Management Theory and Organization Studies have promoted a series of representations, that have pervaded management thought and shaped managers actions. These have changed radically during the past century, and any manager, especially one whose experience encompasses the more recent decades, has had to learn, and relearn, a great deal during their careers. One would expect that, in the business schools, it would be the practitioners of organization studies, above all other specialists, who would be guiding the development of new paradigms for changing conditions. Yet, as this paper addresses, the literature on paradigms in organization studies and the literature of paradigms addressed to business practice have hitherto been largely separate enterprises. Notwithstanding this separation, the business paradigms literature has considerable implications for organization studies, and the theoretical paradigms that guide work in this literature, as the paper spells out.

Managers, above all, are practical people who have to manage extremely difficult and challenging tasks: they are beset by many contingencies on a daily basis, some routinised, others not. If Mintzberg (1973) is a reliable guide, they need to find solutions to new problems every ten minutes or so. Not surprisingly, they have little time for other than the most local, contextual and bounded of rationalities. Managers do not conceive managing immaculately: they take its shape from those wider, more discursive rationalities available to them. Many forms of knowledge may in practice enter management calculations. Many sites exist where they may be encountered: not only university courses but also popular books, training sessions, magazines, web-sites, the popular press, as well as the usual networks of sociability. There are many sites from which practical orientations might develop. The important point is that, in practical terms, university academics enjoy neither an exclusive
nor a privileged role: they are not legislators of what is management knowledge but simply among its many interpreters (Bauman 1987). For all intents and purposes, however, given the institutionalized norms of journal publication, many university academics continue to practice their craft as if they were legislators rather than particular interpreters. For others, the audiences in the lecture theatres and of the more popular journals and books, the craft of organization studies provide a set of popular recipes and tools that can serve as solutions to the problems of managing modern organizations, promoting a series of rules, representations, procedures and technologies of, and for, management thinking, rather than contingent scientific 'proofs'. With these tools, often used retrospectively to constitute those actions that have already been undertaken as being in accord with some rationality, as being, in a word, \textit{legitimated}, managers are able to create order out of potential chaos, are able to be seen to be managing rather than merely coping. Managing means creating an ordered ensemble of relations between past histories and future actions as strategies that constructs the present. Managing means creating nexi of peoples, materials and technologies that can act autonomously in pursuit of these strategies. No longer does managing mean creating limits to freedom, as in Taylor's day, but it means making organization members free, \textit{qua} organization members, thus enabling people, materials and technologies to traverse spaces and times. These elements do so as components of a specific (dis)organization: the essence is managing creative destruction of existing recipes and practices in order to reinvent the organization anew. It is for this reason that today organizing increasingly means disorganizing.

The accounts of managing that managers have available are not so much causal springs of their actions; rather these actions can be justified in terms of those accounts that discursively, legitimately, seem to be available at any time. No necessary relation exists between the words and the deeds: managing means being discursively creative in situational actions.
When formally framed these props for discursive creativity are increasingly referred to by the shorthand term of 'business paradigms'. Business paradigms are not only of rhetorical significance but practical relevance in the way that businesses are run. Business paradigms can be seen to have passed through a series of stages of evolution. These synthesise the ideas that represent the world from the point of view of managers and businesspeople, responding to their perceptions of the changing business environment. They are systems of value that interpret reality, act on it and that place ethical limits upon behaviour. The meaning given to concepts such as work, property, management, efficiency, performance, quality, excellence, innovation and knowledge, not only orient social practices but also provide the means deemed adequate for those purposes. They are a set of images that orient the conduct of individual organisations, considering specific materials, relations and procedures. These paradigms develop and achieve ascendency, only to reveal their limitations, and be subsumed within former business paradigms, as a new paradigm is constructed to deal with the next business dilemma.

A Century of Business Paradigms

Exemplary business paradigms this century started with scientific management. The one best way of scientific management represents a set of images and meanings to reinforce control and discipline behaviour at work. Though yielding productivity this was at the expense of meaningful work and the commitment of workers to the labour process. By the 1930s it became increasingly supplemented by the human relations paradigm, especially during the Second World War (see Clegg and Dunkerley, 1980). The human relations paradigm represents a set of images and means to complete the Taylor dream, proposing a rhetoric to invent a new identity at work, allowing management to take control of the soul of 'happy workers.' Though ameliorative in many circumstances, this did not provide in itself
the competitive efficiency required. Placing workers under the discipline of Fordism, through the continuous production line, permitted the successive gains in productivity necessary in modern competitive conditions. Economies of scale under mass production allowed the mental and physical injuries of work to be compensated for by the pleasures of consumption. However improvements in the quantity of goods produced were not matched by improvements in quality. In rapidly changing markets with more discerning customers, the quality paradigm became an essential adjunct to Fordism, even though total quality management involved dismantling some elements of Taylorism and Fordism. The quality movement provided commitment to improving products, but not identification with the enterprise. The emphasis upon corporate culture and the pursuit of excellence was an elaborate and subtle development of the quality paradigm. Images and meanings reinforce the conduct of individuals, as they see themselves as autonomous practical subjects, responsible for their own actions, success and failure in the service of the enterprise. However changing markets and tastes quickly made redundant businesses and products that, briefly, had appeared excellent. The utopian rhetoric of flexible specialisation added technical innovation and flexibility to the drive for quality and excellence. Highly skilled technical operatives employing flexible technologies could respond to market shifts and identify market niches. The rhetoric of the learning organisation takes the lessons of the quality movement, the pursuit of excellence, and flexible specialisation, and builds this into a philosophy of management adapted to the knowledge economy and information workers. There are no strict rules that scholars such as Weick and Westley (1996) and consultants such as Peters (1992) urge as organizationally appropriate from this paradigm. Though employees are set free intellectually this is to pursue goals and within institutional parameters which are generally pre-established. Most recently, in world class organisations, the paradigm inspires organisations not only to achieve the highest international standards of quality, price and
performance, but to continually benchmark with customers, employees and competitors to ensure the organisation remains at the forefront, superseding its own products and services before a competitor does. The weaknesses of this paradigm include the exhaustion intense competition can cause, and the resort to improper and monopolistic practices to retain world leadership. However, between these creative solutions and the pressures of concrete situations there exists a tension. It is in this tension that inscribes management and organizational functioning, as managing and organizing.

Management and organizational theories constitute grand narratives that exploit myths associated with signs of success in different epochs. Business paradigms are a way not only of interpreting reality, of constructing it, and giving it definitive sense but also of constituting different realities. The reality of managers and workers in an organization that aspires to be "world class", for example, is constituted very differently from the reality that confronts people in Taylorist factories (many of which still exist). Organizational realities can always outlast their epochs, or can migrate and colonize new spaces, far from sophisticated centers of trade and commerce in ideas. It does not matter if reality does not correspond to the paradigm representing it: the point is that managers will act with reference to the reality that their paradigm constructs rather than any "real" reality. What is such reality, anyway? Paradigms define the key terms of their own discourse, thus they define, differently, and at various times, what efficiency is, what property is, what excellence is, and so on. What is critical is that managers must see themselves within, and thus act in terms of these constitutive definitions and images, to be considered current, responsible and efficient. Business paradigms are, in this sense, what Foucault (1979) termed the pastoral guidance of each epoch; they represent the changes in the "imaginary" of managers between one epoch and another. These imaginaries define who one is by showing one how to construct ones reality, what ones place is in it, and the place of others and other things. Through them one not only
normalizes particular constructions of reality in and around organizations but also stigmatizes and marginalizes those whose representation do not admit of the reality of the epoch that one is in the business of creating. As De Gaudemar (1992) suggests, the problem of work for management is not that it be obligatory but attractive. For the majority of employees without alternatives to the sale of their wage-labour, what determines the terms of their effort bargain is the attractiveness and interest of the work that they do, not its necessity. It is necessary to transform employee attitudes less through punishment and more through the foundation of a new mode of life that creates the conditions for a voluntary productive servitude. The constitution of discipline in the organization and the transformation of employees rests on the progressive invention of recipes to aid the constitution of working self as obedient and satisfied. With this main idea, de Gaudemar stresses the link between the images of the manager and discipline at work: if this image changes, as the manager's paradigm changes, then the discipline changes. Thus, during this century we can appreciate that business paradigms are a tip of an iceberg of deeper material changes that have occurred inside enterprises.

Global Business Paradigms Under Challenge

The major challenge to the recent universalism of paradigms, that there is one best global way, arises from the economic success of organizations whose local realities seemed starkly at odds with those assumed by the universalists. One thinks, for example, of Whitley's (1995) accounts of East Asian business systems, of Redding's (1990) account of the 'Spirit of Chinese Capitalism', of Clegg's (1990) account of 'French Bread, Italian Fashions, and East Asian Enterprise'. The currency turbulence of 1997 - 1998, and the IMF response to it, threaten the assumption that there might be organizational scope for local realities, local rationalities, that run counter to the trend of universalisation. In our terms we can see these
events, irrespective of any moral argument about the efficacy of the different regimes of truth at issue, as instances, precisely, of normalization, marginalization, and stigmatization. The existence of alternative realities weaken any recourse to a universalising vision of order and equilibrium, where everything has its place. The recent sources of disorder in the Asian market, now being manifested globally, serve to communicate, once more, in a heightened form, the values of a universal order, reasserting the old rationality over and above the local rationalities. Whatever interpretation one might make of the market’s judgement of the East Asian economies, it is evident that much has changed organizationally.

Initially, organizational changes were experienced locally; liquidity tightened; credit became more expensive; firms went bankrupt; workers were laid off; currencies devalued. But the effects are not just local: these experiences result in part from the international connectedness of world-wide markets, such that at the close of the 20th century, no market is an island. Information technology connects every local rationality to the expressive essence of universal rationality constructed as the effects of buy or sell decisions made on a few thousand terminals around the world on a 24 hour basis. Speculation translates the rationality of the market into life and death judgements; at the time of writing these impact most adversely on those business systems, and their organizations, that do not correspond to the universally accepted economic prescriptions for excellence.

What the recent speculations demonstrate is that information technology capacities, and the decision-making that they support, have a universal dimension. The technological advances associated with information technology have transformed the nature of managing. Established occupations have been re-engineered; new occupations have been born on the back of the new technologies. New information technologies have relativised the boundaries of organizations to a considerable extent. The market has penetrated many of the most bureaucratic areas of organizational life just as learning has penetrated many of the most
market-oriented areas, such that the specificity of the last redoubt of bureaucracy, universities, is even under challenge. Social organizations, such as universities, are becoming more like business firms, while business firms (as learning or intelligent firms) are becoming more like universities (see Gibbons, 1994; Ezkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997). The old orders have melted away, however solid they might once have seemed.

Moreover, once upon a time, at the core of the theory of bureaucracy, was a split between the public and the private spheres. To the one was the world of masculinity, the public space of the office as the workplace, the sphere of the productive economy; to the other was the world of femininity, the domestic space of the household as a haven in a heartless world. Today the spherical separation of the world that Weber (1978) imagined makes little sense. A vignette, connecting our themes, helps to make this clear.

Imagine a person called Maria. Maria works mostly in cyberspace. Sometimes, physically, she works at home and sometimes she works at work. Mostly she sleeps at home, however, and in the morning, when she wakes up, she switches on the computer in her study, on the way to the espresso machine in her kitchen. As the water forces through the coffee to make the beverage, she taps into her e-mails. Crisis! Overnight, there has been a currency meltdown throughout the East Asian economies. First, the Thai baht, then the Indonesian rupiah, Korean won, and now the Australian dollar. It is like Mexico in 1992, all over again, but with a domino effect. Rapidly she switches to her market data-base. The slide has not been arrested. Immediately she logs into the remote access to the office and starts a complex series of computer transactions designed to try and cover the debts that she has accumulated overnight in the portfolios that she manages.

Meanwhile the coffee boils away and her children have stirred, wanting breakfast. Abstractedly she dismisses their calls on her attention and stares anxiously at the screen. All her realities are currently embedded there. Her husband attends to the children instead. Later
in the day, exercising her flexi-time, she leaves for an appointment at the office. On the way she advises the party that she is meeting, using her new mobile phone, that she will be late because of a traffic-accident that has occurred on the Harbour Bridge, causing grid lock way up into the northern suburbs. During her afternoon tea break in the office, after her overseas markets are closed, she logs onto the networked game of *Riven* that she is involved in playing, for some relaxation. Later still she returns home to meet her husband heading off to work and the children once more demanding her attention as she settles in front of the computer to check the opening prices on the FT 100. The evening is almost over, but before bed beckons, there is homework to do for her MBA. She settles down in front of the TV with a small glass of tequila and a pastrami sandwich and switches it on for the Late News as she prepares her term paper in International Management. Prior to the News, as she ponders the question “How universal are contemporary management theories? Discuss with reference to Foucault’s changing accounts of surveillance and governmentality,” she catches the end of a documentary about the history of the post-Cold War world, charting its changing fortunes since the collapse of the Berlin Wall. (She thinks “I would love to visit Germany one day.”) But it is only a momentary thought: other, more reflexive thoughts jostle her attention. It would be surprising, in such a scenario, if Maria were not to be a little reflexive.

Reflexively, the resurgence of neo-liberalism as a form of governmental rationality, rather than as just economic doctrine, (an account that she had found in Foucault [1979] and Rose [1996]), seemed increasingly to be relevant to her life as well as her paper. She was well aware of how, increasingly, she governed herself in the name of other rationalities. She lived in an increasingly neurotic state of ego-surveillance, one which allowed her to do the surveillance that allowed her to be under surveillance by others. She thought, for example, of that e-mail requiring instant reply that she had received from her supervisor [who couldnt see her] when working at home earlier that week: she was sure it was sent just to check up on
whether she was at her work-station.). It wasn't only Foucault that seemed to be connecting her study, her life, and her work in an intricate interlacing of escalating anxiety and enlightenment. There was also the evening's news, she reflected: was the meltdown in East Asia the revenge of universal theories, delivered through the judgements of the markets, on the idiosyncrasy of local particularism out of kilter with the times? Maybe, instead, as one of her tutors suggested, it was just a sign of the hegemonic dominance, premised on both ideological legitimacy and financial power, of one presumed best way of running the new-world order? Yet, how can it be that the very factors that her books told her contributed to the success of these economies were now being hailed as the signs of their weakness?

Absently mindedly, as she did her nails and continued to watch the TV, she thought some more about her MBA. She had spent time at a workshop with her feminist tutor at the university recently, deconstructing the sexist bias of organization theory from Weber to the present day, particularly in its privileging of the public over the private. She, on the other hand, was not sure that these terms meant much to her, and certainly not her children. What was private and what was public? What was economic and what was social? She almost did as much work from home for her employer as she did from work. She worked at the university from home, using 'Top-Class'. When she played a game for recreation it was a computer game. Like much of her work, her play occurred at home on the keyboard. At least at work she had opportunities for conviviality that were singularly lacking at home. Her husband was rarely there when she was. They were a two-income family and needed to be to service the mortgage on their North Shore waterfront. Interest rates would rise again, if the Australian dollar kept declining, to try and arrest the capital flight that she was an agent in creating. She thought that this interconnection between her work and her life, through her actions, might be what her Organization Studies professor meant by reflexivity but she
wasn’t sure, and, having just smeared her varnish, wasn’t in any mood to think about it any further right then.

Later, in bed, with a few minutes to catch up on the backlog of papers, she noticed a review of a new book. The book was by Arlie Hochschild (1996), called *The Time Bind*. Hochschild’s argument seemed to be that it was less stressful to be at work than to be at home these days. I hardly know the difference, she thought, as she drifted off to sleep, fretting not only about the markets but also her MBA paper. Could she work Hochschild in to it, she wondered? Maybe one of her professors, who she knew was working on a book on global management, might be able to advise her?

For Maria, as a student practitioner of the management arts, market turbulence foreshadowed major intellectual as well as practical preoccupations. To what extent were the organization and management theories that she was learning prepared to change their traditional universalism and recognize the diversity of the world that she moved in, saw on the news, and experienced in her everyday life? What role did universal theories, grand narratives as she had learnt Lyotard (1979) called them, play in the constitution of the many local realities and diversities she had to navigate? Or, to put it slightly differently: what, in the past, had been the symbolic function of universalism? How does it reintegrate diverse worlds? How does it perform the odd trick of being a particular universalism that denies its provenance as it simultaneously seeks to hold sway over all domains, all places, all times? These are not merely academic concerns, as one would have Maria realise.

The institutional spaces within which organizational and management knowledge flourish are dominated by an ethnocentric vision that assumes the *a priori* of modernity already installed. It is only within this modernity that we can think in terms of its presumed universalism. Local differences are to be managed from within a logic of development in which everything that doesn’t respect the rule of the grand narrative can only be considered
as deviant, as an example of the type of error for which the universal theory serves as a corrective. Universal theory requires local error; without it truth would not be transparent. For this reason, the unique problem for universalism resides in the determination of ways in which problems of organization are constituted as problems outside of the norm, outside of the rule, outside of that which would be universal. Thus, rationally, those organizations that must be chastened in order to become modern exemplars of the one reality that is universal, rather than of the many realities that must be local, must, from this perspective, be in error. Such error defines reality, representing the modern hope either of integrating or containing everything that exists outside of its logic of rationalisation. That which cannot be integrated or contained must be destroyed. That which remains, appears as the universal logic of the electronic market, especially to those subjected to its dictates. As Morin (1982) suggests, we need a theory of error rather than of order.

The gaze embedded in a vision that surveys from a universal pinnacle can see only that which is close to it, normatively, however encompassing its viewpoint may be. The other can only be absent, an empty space with no substantive existence, in the face of an over-riding presence. The other is only recognisable when its presence is subordinated to the universal gaze; thus, it can only ever attain a subjected position. Any universal gaze of the cultural world must, by definition, be ethnocentric. As such, its gaze ranges across the terrain made visible in and by the postmodern, postindustrial, postfordist, postbureaucratic, postmasculinist world. In this world one finds those post realities that comprise the imagined societies for certain types of intellectual of the first-world, one that sees only those subjects visible and recognisable to the colonising heroes vision, fixed in the universalising gaze. The rest of the world, those past (not post) societies that are not advanced, not economically rational, not white, and not western: past societies provide only a complement, a domain, a data, and an occasion for the market to correct. Error reigns supreme in order to prove truth.
In reality the problem is complex because a diverse world co-exists simultaneously with an organizational logic that presumes and assumes a universal character, one, however, that can only ever find its specific forms in the institutional and cultural contexts of every local reality. As already indicated, the contrast between the fashionable recipes and the results of their translation to these diverse locales, establishes the terms of this ambivalence.

These remarks are written from margins, some of which are culturally proximate, while geographically distant, from the American heartland (UK and Australia), while others share geography but are culturally as remote as geographically they are near (Mexico). Both Australia and Mexico are colonial and post-colonial space simultaneously, depending on the metric applied. One struggles to make sense of organizations and politics in such places and spaces through theories that are overwhelmingly produced and reproduced elsewhere, under different assumptions, from different realities. For non-English speakers, language and culture are a large part of the problem: the two are inexorably intertwined. Outside of the English language, familiar attributes of managing and organizing, such as a shared sense of time, turn out to be quite different. For instance, there are still many locales in which time is still closer to cultures other than those of the factory; where the rhythms of religion, agriculture, family, community, or political obligation are much more real than those that translate from English into local practice (Rodrigues and Child 1996). As Weber recognized at the outset of modernity, that the project of the protestant ethic obliterated the traditions of the past was one of its most sublime achievements.

For non-American English-speakers the signs of difference are for more elusive and subtle. So much of our reality is a reality made elsewhere, in the North American heartland of the United States. Even in this proximate culture and language, there remains a recognisable sense of difference embedded in a peculiar history and specific institutions. This only reasserts, again, that while universal management practices may often be proclaimed as
such, they always have to be implemented through local regimes. Local regimes thus function as the crucial point of reference in the construction of universal paradigms. These “other” realities act as a demonstration of the truth of the universal in two ways. First, they serve as good examples of local experiences that do not function “properly” to contrast with current business paradigms. If local realities do not function in the way the theory establishes, they simply need to be improved and modernized with the help of the business paradigms: in Weberian terms they must be Protestantized. Second, if these local realities provide successful experiences, they will be used to support the advent of new business paradigms (actually, the only universal principle seems to be “acting locally”). Local realities thus have two faces: local success and/or local failure prove the truth of universal business paradigms; if they function they support a shift in paradigms; if they fail, they prove the validity of the current ones. The cycle of 1960s criticism of Japanese management by the late 1970s had receded in favour of some practices that previously had been stigmatized as Japanese. Subsequently, some of these practices, after the reinterpretation of the work of Deming (1982), were themselves reinterpreted as American lessons that the Japanese had remembered that had been forgotten at home. By the 1980s they became the basis for the new “lean” paradigm that Womack et al. (1990) captured in their studies of Toyota. Japanese experiences thus became best practice in the world because they represented the new “how to. . .” in management. It was from Japan, for instance, that scholars drew the necessary support for the importance of culture as the strategic key to managing successfully (Kono and Clegg, 1998). Now, with the recent crisis, another crop of management theorists can demonstrate that culture should be seen as only one of the elements in the complex flux of organizing: tight fiscal controls and managing by the numbers are now seen to have their place, after all.
Organizations and their management are always inscribed in a tension between attempts at universalism, as business paradigms are taken up and institutionalised in local knowledge, and the pull of situational particularism, those locales, places, spaces and times, in which are inscribed specific substantive values. Sometimes these are the stuff that makes the new forms of organization possible; on other occasions they may be deeply destructive and disorganizing of the imaginary projects for managing locally.

In the century whose time has just about past organizational and management representations were invariably cast in terms of universal themes such as these. After all, universalism, in its eclipse of particularism, was the very hallmark of modernity, according to influential theorists such as Talcott Parsons. The cultural and institutional diversity of the present state of the world still confronts universal organizational rationalities common to the representation of this historical epoch. So, how do paradigms change, if they always ascribe a universal imaginary?

Why do Paradigms Change?

The cynical answer is that it is all a question of fashionable knowledge. Consulting organizations seek to become the Versace and Armani of the business world, purveyors of expensive designs tailored to the needs of wealthy clients. A less cynical answer, closer to Kuhn (1962), the grandfather of paradigms, would stress the importance of punctuated equilibrium. Normal science comprises long periods of relative stability. The equilibrium of this stability is punctuated by extreme flux when anomalies accrue as puzzles develop that the existing paradigm cannot solve, or does not even address.

What creates the flux? Kuhn (1962) stressed the political nature of paradigms in scientific life, but did not really tell us why the adherents of subordinated paradigms suddenly
triumphed when they did, other than to say that the anomalies were becoming an embarrassment for the powerful adherents of the existing paradigm. In organization studies, influential purveyors of the paradigm concept, such as Burrell and Morgan (1979), never really answer this question of change, either. For them the paradigms never really change: they serve simply as spaces for the creation of new intellectual capital whose struggles with existing paradigms is how the politics of careers play out. As the existing dominant paradigm becomes overcrowded a few pioneers will build intellectual capital in other paradigms.

Interestingly, the whole paradigms debate in organization studies is producer driven. It is a debate generated by academics, about academic texts, for other academics, one that started with the framework offered by Burrell and Morgan (1979) in Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. The Burrell and Morgan (1979) approach provided a sense-making device to account for and locate new approaches, as well as carving out legitimate spaces in which they could flourish. The idea that organization studies should comprise a parallel set of unrelated options, different menus, and disconnected conversations, became part of an extremely influential debate during the 1980s. The framework, which classified research on organizations according to functionalist, interpretative, radical humanist and radical structuralist paradigms, may have seemed just a relatively straightforward way to catalogue a limited number of available options for the study of organizations. But Paradigms was not proposed merely as a theory of knowledge. It was a means to carve out a protected niche where alternative researchers could do their thing, protected from the criticisms of functionalists, free from what they saw as the necessity of having to try to explain their work to them. The key to this defensive strategy lay in the incommensurability of the paradigms and the language differences that precluded communication among them.

As the book by Burrell and Morgan (1979) elaborated, most existing organization and management theory worked within the assumption that only objective knowledge could be
valid, and that, typically, a regular social order characterised society, which fluctuated around a normative equilibrium. The interpretive space found people *making* social order, as they *made sense* of various other frames of references. The more radical version, known as radical humanism, where more powerful, elite or hegemonic groups dominate sense making, was used far less frequently, as was the radical structuralist frame. Like the radical humanist frame this shared the same stress on domination, although the emphasis was less on its subjective mechanisms (such as consciousness) and more on objective aspects such as the class structure of particular modes of production. (For instance, one might stress that relations of property produce two basic classes in capitalist societies: those who own the means of production and those who do not.) Typically, while individuals might change paradigms on rare occasions, the paradigms themselves were unchanging in their form: only the content that was formulated within and through them would differ. There is no substantial difference between paradigms that appear at first glance different. Management paradigms may differ in their form but they share the same imaginary base.

One can easily identify Burrell and Morgan’s approach as a theory of essential forms, as Platonist, after the view of the ancient Greek philosopher. Plato argued that reality presents itself to us as a series of unchanging forms. Some management educators revel in this Platonist view, and use it to relativise paradigms. The liberatory potential emerges, especially, when management educators can point out that most theorists only employ conceptual resources from one or other of the possible forms; usually the most conservative functionalist frame in the bottom right hand corner of Burrell and Morgan’s scheme. Knowing this, the task of the management educator is to spread enlightenment through surfacing the assumptions that managers routinely use. Having done so, the odds are that they normalcy will be functionalist in some way. These managers can then be exposed to the way that the world looks from other forms. Different paradigms (sometimes termed metaphors or
frames) reveal different facets of our understanding of management (Morgan 1985; Bolman and Deal 1992).

Many MBA and Executive Management programs now use a method of switching frames as a learning device. Using new frames or seeing through different assumptions means that the managerial and organizational world not only looks different; it becomes different, because it is the way that we see it. With the exception of the metaphors (Morgan 1985) and framing (Bolman and Deal 1992) takes on paradigms, the arguments move in an academically tight hermeneutic circle. What they do not do is address lay or practitioner conceptions of paradigms and changes to them. Thus, on this occasion, our interest is more oriented to the changing paradigms that business commentators, pundits, and authorities focus on. For many such people, the notion of changing paradigms captures the flux of recent and projected organizational, management and business experiences. One would argue that if Organization Studies were unable to bring these practitioner concerns with paradigms into its loop, the concept of paradigm would diminish in value, for the simple reason that it addresses only a restricted audience of paradigm warriors. The implementation of new paradigms in practice will be under-theorised, thought of merely as fads and fashions, rather than as extraordinarily powerful material practices.

Paradigms as 'Fads and Fashions' or 'Long Waves'?

Some theorists propose that management theories consist predominantly of recipe knowledge: a mixture of inexact science, artful appreciation, and pragmatic taste. Some reviewers are sceptical about the novelty of the latest paradigms. While there may be a plethora of fashionable paradigms they propose that few offer genuinely new recipes. A good example is the pioneer work of Richard A. Feiss (1910-1925) who early introduced industrial
democracy and recognized the importance of corporate culture (See Wrege and Greenwood, 1991: pp. 161-171). For instance, Peter Drucker introduced the term “post-modern world” as early as 1957, before the post-industrial concept had been built by Touraine (1969) and Bell (1973). It is clear that “the new” is not so new as we always believe. In this sense paradigms could be interpreted as the introjection of some representations and values that were sleeping for a long period of time, giving place to a new social imaginary that orients practices and discourses in a new way. Because management writing is afflicted by fads and fashion, all the important questions, and most of the important answers, have already been asked from within the confines of one existing paradigm, some theorists suggest (Donaldson 1995; Hilmer and Donaldson 1996). The dedicated proliferation of new paradigms is quite unnecessary because existing paradigms already answer all the questions that the new paradigms propose. The strongest version of the view that paradigms are merely fads and fashions is offered by Kieser (1977).

Kieser (1997: 50) suggests that the recipes for managing that are offered in the popular market are somewhat similar to the recipes of ancient apothecary in the use of bold promises, bustling consultants, magic, and sporadic reference to strict academic science. Ancient apothecary may be an appropriate analogy for the more outlandish consulting quick-fixes, but on the whole, we may say simply that management is an uncertain art; a type of cookbook knowledge, where each recipe uses similar ingredients in conjuring up dishes. However, these ingredients can be combined in many different ways, (contingent upon the aptitude of those who use the recipe books and the techniques, implements, ingredients, and utensils available to them), sometimes as new recipes.

If the metaphor of recipes captures a part of the reality of management, it is a metaphor that requires extending into the market in which recipe-knowledge circulates. Cookbooks, whether of management or food, are best sellers. They jostle together on the non-fiction lists
as fashionable and profitable commodities. (There may be some market segmentation, inasmuch as management and cookery books may command slightly separate audiences.) Management knowledge, like any other fashionable commodity, sells in a marketplace where variations and innovations compete with each other for acceptance and normalisation, where it is difficult to predict what will emerge dominant at the time that one is seeking to design, retail, or wholesale something new. But, when the fashion trend is discernible, some styles will rapidly be abandoned and others as easily accepted as they become normalised around the victorious themes (Kieser 1997: 51).

Why do some variations and innovations succeed where others fail? He offers basically three separate explanations. First, there is *trickle-down theory* which suggests that norms govern the widespread adoption of organization recipes. New forms of organization, like multi-divisional structures in the USA in the 1930s, become widely accepted because they become identified with successful companies. Being adopted by organizations held in high regard, they diffuse widely. Note that the argument is not that they diffuse because they are more efficient, but more fashionable. Certain ideas attain high cultural capital, or distinctiveness. Perhaps, as well as being adopted by powerful organizations, they are advanced by prestigious professors or consultants. Others then emulate the practices because they seem powerful. Sometimes they seem powerful because they display a showy *web-site*, one that legitimates itself as truth because of the space technology provides them with. Thus, such web-sites function in the same way that books functioned in the past, as ‘truth’ because they were printed. Good examples are the web sites of Tom Peters and Stephen Cobey.

Second, *collective selection theory* stresses the functions that fashionable recipes fulfil for audiences. Fashion tells us what to wear or what to read and practice and thus creates order from the chaos of choice. Achieving detachment from the past fashions propel us forward persuading us to leave the past behind in the embrace of the new. Orderly innovation occurs
through the gauntlet of competition and collective selection from fashionable recipes. In this way, the range of variation recedes as people attend to more limited variation than the environment presents, registering only those trends that appear already to be gaining recognition, thus seeking to avoid the role of fashion victim.

Third, *marionette theory* regards fashions as the natural outcome of competitive capitalism in its blind pursuit of profit. A constant supply of new recipes feeds the fires of commerce. Fashions are merely fetishistic recipes collectively consumed. Consumers dance to the strings that the fashion producing industry pulls. In the case of management the puppet masters are academics and consultants. Consulting houses have to have new and different recipes to sell, discontinuous from those that they previously sold, in order to maintain profits. A good example is Peters, who seems always to be “searching” for new recipes to sell. Compare, for example, the classic ‘excellence’ study of Peters and Waterman (1982) with Peters’ (1987) *Thriving on Chaos* and *The Circle of Innovation* (1997). Many managers become marionettes for consultants. Others know that the latest management recipe, whatever it is, can be functional: using the rhetoric of downsizing, for instance, they can achieve goals long held for other reasons: perhaps to rid themselves of that troublesome HRM Department or some of those creative R&D types. Out with the old recipe; out with the old enemies. Sometimes, the fashionable recipe simply seems overwhelming. Just as, in an era of wide ties no male executive who wanted to be thought fashionable would be seen in a narrow tie, so no manager would want to be seen espousing yesterdays theories and practices.

Kieser follows the nub of institutional theory in suggesting that when new fashions have been embraced by the rich and famous, the powerful, big end of town players, others will flock to them, as a matter of fashionable and unfashionable rhetoric. Fashionable rhetoric will promote recipes that emphasise on one best factor as the sole principle of the new way of doing things; stress the inevitability and necessity of the new principle. (Resistance is futile,
as the Daleks used to say.). Only fools who do not respect the icons of the age could or
would resist: for who can be against recipes that promote progress, efficiency, effectiveness,
and so on? Successful fashions will note that academics spin theories while practical men
(and rarely women) steer by tried-and-tested principles, often founded by people of great
genius. The new principles replace not rubbish but sound recipes whose day is done.
Tomorrow will be a new era and new eras will demand new recipes that require simple
metaphors not complex empirical proofs. Simple metaphors are best made highly ambiguous
in meaning: one should be able to read many possibilities in them. Above all, they must not
close off imagination (or imaginization as one guru [Morgan 1991] has it). The metaphors
should promise great challenges that many may fail while attempting to master the new
principles, as well as great rewards if mastery is achieved. These metaphors should treat
empirical research cavalierly: enlightenment need not be researched but may be revealed.
Above all, they should read well: they are not academic documents but timely texts for busy
practitioners.

The cynical view advanced by Kieser (1997) is limited. It fails to attend to the real
bunching of innovation that writers such as Eccles and Nohria (1992), Ezzamel and Wilmott
(1993) and Ramsay (1996) note. Different notions of business paradigm develop as a way of
attending to changing realities rather than to rhetoric that leaves reality unchanged. For
entrepreneurs and managers, located within the creative destruction of market forces rather
than the more sheltered groves of academia, the experience of change is somewhat more
compelling than the preservation of any existing intellectual capital whose investment they
might presently attend to. For practitioners, preservation spells extinction. Firms that display
arrogance in the face of innovation do not usually survive to tell the tale. In the contemporary
world of business books, magazines, and consulting, new business paradigms are
everywhere, while the paradigm debates in organization studies resolutely fails to address these concerns.

Recall that the ‘fashion’ perspective on paradigms and rhetoric does not suggest why innovation occurs in the first place. Some theorists suggest that periods of flux are characteristic effects of ‘long waves’. It was a Soviet economist called Kondratieff (1935) who first pioneered long-wave theory, but it has gained many adherents. Long wave theory proposes that the world economy has a rhythmical pattern, as rapid expansion and stagnation alternate with a periodicity of around about fifty years. A single long wave is estimated to have about a fifty-year cycle through initial growth to decline. Some theorists emphasise, as did Kondratieff, that the causes of the seismic changes that long waves represent are the result of massive investments in, and the subsequent depreciation of, major aspects of infrastructure such as canals, railways, and roads. Others follow Schumpeter (1934) and think that it is less the decline in infra-structure that is responsible and more the fact that clusters of innovation bunch together, creating new and discontinuous leading edge sectors in the world economy, driving macro-economic growth. Eventually further innovation restarts the whole cycle around further discontinuous innovation-bunches.

One writer who has worked with long wave views is Carlota Pérez (1985) who writes about a techno-economic sub-system. Here, innovations precipitate system changes across firms, industries, and countries. New eras are ushered in by innovations like the steam engine, automobile and computer. Each innovation-lead system change, and their key factors, steel, oil and electronics, crystallise a new rational technological paradigm in the upstream and a normative paradigm, designed to extract diminishing returns through additional motivational zeal in the downswing, with each phase accompanied by substantial economic restructuring and organizational redesign. The advent of mass production bureaucracy contingent upon the dawn of the automobile era would be one example; today, the corollary
would be the impact of the digital revolution that has accompanied the growth and
importance in computers. The impact is variable across countries, industries and
organizations, and each of these adds their own level of indetermination to the picture,
producing a highly contingent outcome.

Long wave theories entered management initially in the work of an industrial relations
writer, Harvie Ramsay (1977). Ramsay was an early and influential British proponent of this
connection of waves and rhetoric in his ‘cycles of control’ hypothesis, (which was influential
in the development of Clegg 1979; Clegg and Dunkerley 1980). More recently they have
been taken up by US theorists of management such as Barley and Kunda (1992), DeGreene
1988) and Gill and Whittle (1993). The most recent and empirically sophisticated proponent
is Eric Abrahamson (1997). He agrees with Kieser (1997) that the paradigms consist of a
change of rhetoric. Five of these have swept over US personnel management in the past ‘long
century’ from 1875. These comprise welfare work; scientific management, human relations
and personnel management, systems rationalism, and organization culture and quality.

Management rhetoric should not be dismissed as ‘merely rhetorical’, says Abrahamson.
Thus, he is far less dismissive than Kieser. Rhetoric has important functions: it provides
vocabularies of meaning and motive for management actions that managers can use to
provide legitimate accounts of how they manage their employees, as de Gaudemar (1991)
also suggested. New rhetoric may trigger the diffusion of new management techniques, and
the persistence of rhetoric may aid the continued use of these techniques. Rhetoric also aids
managers to better grasp the changing environmental realities that confront them in their
organizations and businesses (Abrahamson 1997: 492).

Why does rhetoric innovate and proliferate? Two hypotheses present themselves:
performance gaps and pendulum swings. Performance gaps open up when the targets that
managers wish to meet, and their performance in meeting them, do not coincide; when the
targets are out of reach. Consequently, managers become interested in rhetoric that hold promise that they can bridge the gap; should management or environmental changes narrow these gaps then interest will shift to other rhetoric that seems better able to address other gaps that have been ignored or have opened up more recently.

The pendulum swings thesis has three parts: rhetoric is either rational or normative. Rational rhetoric stresses technical aspects of work organization while normative rhetoric stresses the orientations of the employees. Rational and normative rhetoric are irreconcilable; hence they never emerge simultaneously but in a pendulum or cyclical alternation. New rhetoric emerge around the onset of each expansionary upswing of a long wave, a wave of economic activity that takes approximately 25 to crest and 25 years to recede. Thus each long wave has about a fifty-year duration.

Rational rhetoric is associated with upswings; normative rhetoric with downswings. As we shall see, an explanation exists for this difference in emphasis. Rational rhetoric stresses the formalisation and rationalisation of management and organizations, such as Taylor’s (1911) ‘scientific management’. It takes a mechanistic view of the organization and uses engineering-type analogies and metaphors to make the rhetorical point. While this clearly characterised scientific management it also characterised the systems rationalism of the 1950s and 1960s, although now the mechanistic analogy was less with a machine and more with the organization as a type of cybernetic system (see Table 1).

Normative rhetoric stresses that it is the orientation and attitude of employees that is most important. The stress is on the needs of the employees and their satisfaction in the firm, modelled as a community. Managers must meet employee needs (Human Relations) and simultaneously unleash their creative energies (Corporate Culture). While the rational rhetoric is stronger in the upswing and the normative rhetoric is stronger in the downswing, neither is ever wholly dominant. They coexist with greater or lesser emphasis. While the
digital revolution is rationalist in some of its implications, the impact that it is presumed to have for organization design is highly normative. In fact, it is less easy to separate out these ‘moments’ than Abrahamson (1997) presumes. The two theses, of gaps and pendulums, are complementary, as Abrahamson (1997) discovered.

**Table 1: Long waves, paradigms and rhetoric, after Abrahamson 1997:** Table 1, 494

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Second Kondratief Long Wave</th>
<th>Third Kondratief Long Wave</th>
<th>Fourth Kondratief Long Wave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upswing</td>
<td>Downswing</td>
<td>Upswing Downswing</td>
<td>Upswing Downswing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
<td>of paternalist paradigm</td>
<td>of mechanistic paradigm</td>
<td>of systems paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric type</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Rhetoric</td>
<td>Welfare work</td>
<td>Scientific Mgt.</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>culture &amp; quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirically, it is the pendulum thesis that explains the emergence of new rhetoric and the performance-gap thesis that explains their prevalence after their emergence. Moreover, the pendulum effect of rhetoric may not only be an effect of the underlying long waves. It may also be midwife to them: it may ease their transition from embryo’s to emergent forms in their own right as periodic ‘gales of creative destruction’ in macro-economics wipe-out pre-existing innovations and the regimes of rhetoric associated with their dissemination through organizations.
**Key elements of an emergent rhetoric for the next ‘Long Wave’**

Presently, Sibbet (1997) characterises the key issues of the current environment in terms of globalisation, knowledge workers, digitalisation and sustainability. We argue (in Clarke and Clegg, 1998), on the basis of a consideration of a vast and burgeoning management literature, focused on the literature of paradigm shifts in management, as well as through an assessment of significant corporate responses to paradigm shifts (such as Shell’s ‘triple bottom line’) and major private and public sector reports (such as the 1995 ‘Enterprising Nation’ Report in Australia, chaired by Karpin and the ‘Tomorrow’s Company Report of 1994 in the UK), that there are more elements to the principal rhetorics that are contenders for the next long-wave. Each of them is likely to be important, although one cannot calibrate their relations at this point. What one can do is to suggest what the implications of each might be for the present multi-paradigmatic universe of organization studies. Hence, we conclude this paper with an account of what we take to be the implications of a changing reality for the rhetoric of Organization Studies, rather than dismissing the reality through the rhetoric as merely a matter of fashion, fad or taste.

*From a single perspective to multiple management paradigms:* The plurality of management paradigms offers opportunities for learning to think systematically differently. This is one point of intersection between the different literatures on paradigms. Writers such as Morgan (1986) exploit this opportunity. Thus, on this reckoning, as Organization Studies practitioners we become metaphorical innovators, poets of organization practice, in search of ever more telling juxtapositions: the humanists on the trading-floors of finance, accounting, economics and so on.

*Globalisation: Once the certainties were known:* one knew ones competitors, customers and suppliers personally, because they were local: now, with the internationalisation and globalisation of business, these significant others may be worldwide. The globalisation of the
world economy presents a new business environment in which competition is international in a growing number of industries, and where it is only world class standards that will satisfy customers. Thus, the story goes, local paradigms will disappear as one paradigm of worlds best practice becomes universal. While such a view seems to neglect the academic capacity for spinning out difference it may point to the increasing irrelevance of such, from a business point of view, trivial pursuits. From this perspective, those disciplines in the Business Schools that are unable to present a unified front, (as Pfeffer [1994] suggests), are likely to wither. New entrants to the academic market, consulting companies in alliance with global software and communications companies, package glossy and up-to-the-minute versions of functionalism for mass consumption and training. In such a global market, there may be room for niche players offering non-standardised paradigmatic solutions from non-conventional paradigm positions but they will be, literally, marginalised. From this perspective we see the bleakest future for Organization Studies: withering on the vine of increasing irrelevancy.

**Digitalisation:** As a result of digitalisation and the creation of intelligent networked organizations, one may rarely, if ever, see those with whom one does business on a face-to-face basis. Interaction occurs in cyberspace, through the worldwide web and the Internet. The old world, based on manual operations, hard copy and analogue processes has been replaced. The convergence of computing power and telecommunications reach is providing new technological and information resources with which to pursue business opportunities, but this is only achievable if the management and organization of enterprises is transformed to capture the potential of new technologies. The two disparate concerns with the notion of paradigm those of the practitioner and the academic thus fuse in a practice of organization design, that draws on the postmodern, the virtual, in creating new networked worlds of organizations. In many ways such a fusion is the most exciting and challenging of the options
for Organization Studies. If in the past, theorists of structural contingency theory likened themselves to engineers designing the best fit for organizations with their contingencies, this option opens the possibilities of imaginative architectural practice, where one envisions structures and designs that exploit new technologies, theories, and feelings.

*Flexibilisation and the emergence of a different form of organization:* The emphasis is on a shift from older, more imperative methods of managerial fiat, based on prescription, command and control, to empowerment, team-work, and networked relations. These, it is argued, are more suited to the postmodern world as one of instability and fragmentation, where both product and service markets, as well as the systems that sustain them, change at a bewildering rate compared to the old certainties of mass-production and mass-marketing. Traditional command and control forms of organization that predominated in 20th century industry, fail to respond quickly and creatively enough to the developing demands of consumers and emerging market opportunities. Organizations today have to be intelligent, have learning capacities built-in, to take full advantage of the opportunities that changing realities afford. Here the paradigm options are determined by practice setting the agenda and theory responding accordingly: a handmaiden or applied conception of the role of business academics become market agents in the universities. Organization Studies will do as it is told as research strategies determine the structures of its knowledge, the perspective that one anticipates being embedded in the flexible perspective.

*From Planning to Strategy:* Stable markets and long production runs are disappearing to be replaced by niche markets and shortening product life cycles. Consequently, earlier methods of strategic planning based on rational modes of analysis become too rigid and are replaced by more creative strategic thinking. Rational modes of analysis mean using mathematical models to build the future right now, as a simulacrum, as Baudrillard (1984) would say. Here the representation must be the real, giving the real no place to survive. Such
simulations can respond more sensitively to rapid shifts in demand. Once organizations sought to plan, constructing scenarios on the basis of what they knew and what was past. Now, what businesses know today is an unreliable guide to what they need to envision tomorrow. Recognizing this, in many companies, planning has melded into strategising. Here, the concern with paradigms becomes a tool of the corporate planner, constructing scenarios. From this perspective, Organization Studies will continue to have a role in so far as it is associated with questions of strategy; otherwise its options look limited for further development.

**New stakeholders:** For companies to succeed in this increasingly competitive business environment they need to build better business relationships with all their stake-holders. While improving relationships with investors is part of this effort, companies will have to manage a much wider array of strategic relations with other constituencies who claim a stake holding in the company. Thus, today businesses have to account for many, and to, many more stakeholders. Included among these might be the ecology (and green groups who claim to represent it), ethnic or sub-national groups who live where ones firm works, various rights based advocacy groups, all clamouring for a representation that reflects more broad-based performance measures than do quarterly accounting representations of the bottom line. Thus, in this conception, paradigm innovation becomes a way of legitimating new players in the corporate scene. Organization Studies, on this criterion, will increasingly become part of the struggle to establish new norms of diversity in practice.

**Sustainability:** How long will today's businesses last and what impact will they leave on the planet? Arie de Geus (1997) addressed the first question when he was part of a team asked to consider how many of today's major firms have been around for at least 100 years. They could only find 40, worldwide, including firms like Mitsui, Sumitomo and DuPont. If one were to narrow down that list to firms that have not only sustained themselves, but also
the communities and ecologies with which they interact, it becomes smaller still. Yet, these will be the criteria for sustainability in the future. Here, the concern with paradigms becomes a call to moral awakening: creating new paradigms can call to attention neglected and potentially destructive aspects of present practice. New paradigms add moral, as well as long-term bottom line superiority. From this perspective, one would anticipate that the ethical implications of Organization Studies would become uppermost.

Conclusion

The critical research question remains the local impact of global changes on particular organizations, in distinct locales. Despite the rhetoric of globalisation there is no more reason today to think that there will be universal solutions to organizational issues than there was in the past. How issues of sustainability, new stakeholders, strategy, flexibilisation, and globalisation are defined, addressed and resolved, will, as ever, depend on how they are embedded and constructed locally. Even in an era of globalisation and digitalisation, universalising tendencies if ever there were any, we have no reason to expect common stakeholder, strategic and flexible responses.

Organization Studies paradigms, like the baby in the Virginia Slims adverts, might seem to have come a long way. Yet, we are sceptical. For us they seem still positioned on the cusp of marketing a product, (albeit an intellectual one), rather than grasping a changing reality. Just as Virginia Slim ‘babies’ are not constructed to deal with a changed reality in which the practice of smoking is basically ostracised as an uncivil pursuit, (at least in the advanced societies like Australia), the Organization Studies paradigms remain stuck, out of time. They relate to an era when theorists determined agendas, much as more prosaic marketing might once have done for other products. Yet, markets change not just as an effect of marketing but
also as a consequence of product innovations. The major innovations in the field of business paradigms have been slighted and disdained by Organization Studies gurus.

Perhaps, for the sake of all the Marias in the world it is time for the discourse of Organization Studies to develop some newer modes of reflexivity. For Maria, confronted with the history of science, the politics of Organization Studies presents a range of options for different forms of engagement, withdrawal, or defeat by academic practitioners confronted with the fast-moving world of practice with which she struggles and in which she struggles to make sense. In addressing a universalising reality recursively, rather than pluralising texts discursively, the concept of paradigm has nothing to lose but its irrelevance. Moreover, Organization Studies has everything to gain by way of a future. To remain trapped within the old paradigms, intellectually, as well as practically, is, we believe to spin out careers of declining intellectual capital and diminishing returns.
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与企业实践：制定适合国情的中国公司治理原则
同治理原则(草案)》及其解说
治理原则研究课题组研究论文摘登
业发展与公司治理原则研讨会
中国管理学核心期刊

自1998年创刊以来，《南开管理评论》在国内外管理学界专家学者的大力支持和编辑部的积极努力下，在不到两年的时间内，取得了长足进步，已成功地进入全国管理学科重点核心期刊行列。

从1998年9月创刊至今，《南开管理评论》共出版12期，刊物的稿件水平以及设计和印刷质量不断提高。所刊发的文章中，各类基金项目成果（包括国家社科基金和自然科学基金）占发表总额的40%多，吸引了一批国内经济、管理学界知名学者成为刊物的固定作者。2000年5月，国家自然科学基金委员会管理科学部已将《南开管理评论》列为管理学科全国重点核心期刊。此外，中国人民大学等国内重点大学已将《南开管理评论》列为本校管理学科核心期刊。

目前，《南开管理评论》正在与国内高层次的学术机构合作，以取得更加广阔的成长空间。
企业改革进入公司治理新阶段

伴随着新世纪的钟声，我们开始谱写新的百年篇章。
作为管理理论与管理思想交流的园地，《南开管理评论》在国内外管理学界专家学者的大力支持和编辑部的积极努力下，在不到两年的时间内，取得了长足进步，已成功地进入全国管理学核心期刊行列。

从1998年9月创刊至今，《南开管理评论》共出版12期，刊载的稿件水平以及设计和印刷质量不断提高。所刊发的文章中，各类基金项目成果（包括国家社科基金和自然科学基金）占稿比例的40%多，吸引了一批国内外经济、管理学界知名学者成为刊物的固定读者。2000年5月，国家自然科学基金委员会管理科学部已将《南开管理评论》列为管理学核心期刊。此外，中国人民大学，北京大学等国内重点大学都将《南开管理评论》列为本校管理学科核心期刊。

目前，《南开管理评论》正在同国内外高层次的学术机构合作，以取得更加广阔的成长空间。
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探索海尔市场链、业务流程再造实现机制的一篇作为

○ 曾培敬

(1) 企业关系：海尔市场链的机制化及实现机制的一篇作为。这是一篇关于海尔市场链机制化及实现机制的一篇作为。篇中指出，海尔市场链的机制化及实现机制中，企业关系是其核心环节。企业关系的实现机制，就是指企业在市场链中的地位、作用和相互关系的实现。企业关系的实现机制，有其自身的规律和特征，这些规律和特征是由企业关系的内涵和本质所决定的。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实现过程中，通过对企业关系的路径、路径和路径的实现，实现企业关系的实现机制。企业关系的实现机制，是企业关系实现的必要条件和重要保证。企业关系的实现机制，就是在企业关系的实
二、范式（Paradigms）

Paradigms这个术语是英国哲学家Kuhn(1962)首先提出的。他基于分析范式内在逻辑结构的布局，而使之与其他逻辑系统形成明显的区别。他指出，各种科学理论的产出和形成，都必须具备某种逻辑结构，而且这种逻辑结构必须是内在的、自足的。然而，由于科学理论的内在逻辑结构不可能被外在的逻辑系统所替代，因此，科学理论的产出和形成必须具备某种内在的逻辑结构。

科学理论的产出和形成，是科学理论内在逻辑结构的体现。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本前提。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本条件。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本依据。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本保证。

然而，科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是不可能被外在的逻辑系统所替代的。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本前提。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本条件。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本依据。科学理论的内在逻辑结构，是科学理论产出和形成的基本保证。

科学理论的产出和形成，必须具备某种内在的逻辑结构。科学理论的产出和形成，不可能被外在的逻辑系统所替代。科学理论的产出和形成，必须具备某种内在的逻辑结构。科学理论的产出和形成，不可能被外在的逻辑系统所替代。科学理论的产出和形成，必须具备某种内在的逻辑结构。科学理论的产出和形成，不可能被外在的逻辑系统所替代。
**Strategic Management**

Kuhn (1962) notes that the scientific community of the time was facing a crisis. The dispute was about two competing models: the "normal science" model and the "revolutionary science" model. The two models were fundamentally incompatible, and it was clear that one model was superior to the other. However, it was not possible to judge which model was better by looking at the data alone. Instead, it was necessary to look at the context in which the models were developed and the values that underpinned them. This led to the concept of the "normal science" model, which is characterized by the presence of a well-defined set of rules and procedures that are followed by all members of the community. In contrast, the "revolutionary science" model is characterized by the presence of a radical break with the past, where the rules and procedures are no longer followed.

Kuhn (1962) argues that the process of scientific change is not smooth and continuous, but rather a series of revolutionary changes that occur as a result of the accumulation of anomalies that cannot be explained by the existing paradigm. He argues that these anomalies eventually lead to a crisis, which is a period of great uncertainty and confusion. During this period, scientists are forced to reevaluate the existing paradigm and to come up with new ideas that can account for the anomalies.

Kuhn (1962) also argues that the process of scientific change is not a simple process of accumulation and revolutionary change, but rather a complex process involving the interaction of various factors. He argues that the process of scientific change is influenced by the social context in which it occurs, including the political and economic forces that shape the society in which the scientific community operates.

In summary, Kuhn (1962) provides a rich and complex account of the process of scientific change. He argues that the process is not a simple process of accumulation and revolutionary change, but rather a complex process involving the interaction of various factors. He argues that the process is influenced by the social context in which it occurs, including the political and economic forces that shape the society in which the scientific community operates.

**References**


战略管理

Kondratieff (1935) 提出的经济周期理论指出，经济周期的形成和发展受到各种因素的影响，这些因素包括技术进步、政策变化和市场的供求关系等。在经济发展过程中，不同阶段的产业结构和生产方式会不断发生变化，从而推动经济的持续发展。

在企业经营管理过程中，战略管理是企业面临环境变化和竞争压力，制定并实施战略的管理过程。它涉及企业目标的制定、战略的分析、战略的实施和评估等环节。通过战略管理，企业可以更好地应对市场环境的变化，提高企业的竞争力。

在企业经营管理中，战略管理是一个系统工程，包括企业使命的制定、战略目标的设定、战略规划的制定和实施、战略的评估与调整等环节。通过战略管理，企业可以更好地达成企业的目标，提高企业的效率和效益。

战略管理的核心目标是提高企业的竞争力和生存能力，实现企业的持续发展。战略管理的实施需要企业具备良好的战略思维和管理能力，同时还需要建立健全的战略管理体系和机制。

通过上述分析，我们可以看出，战略管理在企业经营管理中起着关键的作用。因此，企业必须重视战略管理，通过有效的战略管理，实现企业的持续发展和创新。
Arie de Geus (1978) has pointed out that competing for a company is no longer about what it is, but about what the people within it are capable of doing. Both individuals and organizations have to learn, unlearn, and relearn a great deal during their lifetimes, reflecting changing conditions. This is being increasingly valued.

In organization studies and business practice have hitherto promoted a series of representations that are not reflective of the way contemporary organizations operate and evolve. This is reflected in the literature as the paper addresses, the literatures on paradigms would expect that, in the business schools. It would be the case that managers have had to learn, unlearn, and relearn a great deal during their lifetimes, reflecting changing conditions. This is being increasingly valued.

In this paper, we focus on the relationship between management theory and organization studies. Management theory and organization studies are two distinct but interrelated domains. Management theory provides a framework for understanding and analyzing organizational behavior, while organization studies examine the practical application of management theory in real-world settings.

By using a case study approach, we examine the relationship between management theory and organization studies in the context of the Australian software industry. We analyze how theoretical concepts from management theory are translated into practical applications in organization studies, and vice versa.

We find that there is a significant gap between management theory and organization studies, which hinders the development of a comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior. To bridge this gap, we propose a framework that integrates management theory with organization studies.

This framework involves the following steps:

1. Identifying key concepts from management theory that are relevant to organization studies.
2. Analyzing how these concepts are applied in real-world settings.
3. Incorporating insights from organization studies into management theory.
4. Repeat steps 1-3 until a comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior is achieved.

We believe that this framework can help to bridge the gap between management theory and organization studies, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior.

References:


Conclusion:

Our study highlights the importance of integrating management theory and organization studies to better understand organizational behavior. By adopting a comprehensive approach, we can bridge the gap between these two domains and develop a more nuanced understanding of the complex relationships that exist within organizations.
《南方管理评论》征稿启事

《南方管理评论》是由国家教育部主管、南方科技大学管理学院主办的学术理论期刊，欢迎海内外作者赐稿。

为方便投稿，特作如下说明：

1. 本刊适用的文章主要分为以下四类：
   (1) 学术论文——有观点，有思路，有见解，有学术价值的学术文章。
   (2) 学术论文——有观点，有思路，有见解，有学术价值的理论探索文章。
   (3) 学术论文——有观点，有思路，有见解，有学术价值的学术视角文章。
   (4) 学术论文——有观点，有思路，有见解，有学术价值的学术探讨文章。

2. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

3. 本刊投稿截止日期为每年的3月31日。

4. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

5. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

6. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

7. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

8. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

9. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

10. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

11. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

12. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

13. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

14. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

15. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

16. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

17. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

18. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

19. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

20. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

21. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

22. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

23. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

24. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

25. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

26. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

27. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

28. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

29. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

30. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

31. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

32. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

33. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

34. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

35. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

36. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

37. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

38. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

39. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

40. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

41. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

42. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

43. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

44. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

45. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

46. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

47. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

48. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

49. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

50. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

51. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

52. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

53. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

54. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

55. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

56. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

57. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

58. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

59. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。

60. 本刊审稿通常在2-3个月内完成。
2 Academic articles should be 6000 – 8000 words in length.
3 For academic articles, please add a cover page, indicating the Chinese and English title, the author’s name, an abstract of 200 words in Chinese and English, author’s biographical details, and so on. Please do not indicate the author’s name in the article, for the purpose of anonymous peer review.
《南方管理评论》以促进中国企业管理现代化为宗旨，刊发关注中国管理实践热点与难点的研究成果，跟踪国际管理理论前沿，服务中国管理理论与实践的创新。