Being situated in a complex, rapidly changing environment, the university has a significant role to promote the importance of working together that is interconnected rather separated. As we have seen there is no one single problem could be solved by one body of knowledge. It requires other disciplines to contribute to solve the problem in order to get a better solution. For this reason, this short paper attempts to elaborate multidisciplinary approach which later known as critical systemic thinking and to address ways to develop and apply it to the university environment and challenges that universities face.

Toward integrated and interconnected approaches. In order to create a vision for better future and generation, Somantri (2011) suggested that we need to think beyond our campus walls. In relation this, he encourages student to think in a big picture by enlarging their perspective. The Rector of Universitas Indonesia created space that enables creativity to emerge with the concept of integration that followed by some curriculum as well as other facilities required to create knowledge without borders. His ideas effective at change, as he believes that we must leave behind the imaginary organization we design and learn to work with the real organization, which will always be a dense network of interdependent of relationships. Citing Capra (1996 as cited in Jackson, 2000) in calling for a new way of thinking, based upon “a deep ecological awareness”, which responds to the current situation that is multifaceted.

Moreover, complex problem involve richly interconnected “set of parts”, and the relationships between the part can be more important then the nature of part themselves (Jackson, 2000). This system thinking, as argued by Checkland (1981). System thinkers advocate using holism rather than reductionism in such situation in which respects the profound interconnectedness of the parts and concentrates on the relationships between them and how these often give rise to surprising outcomes, the emergent properties.
Multidisciplinary approach, or systemic thinking, can be seen a reaction to the failure of natural science when confronted with complex, real world problems set in social system.

Checkland (1981)

Construct the future (Banathy, 2000) requires the ability to think in term of the big picture (social, political, economic and environmental and the next of human and other species). Research needs to draw on the wide range of knowledge narratives to create wise solutions. Co-research through learning by doing with people who have wide experiences in solving complex challenges faced by government need to be given supports. Humility and willingness to learn from the experience of the other can be addressed through the implication of where we situated ourselves or will help us to co-create meaning. The closest we can come to a shared truth is through dialogue (McIntyre-Mills 2000).

We need to work across disciplines and sectors and realize that working with, rather than within knowledge areas, requires managing knowledge and understanding that information is based on either or as well as both (McIntyre-Mills, 2006). The old fragmentation approach is divide and rule. The new systemic approach is based on “link and thrive”. We need to implement inclusive, integrated policy and planning for sustainable, integrated development by, with and for people within their environment can enhance life chances (McIntyre-Mills, 2003). Such an integrated approach is the basis for bringing about change. The challenge is to find ways to encourage existing organizations (that tend to work separately) to work together.

**How Universities Can Adapt**: Problem solving in human service organization using open systems and non-hierarchical approaches to collaborative problem solving are the way forward. This requires for an organization to be more open and flexible. Due to this reason, the university need to consider and use Mode 2 thinking rather than Mode I thinking approaches (Gibbons & et al 1994, & Banathy, 1996, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mode I</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Old approach to science: compartmentalization and dualism</td>
<td>New approach to science: integrated and systemic thinking that links the mind and body, thinking and practice and uses both qualitative and quantitative method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Top down research and development</td>
<td>Participatory action research based on learning from successes and mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Management stresses efficiency and outputs</td>
<td>Management stresses effectiveness and outcomes (the qualitative perception of the impact of a development intervention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hierarchical structures of management, communication and program delivery</td>
<td>Web link approaches (matrices) that span sectors and disciplines in order to addresses the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Either or thinking in narrow terms i.e, specially about social and political or environmental issue</td>
<td>Both and thinking in social and cultural and political and environmental issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Systemic Thinking (CST) and Its Contribution. There are at least five big issues that have been brought by many systemic thinkers in many literatures on how to enable people to work together across disciplines of knowledge. Systemic skills can be used to draw connection which explores many domains of knowledge and also emotions (ethical implication; McIntyre, 2010). Therefore, critically review research trends could be taken in placed on how they have tried to design of policy based on consideration of many kinds of knowledge, spanning the rational and emotional. Below are some of the five big issue of the critical systemic thinking that needs to be explored, as follows:

1. CST is on the design inquiry for testing out ideas using, logic, empiricism, dialectic, idealism, and pragmatism (Churchman, 1971) to engage with others to achieve best matches and better decision making that is mindful perceptions, values and emotions. The five dimensions are inter-subjective in its relationship (Habermas, 1984)

2. CST is based on the ability to draw and re-draw boundaries as much as possible, enlarging our sense of space and community as well as the implication for the future generations (Midgely, 2000; McIntyre-Mills, 200 & 2006b)).

3. CST is based on the ability to understand and appreciate the fact that there are many kinds of knowing both rational and emotional, physic and metaphysics, religion and science, both animal and human animal and learning from nature which shapes us and which we have the power to shape (Banathy, 2000) in a more interconnected and integrated.

4. CST is based on the ability to see the truth through the eyes of another (McIntyre-Mills, 2003)

5. CST is based on the ability to co-create meaning and thinking if then scenarios as suggested by Ulrich.

“It's Your Attitude”: Dialogue and Communication, Major Key in Multidisciplinary Approach. Critical system thinking is about putting all different system approaches to work according to their strength and weakness and also the social conditions prevailing. Jurgen Habermas (1974 cited in Jackson, 2000) argues that we need to engage in respectful dialogue. Critical system thinkers like Romm, Flood and Jackson have argued that if we would like to solve social problems, we have to look at a broad scheme: social, cultural, political, economic and environmental. They believe that there is no single calculus of life that can span all living and meaning system. Being aware that they can never find the ultimate in which total picture is required, and only with better contextual understanding are needed is the characters of critical system thinkers (Banathy, 1996). Following this reason, critical system thinkers believe that there is no single theory or theorist can possibly find all answer. In this regards, respectfully co-create meaning and develop some useful change within a specific context is much more important issues. In other words, we can get to a contextual truth is through dialogue and humble communication (McIntyre-Millis 2003).
Getting a sense how the stakeholder see the world is important. Churchman (1979, p. 231) stated that the system approach begins “when you see the world through the eyes of another. This view is supported by Jackson (1991). He said that the nature of the relationship between participants is the other factor that can greatly affect the character of problem context.

There are many ways to seeing the problem. One way is the mode of coercive and this is not the notion of critical system thinking (CST). Critical system thinking approach try to avoid dominating, so pluralist is what we are aiming for; open, systemic, pluralist, complex, and liberating. Therefore, we are trying to avoid close, restricted, mechanists unitary and dominating approaches.

Summary. From the above explanation we can see that critical systemic thinking enable us to see other body of knowledge as partner to solve contemporary problems. Therefore, university leaders has a crucial position to enable such creativity to happen by making policy that enable researcher among different perspectives to work together in one place or area of concern. Communication among researchers with different background is encouraged so that they will learn each other to see whether there are some issue that could be handled in a more integrated and holistic manner.
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