieve a truly 'green' society (Peček & Pavuna, 2018).

We found the fantastic solution for humankind in sustainable socially responsible society concept Žižek, Mulej, and Potočnik (2021), which they named: "Well-being Society 6.0". This is new concept supposed to the 'Corporate Social Responsibility', which is new chance to survive beyond the dangerous neoliberalism. The concept is autopoietic framework of a 'Well-being society', inside it is a space for life a consciousness human and harmony, quality of life into work-balance for the humans, the leaders, which are tuned with Nature. The concept brings a big change in terms of organization and management, which includes holistic management, which can be a comprehensive approach over a mechanistic society in which only profit is still ruled.

Research Question: How to consciously create a person and implement a change of consciousness organization as a social responsibility concept?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

With the aim of establishing an ecosystem of a healthy creative person, relationships, life cycle and closing them in a conscious organization, where the essence of social responsibility is created. The natural conditions for people's survival must be established and it enforces three assumptions: responsibility towards everyone for the impacts on society, interdependence and integrity (Mulej *et al.* 2019).

We reviewed the theory of the organization, how this phenomenon is defined in theory, that in practice it allows as many irresponsible actions as we have witnessed in the system of organizations in recent years. We have given the definitions of various authors to explain the phenomenon of consciousness, because we assume that the consciousness of a person in an organization is closely related to the consciousness in the organization. Ovsenik and Peček (2019) highlight the relevance of human consciousness creation in the fourth industrial (r)evolution, which, as we see, does not bring quality, let alone consciousness organization.

We present the sociological phenomenon of organization and the biological-cognitive phenomenon of autopoiesis, with the aim of delving into the 'organization of a human' on a biological and conscious level, which self-creates itself and relationships in the organization and society. We critically examine natural phenomena and, by analogy, transfer consciousness to the research of more resilient, conscious and socially responsible organizations. Researching the concepts of organizations must be based on interdisciplinarity, because it concerns abstract phenomena as well as the functioning of a human himself and mutual entanglement in various mutual relationships. From the researched literature, the authors Mesec (1998) and Ambrož and Colarič-Jakše (2015) note that to investigate abstract phenomena, it is necessary to follow the ontological research process. While for scientific validation and confirmation it is necessary to use primarily qualitative research methods. Mesec (1998) says that we use qualitative research if we are interested in the purpose,

process and relationship between research and theory. He emphasizes that the holistic view of a human is not only the study of the organism as a whole, but above all the practical problems of people in life.

IV. DISCUSSION

The phenomenon of organization is presented by many authors from different points of view and thus ennobles the understanding of the theory of organization, from sociological, economic, systemic and also biological and physical laws. If the organization is a whole, then why is there so much competition, non-cooperation and incitement in our organizations and unconscious action instead of conscious co-creation. Is behind all this a deep-rooted fear of losing yourself, your position in the organization and our relationships?

Perhaps one of the reasons is that we have achieved very important results that are easy to implement in the organization and are still undesirable in society (Balazić Peček, 2018). We found that there is a lack of thinking and empathy in the modern and the 4.0 organization. We pointed out that the results show a decline in human creativity after a very short time since the introduction of the Industry 4.0. On the other hand, the reduction of the variety of processes can cause radical changes, which are reflected in a disharmonized person, organization and, consequently, society. Instead of our primary institution informing academia and the general public with more than current, if not alarming, results. Because on the basis of these results, organizations could take active action in practice so that the functioning of organizations would once again turn in the direction of humanity. Already Lipovec (1987) points to the dehumanization and voids in a human as an individual and mentions both the disintegration of the organizational community and the disintegration of the human personality, the consequences of which are clearly visible on human health at all levels, in uncontrolled consumption and constant dissatisfaction. In this point we see the origin of the problem that the daily practice of organizations manifests itself as a change in a person's personality and overall health. That everything turns away from man and even more, that it destroys him right down to his DNA. We are already experiencing this in our reality today, in various almost 'genius ways' with the inhumane concepts of the 4.0 and even more so with the 5.0 society in which robots and AI are increasingly important, there is no sense of social responsibility towards people.

Co-evolution is beautifully described with a natural parable by Ovsenik (2019) in one of our many in-depth discussions: let it blossom, develop and mature into a fruit. Therefore, we can confirm that our organizations are in 'crisis' because the ruling system does not allow our flowers to bloom, let alone bear fruit. Lauc (2000) also wrote about the fruits on the autopoiesis tree, that it is necessary to learn from one's own mistakes, and above all to grow into self-actualized individuals and make fewer and fewer mistakes until "Zero defect". This is also the desire and need of organizations, where they are aware that the self-organization of individuals extends to the entire

organization, as self/co-management. Then there is no more competition in such an organization, even though it builds, cooperates and wins every day, otherwise the organization goes into destruction, non-cooperation and self/co-destruction, which can be seen in the relationships between people and their health.

Vila (2000) visionarily predicted the postmodern organization with the definition: "The organization of the 21st century does not have definite outlines and form.". This definition literally "obsessed" me in research. What is it, I wondered, if it doesn't have outlines and shape. We imagine and Peček and Možina (2020) say that something that has no outlines and shape can spread in all directions as a kind of all-encompassing organization. And what an overarching organization is is perhaps easiest to define if we look at it from a biological and anthropological perspective as a living entity that extends from each cell and its DNA to the global ecology that James Lovelock called Gaia. Physicist Fritjof Capra also wrote in 2002: "Human organization is understood as a living system.". This definition is multifaceted, as it refers to man as the creator of processes on the one hand and to the structure in which processes are implemented on the other. This eternal dual role of man confirms that "a human is the process and structure of the organization" (Lauc & Peček, 2017). In order to transition to a new paradigm, it is necessary to reprocess and restructure existing organizations if we want to co-create a fairer, socially responsible and healthier society.

Self/co-example is one of the virtues of leaders and mentors, which is a strong attribute for self-organization to establish a conscious organization that is socially responsible. If we return to the relationship between mentor and PhD student, we can see that the mentor is the one who feels our PhD as a whole, directs it to the final product and is already thinking about promotion and implementation in society. According to the theory of autopoiesis, we can say that if something, someone no longer develops, it simply dies and dies. But what if our flower, which we call a dissertation, does not even manage to bloom, let alone develop into a fruit that would serve for personal, organizational and social well-being. Where are the causes? If you are rejected and abused by your mentor, you are also an outsider and not a flower in the academic world. This is where your own experience counts the most.

Self/co-confirmation is important, but the value of the work and the person definitely increases if behind it stands a person imbued with social responsibility, and not only that, he laid the foundations of a socially responsible society at all levels. But if there is no active communication and everything is aimed at achieving one-sided material goals, if ideas stagnate in the 'rigid bureaucratic mills' of an organization where there is no interest in life, but power, hierarchy and control prevail, then human life practically comes to a standstill. This also coincides with the results of research and we posit a thesis that should be further confirmed: Both at the level of a person and at the level of an organization, there is no spontaneity without compassion for oneself and others; without one's own freedom and the freedom of others, and

without self-referentiality and co-referentiality, there is no consciousness. These are the starting points for the conscious organization of the future, which is already here.

If we follow the self-reflection in the contemplative “The Sine Curve” of Ovsenik (1999), we can confirm our process of self-knowledge in the daily practice of self-awareness, the ecosystem in which we find ourselves, and conscious action. Maturana and Varela (1980) already wrote about this, that the processes of self-knowledge create consciousness, which co-creates the world in co-evolution. We confirm once again that it is not important to win, but to actively participate and that we are all part of the ‘big win’ when we see symbiotic social effects. It has been proven in organizational theory (Ovsenik, 1999; Capra, 2002) that a human and organization are one and the same, then it is pointless to ask who is to blame for the situation. Peček and Možina (2020) say that finding the culprit through bullying does not lead to cooperation, but to alienation, stratification and labeling. It is this marked a human who is often excluded from the collaborative rhythm simply because he thinks, because he cares about the organization and his fellow a human. The process of elimination often begins covertly, so that the marked person is no longer part of the whole. As a result, a person can no longer work with commitment and with a sense of belonging to the organization, because work is just a routine and no longer a virtue, so he is more or less absent and alienated from work.

Today, we have reached a critical level, well below all these theoretical assumptions and theories, where people’s consciousness and conscience will play a crucial role. In the conscious organization is our present and future. Autopoietic principles contain the natural attributes for self/co-operation of a human as a complex being. When all stakeholders are involved in the development of organizations, knowledge and experience begin to pass naturally between different stakeholders and a collective consciousness is created. In daily practice, however, we can see how important it is to be relieved of the pressure for creative work, which starts in the head much earlier than it happens on the physical level. This is how great geniuses, thinkers and artists’ work. Above all, it is important to be as close to Nature as possible, or even better, to co-create part of the activity and work space right in nature (Peček & Šegula, 2022).

Every day we can get to know a part of the ‘visionary plan’, which was hidden to make people incapable of living a natural life. It is evident that many people will not be able to take the step that was evolutionarily intended for them. The 4.0 and even faster the 5.0 society happened at a revolutionary speed to artificially stop the natural evolution of a human. A human is no longer a free being, but a tool of a ‘great plan’. We can see with our own eyes the negative transformations of human society and what’s more, a big question arises about the ability of self-renewal, self-reproduction and even the existence of our civilization. All of this can be felt in the 4.0 organization, and even more so in the 5.0 organization, which does not include the key human factor in the direction of conscious action and what is more, it does not

have minimum ethical norms for a human-worthy life (Peček & Možina, 2020). In 2020, the world has already experienced a breakdown that signals the beginning of a new era, because we experienced the one of the serious health hazards due to pandemic. It is in autopoiesis, as a self-organized process of maintaining life, that we can see a potential that is invisible to our eyes. But this very potential can prove to be the key to overcoming the currently dominant materialistic paradigm. Further, there is a great task ahead to find solutions to revitalize the communities.

Consciousness in organization is offered in simple, human solutions: compassion, love, and solidarity, developed through self/co-management in a self-renewing human community. It seems that the time of inhumane organizations that have decided to put profit before life is somehow running out. We can trust that the ‘people of the organizations’ will open their eyes and hearts. That they will begin to realize that if there is no living life in people, organization and society, it is doomed to collapse. Today’s time is a challenge for all people, as we do not remember. Therefore, this is also a unique opportunity to finally live a life in harmony with nature again, especially if we live in beautiful Slovenia, which is primarily rich in natural resources. I am convinced that we can co-create paradise on our earth in a co-natural way. But even before that, processes of decay will take place, which will be followed by purification on all levels, which will not be easy and can also be very painful. But let’s stay human, focus and co-create now! Because it is already noticeable that their primary Nature is emerging in people, which wants the organization of a conscious human being in co-existence with our Nature.

V. CONCLUSION

Organization theory is a young discipline, but we can see that every researcher somehow has his own view on the phenomenon of organization, even those who do not directly research the organization, but enrich it with their research. But the common thing is that organization is a comprehensive concept where people exercise their own virtues of self/co-discipline, which directly influence processes that are socially responsible or socially controversial. Self/co-management in an organization is a natural human action, both on the internal and external ecosystem. that it is a human who makes green breakthroughs for more responsible organizations and a fairer world, where quality is more important than quantity. For this reason, we research with qualitative methods and concepts with self/co-reflection. With this, we set, not only as a theoretical framework, but above all as a practical realization for people to self/co-manage conscious, more socially responsible organizations. We emphasize the extraordinary importance of the relationship between mentor and doctoral student, as well as an informal mentor or co-partner, who in an ethical relationship of research consciously co-create and implement solutions for a more socially responsible society through the organization and conscious people.

The phenomenon of autopoiesis is often understood as a 'circular organization' and/or a 'self/co-referential system' that takes place in several circles, and it is extremely important that open circles are also closed with solutions that are socially responsible. The property and possibility of a human as a living system is that he is capable of self-adaptation, because he always produces his own substances for self-revitalization. This principle works in our entire development and leads us to self-realization as the highest stage of our development, because the autopoietic dynamic is a living dynamic in constant movement through feedback loops and in contact with the environment. Basically, nature has given us all the principles to be able to act consciously and create a living world. How? Humans themselves are actually a living factor in what is happening, in two roles: as observers and as actors. The rule applies that only if the events touch us or we are called to a certain activity, can we consciously, respectfully, organized and socially responsible think, direct, act in love and put it into practice. This convinces us that the autopoietic concept in the organization is the one that works sustainably and socially responsible, in harmony with human natural potentials, which we discover as priceless values, also as a flowering of consciousness.

We assume that people's consciousness is directly co-dependent on their overall health. In nature, everything starts in the food chain, then the healthy design of an active lifestyle, which is reflected in responsible and truly green work in self/co-management. This can be a guide for the integral health of people who create themselves and relationships in the organization, who through self/co-reflection self/co-create the consciousness of socially responsible organizations and socially responsible society.

Our emerging results and insights should interest creative researchers, leaders in all branches of science to evolve as increasingly autopoietic observer-actors with 'love in action' and even more 'Agape in coherent action', in our daily drama of life and works. It is very important, if not fundamental in the organization, to create sincere relationships with love, compassion and solidarity in order to gain people's trust and awareness, which is important for the creative world. It is the new understanding of self/co-organization and self/co-management that leads to well-being at the highest conscious level.

As humankind in sustainable socially responsible society set fantastic concept) which they named: Well-being Society 6.0. The concept is autopoietic framework of a Well-being society, inside it is a space for life a consciousness human and harmony, quality of life into work-balance for the humans and the leaders, which are tuned with Nature. The concept brings a big change in terms of organization and management, which includes self-management and holistic management. This which can be a comprehensive approach beyond the mechanistic society in which an autopoietic human with his inner value can be again emerge.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Ambrož, M., & Colarič Jakše, L. M. 2015. Researcher's view: Principles, methods and practices. *Maribor: Mednarodna založba za slovenske jezike in književnosti*. (in Slovenian)
- Ambrož, M., & Lotrič, B. 2009. *The Turbulent Organization*. Kranj: Založba B&B. (in Slovenian)
- Aristotel. 2002. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica. (in Slovenian)
- Balažič Peček, T. & Bukovec, B. 2020. *Foundations of Autopoiesis in an Organization: Autopoietic 4.0 Human (e)Evolution*. Borovnica: Institute of Autopoietic Organization.
- Balažič Peček, T. 2018. *Autopoietic Building Blocks in 4.0 Organization*. Ph.D. dissertation, Novo mesto: Fakulteta za organizacijske študije. (in Slovenian)
- Beck, U. 2001. *Risk society – Towards a new modernity (Risk Society)*. Ljubljana: Zavod za odprto družbo. (in Slovenian)
- Capra, F. 1986. *The turning point: Science, society and the rising culture*. Zagreb: ČGP Delo, OOUR Globus. (in Slovenian)
- Capra, F. 2002. *The hidden connections: Integrating the biological, cognitive, and social dimensions of life into a science of sustainability*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dalai Lama XIV. 2000. *Ethics for the new millennium: His holiness the Dalai lama*. Tržič: Učila, založba, d.o.o. (in Slovenian)
- Detela, A. 2006. Traps in research of the phenomenon of consciousness. *9. Mednarodna multi-konferenca: Kognitivne znanosti*: 16–17. (in Slovenian)
- Frankl, V. E. 2016. *The unhear cry for meaning: Psychotherapy and humanism*. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba. (in Slovenian)
- Ivanko, Š. 1982. *The outline of organization theories*. Maribor: Visoka ekonomska-komercialna šola Maribor. (in Slovenian)
- Ivanko, Š. 2002. *The structures and process in organization*. Ljubljana: Visoka upravna šola. (in Slovenian)
- Ivanko, Š. 2004. *The Fundamentals of organization*. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za upravo. (in Slovenian)
- Ivanko, Š. 2015. *The History of Organizational Thought*. Novo mesto: Faculty of Organizational Studies. (in Slovenian)
- Jantsch, E. 1980. *The Self-Organisation Universe: Scientific and Human Implications of the Emerging Paradigm of Evolution*. Oxford: British Library Cataloging in Publication Data.
- Kant, I. 1999. *Prolegomena to any future metaphysics*. Ljubljana: State Publishing House of Slovenia. (in Slovenian)
- Kljajič, M. 1994. *The sistem theory*. Kranj: Modern organization. (in Slovenian)
- Lauc, A. 2000. *The social sciences methodology*. J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Law. Osijek: Grafika. (in Slovenian)
- Lauc, A., & Peček, T. B. 2017. New paradigm: Reprocessing of allopoietic to autopoietic organization. In Bukovec, B. (ed.). *Autopoietic organization*. Novo mesto: Faculty of Organizational Studies, pp. 43–69. (in Slovenian)
- Lipovec, F. 1987. *The developed theory of organization*. Maribor: Horizon Publishing House. (in Slovenian)
- Malić, D. 1976. *Cybernetic thermodynamics: Laws and methods*. Belgrade: Construction Book. (in Slovenian)
- Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. 1980. *Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the Living*. London: D. Reidel publishing company.
- Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. 1998. *The tree of knowledge*. Ljubljana:

- Studia humanitatis. (in Slovenian)
- Mayer, J. 1994. *The vision of creative organization*. Ljubljana: Dedalus, Založba Ikra. (in Slovenian)
- Mesec, B. 1998. *The introduction to qualitative research in social work*. Ljubljana: Visoka šola za socialno delo. (in Slovenian)
- Mesec, B. 2009. The action research. Available: <https://sites.google.com/site/kvalitativnametodologija/akcijsko-raziskovanje/predstavitev-1/> (in Slovenian)
- Morgan, G. 2004. *Images of organization*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede. (in Slovenian)
- Mulej, M., Espejo, R., Jackson, M., Kajzer, Š., Mingers, J., & Mlakar, P. 2000. *Dialectical and other soft systems theory: The basis for the integrity and success management*. Maribor: Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta. (in Slovenian)
- Mulej, M., Merhar, V., Žakelj, V., Zore, M., Hrast, A., Toplak, L., Slapnik, T., Rašič, K., & Ambrožič, B. 2019. *The introduction in the political economy of a social responsible society*. Maribor: Kulturni center Maribor, Knjižna zbirka frontier. (in Slovenian)
- Ovsenik, J. 1999. *The pillars of a new doctrine of organization, management and organizational behavior*. Kranj: Moderna organizacija. (in Slovenian)
- Ovsenik, J., & Peček, T. B. 2019. Human awareness of organizations of the fourth industrial (r)evolution. *38 Mednarodna konferenca o razvoju organizacijskih znanosti: Ekosistem organizacij v dobi digitalizacije*: 719–731. (in Slovenian)
- Pavuna, D. 2017. The transcript of discussion on quantum phenomena in physics with influences on a person and civilization. (Interview, October 24, 2017). (in Slovenian)
- Peček, T. 2019. Autopoiesis between a human and a robot in future organization. *38 Mednarodna konferenca o razvoju organizacijskih znanosti: Ekosistem organizacij v dobi digitalizacije*: 75–88. (in Slovenian)
- Peček, T. B. & Možina, M. 2020. From alienation to conscious and living organization: Interview with anthropologist Tanja Balažič Peček. *Kairos. Slovenska revija za psihoterapijo*, 14: 3–4. (in Slovenian)
- Peček, T., & Pavuna, D. 2018. Emerging autopoiesis: On coherence in complexity within organization. *Jurnal of Universal Excellence*, 7(4): 398–407.
- Peček, T., & Šegula, S. 2022. *Autopoiesis: Synergy of knowledge and action in the international project Erasmus+ K2 FlorCert for Futur Master*. 7th Conference with international participation, Vivus Conference: Between the Vision and Reality of new Horizons. Naklo.
- Ridley, M. 2002. *GENOM: The biography of species in 23 Chapters*. Tržič: Učila International založba, d.o.o. (in Slovenian)
- Žižek, S. S., Mulej, M. & Potočnik, A. 2021. The sustainable socially responsible society: Well-being society 6.0. *Sustainability*, 13(16): 9186.
- Tesla, N. 2013. *My inventions*. Ljubljana: Založba Sanje. (in Slovenian)
- Trstenjak, A. 1985. *Person being of future: Framework anthropology*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica. (in Slovenian)
- Vila, A. 2000. *An organization in a postmodern society*. Kranj: Moderna organizacija. (in Slovenian)
- Vila, A., & Kovač, J. 1997. *The basics of organization and management*. Kranj: Moderna organizacija. (in Slovenian)
- Železnikar, A. P. 2008. Slovenian, Croatian, English and German comparative dictionary on the implementation of informational and conscious. Available: <http://lea.hamradio.si/~s51em/book/Medit339slo.pdf> (in Slovenian)
- Železnikar, A. P. 2015. Informational consciousness and half-consciousness. *Humankybernetik*, 56(3).
- Železnikar, A. P. 2017. *Philosophical word formation*. Available: <http://lea.hamradio.si/~s51em/book/Medit339slo.pdf> (in Slovenian)

Copyright © 2026 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.