

Why a Handbook of Macro-Organizational Behaviour?

Stewart Clegg

Introduction

Most research in organizational behaviour is micro in focus, betraying the deep embeddedness of the discourse in psychology, the study of individuals. Thus, the distinctive feature of micro-organizational behaviour is that it is the study of the behaviour of individuals and groups in the organization, as seen from a psychological perspective. If there are similar disciplinary auspices for macro-organizational behaviour they relate to sociology, strategy, and economics.

Is macro-organizational behaviour the same thing as organization studies, organization theory or organization analysis? Well, if it is not the same thing it is very similar: there are strong family resemblances; they are cousins, at least. Perhaps the major difference is that macro-organizational behaviour has a focus on the person and group, even where the effects that are inscribed in them are quite macro whereas one is as likely to find that the phenomena of interest in the close cousins may well be the population of organizations, the organization's form, or the effects of macro-systemic and macro-societal forces on organization level phenomena (Clegg et al 2006).

The present collection is a first; although other resources exist in the general area of macro-organization behaviour, that claim to be 'handbooks', notably Viber's (2004) *Theories of Macro Organizational Behavior: A Handbook of Ideas and Explanations*, one should note that Viber's (2004) text is not a *Handbook* in the way that the present

text is. Viber's 'handbook' is a sole-authored textbook that addresses many different 'perspectives' on the field, ranging from a large number of 'functional economic theories of the firm', 'functionalist organization theories', 'interpretive and social constructivist perspectives', through to 'humanist and structuralist perspectives', thirty five different perspectives in all. It is all rather exhausting and, for the student, perhaps a little confusing, as the question must arise, which perspective should I be using now, and why?

The present Handbook is nothing like the Viber text; instead, we decided what we thought were the major *issues* in rather than *perspectives* on organizational behaviour as seen with a macro-lens. Then, we asked people drawn from the front -ranks of research-based scholars whom we knew to have done exemplary work in these fields to write for us. Where we were not sure whom to invite we sought advice from our illustrious Editorial Board. Each author or authorial team received detailed feedback on the draft chapters that they had produced and then we thought about the structuring of the volume.

Readers might think that one would have worked out the precise structure of a volume such as this in advance; our experience, and between us it is pretty expansive, is that this is rarely the case. Strategy does not determine structure; nor does the structure get chosen in advance and determine the strategy. The process is more emergent, more organic, and more grounded in the material actually produced. Thus, we had elicited a number of contributions that addressed some substantial, central, key questions; these clearly played a framing role in the volume as a whole. The contributors were chosen because of their expertise in the area that they had been asked to contribute to and

were not subject to any prescribed framing by the editors in terms of either approach or methods. Having chosen outstanding contributors we felt confident that we could get significant contributions.

Framing the field: introducing some big issues

The question “what do organization behaviour tools actually do?” is at first glance innocuous, a mere seeking for information about why people might develop and use such tools. However, as André Spicer suggests, such a question can be deeply problematic. Posing it can be deeply divisive of the community of OB scholars. Issues of relevance, style, and audience, not to mention ethics and practice, immediately jostle for attention when what OB does is considered.

For Spicer, there are a number of dimensions to the question. First, there is the status of theory: OB claims to be a theoretical discipline – what ideas of theory does it work with? Second, given that OB does develop theories, what does it matter? What is the impact of the theories produced by researchers on what managers do in practice? Third, given that these theories might frame much of what goes on in organizational life, how is this knowledge used? Addressing the last of these questions takes us into consideration of matters of prediction, understanding, and critique of, as well as innovation in, organizational behaviour.

Theory in organizational behaviour is established, in dominant versions, as being abstract in its representations; ideally, these representations connect conceptual ideas causally; they do so by means of argumentation that connects different theoretical elements either logically or, by means of data, with empirical tendencies in the real

world. All of this must be seen in terms of context: the limiting condition for theoretical applicability.

The auspices of the afore-mentioned conception of theory are quite clear: they derive, essentially, from a modern, scientifically-framed view of the universe of knowledge. For the majority of practitioners of OB this would be the appropriate context within which to view their disciplinary work; they do science when they do OB. The science may be a little different from pure physics, in that it is less definitely deterministic in its specification of relations and somewhat more probabilistic, but it indubitably bears a family resemblance to the other sciences. Essentially, it tests out propositions that are derived either deductively from empirical clues or inductively from conceptual frameworks.

There are other views of theory that Spicer also discusses, in which the theorist does not take for granted either the way that conceptual relations appear to correspond to the empirical world or the necessary correctness of the conceptual scaffolding in use. Instead, the theorist is profoundly suspicious of the sense data that provides their information about this world, in part because any understanding of the social world is already mediated by some kind of theory. We do not observe 'raw' sense data but data that has already been made sense of through the interpretive lenses that we find natural to use. In this view, theory is a way of approaching the world based on constant questioning of immediate sense data and its interpretation. Theory breeds suspicion of what we think we apprehend, empirically. It constantly invites new ways of seeing.

Considered either as propositional or suspicious science, what is the point of theory? Well, it helps us manage the worlds through which we move. Take the example of organizations conceived as routines, for instance. Routines emerge around recurrent activities, such as hiring staff. These activities then become the focus of many different organizational behaviour approaches that address the consequence and corollaries of different ways of doing this activity. Over time, these routines become understood through the wisdom embedded in these organization behaviour approaches as something to which various theories of selection apply. As members of many different organizations in many different places come to understand the process of selection through these theories – often taught in higher education – and apply these theories in practice then they become a constitutive part of common sense used in practice. Subsequently, common sense provides an implicitly theoretical template for the conduct of everyday life. Thus, one important effect of OB theories is the creation of tacit-and-taken-for-granted knowledge. Smart people, realizing this, act to create discontinuous markets in common sense by developing consultancy and intellectual products that periodically remodel its assumptions, creating fashions in ideas.

To the extent that a market in management ideas is captured by particular theories these theories can become, if widely adopted in practice, what Spicer refers to as ideologies – strict and appealing normative schemes for making sense of the world of sense data. He uses the idea of leadership as one example and, as another, the very ubiquity of ‘management’ in the contemporary world where there is hardly any situation, practice or process to which the tag ‘management’ cannot be applied. Of course, any sophisticated market has many claims to small differentia among

products, so that not all products compete directly with each other. Canny investors in ideas will seek out those ideas that seem to have the highest status in the market; thus, one factor driving the adoption of management practices will be the cultural capital that attaches to them, how high a cultural value they seem to have. So another thing that organization behaviour ideas do is to shape conformity in the design and conduct of behaviour; not necessarily because of functional efficiencies attached to the use of specific theories but because they become, for a time, highly valued.

Organization behaviour tools that become widely used, such as particular selection instruments, personality tests, or behavioural profiling, become technologies of management. It is not so much that managers use the tools but the tools use managers, they operate through managers, to produce categorically coherent knowledge about work and organization. The knowledge that these theories encode becomes a constitutive part of almost everyone's ways of making sense and performing their work. Theories become performative tools.

What kind of performance particular theories can produce depends on the type of theory that they are, categorically. Conventionally, following the work of the German sociologist Habermas, the categorical work that theory performs has been classified as one or other of explaining causal relations, understanding and interpreting, and critiquing the world. It is the former activity – the explanation of causal relations – that most often preoccupies academic practitioners of theory. The reason is simple: academics circulate their ideas in a milieu in which prediction has an especial cachet – that of the modern university – in which the sciences enjoy poll position. Of course, most of the objects that most modern science attends to do not have theories about

their own behaviour, as do people. Moreover, in organization behaviour the picture is even more complicated – it is not just that theorizing occurs about what people do but it also occurs through the terms with which people speak about what they do. At every point, theory is embedded in everyday language and understandings; it is, in part, the everyday assumptions about the world that already reflect pre-existing theories that shape how the theorist will understand phenomena of and from that world. As Spicer suggests, this can have perverse effects: “we develop a one-dimensional and rather un-supple understanding of the social world. At times we can end up in a situation where our law-like generalisations act as mechanisms that reproduce existing patterns of domination and subjection. This means our theories can act as a brake on social change and enforce a single dominant version of how things should be.”

It is this first way of approaching theory that is most popular in academic circles. The reason is obvious: academics make stellar careers through publishing their ideas in the most reputable journals; the most reputable journals, by and large, adopt a natural science view of the world, even when dealing with social rather than natural reality. There is a premium attached to explaining things in causal terms. The more abstracted these terms are from the terms of everyday life that they draw on the more refined the theory. However, no matter the extent to which theory is refined it can never escape its necessary embeddedness in the common sense understandings of everyday life if it contains empirical points of reference – because these empirical points are always tied up in and made sensible by these understandings.

Focusing on understanding gives rise to the second way of thinking about theory in which the purpose is to seek to interpret how it is that the world is understood in

particular ways. The task of an organizational behaviour theory in this perspective is to try and communicate how other people interpret and understand the social world by recovering the assumptions, meaning and frames of reference that they find conventional to use. Thus, such an approach to theory is less concerned with providing tools for use and application in everyday life so much as in understanding how the tools in use and application in everyday life shape everyday organizational life and its understandings. The approach is inherently conservative in terms of what exists because it seeks to uncover the meanings that inhere in particular situations and chart their effects. It is not trying to suggest new ways of understanding phenomena but merely to chart, in all their complexity and subtlety, the effects of ideas in use. It is an approach to theorizing that is much favoured by anthropologists because it sheds light on strange and different ways of being in the world; applied by organizational behaviourists it seeks to make the everyday life of the organization 'strange' by bracketing the assumptions shared by theory with ordinary ways of thinking and reflecting. From the perspective of those whose knowledge is being bracketed the exercise can seem a little pointless; even though they may not be able to say in so many words what they know they know they know it and its reiteration by theorists may seem curiously unedifying and unilluminating – especially as it comes back to them tricked out with words and phrases that belong more to the theorists' world than their own. Moreover, if all understandings belong to a specific context it is hard to accumulate knowledge if all knowledge has its character determined by the ways in which it is used in specific contexts.

The third way that Habermas thinks theory can be used is as a tool for critique, as a calling into question of existing social relations and ways of organizing. From this

perspective the organizational behaviourist neither produces predictive theory of what already exists nor attempts to excavate a deep understanding of how what already exists is possible. Instead, they seek to deconstruct, destabilize and disinter those self-evident 'truths' that people ordinarily hold dear. The reason that this is attempted is because critical theorists, as adherents of this perspective are known, believe that knowledge is best advanced by continually asking questions in order to create some kind of radical or emancipatory social change. They seek not only to understand the world but to change it. In doing so, as Spicer wryly notes, they can become rather egoistical, sure in the certainty of their own critique simultaneously as they seek to expose the uncertainties of everyone else's understandings.

The three positions discussed exhaust Habermas' ways of thinking about the relation of theories to the world; however, there is one other approach that Spicer commends, which involves theoretical work as a process of creative innovation, one that involves creating new concepts that allow us to think about organizations in a different way. The aim is to tell us something that we did not already know, to show us something that enables us see the world in different terms, ways of seeing which create new possibilities for organizing and living. There are risks associated with this view of what organization behaviour theories might do and these risks are those that attach to any unbridled innovation program: much which will be created might be interesting but curious; attractive in itself but useless when applied in the existing contexts of understanding.

Whichever of these approaches to theory are used by organization behaviourists there will be consequences. Some theorists seek to limit these by either corralling their

theories within specific paradigms – or models – of research, thus concentrating merely on the internal coherence of their approach, or by adopting an activist orientation towards their favoured theory, building alliances and an intellectual movement around it as they seek to extend its influence. Beyond either paradigms or politics, suggests Spicer, there may be a more modulated practical stance. When we apply and use theory we are doing something in the world. What we should consider when we do something in the world is what its effects are likely to be. Taking this approach involves asking why I am doing this something with this theory, for what purpose, it entails considering who will benefit, and what might be the best way of ensuring these benefits. In answering these questions the theorists may well find that no one of the previously outlined perspectives is entirely adequate; instead the theorists will need to move between different positions, experimenting with ideas here, seeking predictable effects there, and seeking to understand deeply elsewhere, perhaps throwing some critical elements into the mix somewhere else in order to see what conversations are sparked. Indeed, from this perspective good research should be like good conversation, it should not merely affirm but also inform, occasionally unsettle, and sometimes take off in entirely unpredictable and innovative directions.

Organizational behaviour spawns innovation. New fields emerge to be charted, debated, critiqued, and reformed. We shall meet many such fields in this *Handbook*. However, in recent years few have been as influential as the idea of ‘knowledge work’. The idea that there was something distinctive called ‘knowledge work’ was first enunciated by Peter Drucker, as Tim Ray suggests at the outset of asking what it is that knowledge work does. He uses an amusing story to make the point that, if knowledge work largely involves thinking, someone may be doing knowledge work

even as they cannot be seen to be doing so. No one ever knows what is going on in the head of the other except in those terms with which the other tells it.

If knowledge work is hard to see it is also hard to define. Ray suggests we should focus less on the abstract noun of knowledge and more on the active verb processes of knowing. That there is such a thing as abstract knowledge is largely due to the prestige with which modern science has become regarded in recent centuries. It is science that produces abstract knowledge.

Science is one of those words that can be attached to almost any practice: sports science, domestic science, computer science, management science. However, as Ray suggests, calling something a science does not necessarily make it a science much as other sciences are already constituted to be. To make this point clear he cites a British philosopher, Simon Blackburn, for whom the idea of a management science seems as preposterous as Feng Shui or Flying Saucers. (Such views are very entertaining and go down very well in elite circles, such as the University of Cambridge, which employs Professor Blackburn to do his knowledge work.) As Ray suggests:

During the second half of the 1990s, Anglophone management science became bewitched by a curious departure from its realist roots, as oriental oracular mystique shaped the rise of new nostrums. According to Japanese academics, Ikujiro Nonaka and Hirotaka Takeuchi, what the Hungarian-born scientist and Michael Polanyi (1891-1976) called tacit knowledge, which is in the heads of persons and entirely subjective, could be converted into universally comprehensible explicit knowledge objects that can be managed (see Tsoukas 2003; Ray 2008a).

Ray excoriates the views advanced by these eminent Japanese professors. He does so because he believes that they let a relativist cat out of the conceptual knowledge bag. He suggests that the tacit-explicit knowledge-conversion process that forms the basis for Knowledge Management (KM) is promulgated not on the foundations that Polanyi laid down, but goes right against the grain of his argument. Tacit knowledge is tacit precisely because one cannot provide an explicit account of it.

Traditionally, economics has dealt with three commodity sources of value: land, labour and capital. To these in recent times, probably after Drucker, and certainly after Nonaka and Takeuchi, has been added knowledge – on the basis of the alchemical tacit-explicit knowledge-conversion process. As Ray suggests, when what a person knows as knowledge is coded as information it is possible to treat their personal knowledge as a scarce commodity that could be priced according to the laws of supply and demand. Yet, if one sells another their land, labour or capital one alienates oneself from that which is sold – literally – one severs the tie between one's possession of the thing and one's disposition to do with it whatever one will. One passes control of its disposition into the hands of the other: landowner, employer or bank, for instance. Information is different. If one sells some information that one knows to some other party one still knows it and has the ability to dispose of it after the sale. If you sell information, you still have the thing that you sold. And today, as Ray argues, most knowledge that is sold as information is produced organizationally by a multiplicity of knowers rather than by a solitary thinker. Increasingly, such knowledge became identified in the 1990s as 'mode 2' knowledge – not pure scientific knowledge embedded in a relatively closed disciplinary context but knowledge that is transdisciplinary, relying on informal cooperation among practitioners and users from a variety of backgrounds. Such mode 2 knowledge seemed precisely to be the type of knowledge that Nonaka

and Takeuchi felt could flow from tacit-explicit knowledge-conversion processes.

Commodified personal knowledge can emerge from ineffable personal knowledge and be shared with the personal knowing of others to create explicit knowledge.

Ray believes that, to the extent that this process of conversion does occur, it occurs in Japanese companies because of some very specific contextual features. Such organisations can take the long-term loyalty of knowledge workers for granted because of deeply embedded institutional expectations about the role of ‘company as family’ workplace organisations in Japanese society. Employees will ‘give up’ what they know because they know the company is committed to them and their future is linked to the organisation’s success. Cooperation among colleagues is natural and easy where insiders form a cohort that sees things in an aligned way, without the necessity for extensive managerial coordination. The normal practices of power and discipline in Japanese organizations made possible what Nonaka and Takeuchi took for granted. Elsewhere, however, in different institutional contexts, one could not rely on the ease of knowledge disposal and sharing, and in these other cases the project of KM’s construction would be sown on far less fertile soil.

Only under certain organizational conditions of power relations, which Japanese organizations approximate, will subjects feel eager to share what they know.

Knowledge resides in the heads of persons and no knowing subject can construct what they know other than through their experience. Knowledge is actively constructed by the cognizing subject; it does not consist of the ‘discovery’ of an ontological reality, so much as reside in a subject’s cognitive capacity to organize their experiential world. Hence, science, much as any other knowledge-oriented endeavour, is not

premised on an ever more perfect approximation of an unchanging reality – both because reality is always changing – think of global warming – and because whatever we learn changes what we already knew. Scientific knowledge is produced where the constraints under which a phenomenon is observed have been carefully specified; where an explanation of something that is interesting or surprising about the phenomenon under review is noted; where, on this basis, one can make future predictions about the nature of the phenomenon in question, and create standing conditions that should lead to the observation of the predicted phenomenon. Of course, as Spicer suggests in the previous chapter, there are other conceptions of theory that bear less family resemblance to this conception of scientific knowledge that should not be dismissed out of hand because they do not create predictions. Rather than treat knowledge as a part of an object world, it might be more helpful to address the processes by which people learn how to ‘do things’ in concert with others, where concertation is based on what they know, and specific standing conditions that enable them to share what they know with others. From this perspective KM looks to be a lot less objectivistic and to be a lot more concerned with the construction of conditions under which knowing can and will be shared. From this perspective, much of KM misses the mark: the focus should be less on what is produced as objective knowledge and much more on the processes whereby knowing does or does not become shared knowledge.

KM gained its enormous popularity in the West at a time when neo-economic liberalism was very much in the ascendancy. The finest economic historian of the emergence of the liberal market economy from the bonds of feudalism remains Karl Polanyi, who was, incidentally, Michael Polanyi’s elder brother. As Scott and

Weiskopf elaborate, central to the elder Polanyi's account was the notion of a 'double movement': that as a market emerged in genuine commodities it also emerged in commodities that were fictitious. The fiction most deeply held and widely entertained was that of labour as a commodity on the labour market. In fact, labour only became a commodity through the destruction of a dense institutional fabric of feudal bondage. The market did not so much emerge spontaneously but was created by distinct legislation and regulation, such as the various Poor Laws of nineteenth century Britain, which fixed the status of wage earner as a desirable category at the same time that they stigmatized the categories of destitution (see Clegg et al 2006: 43-4). Thus the economic subject as a person in a market for labour was one of the first constructions that market society objectified. That the construction took such thorough root, suggest Scott and Weiskopf, is in part because the conditions of its existence represented a tangible freedom denied to those who laboured under feudal bondage. More recently, they suggest, the promise of release and freedom from the bondage of bureaucracy that came, with the growth of the market economy, to characterize the mature state of organized capitalism, has increasingly been promulgated. The chief promulgator is the enormously influential Tom Peters (1992), whose project seems to be one of re-enchanting economic activity by fusing the passions and the interests, and in the process overthrowing the barriers that have traditionally marked off civil from market society, public from private life, and the employee role from the many roles that the self might play. It seeks to demarcate the organizational role as primary; to reconstitute this role as entrepreneurial, and to infuse it with passion.

These conditions of existence are both novel and specific. Their novelty develops from the 1980s onwards, with the political programs of Thatcherism and Reaganism, and the intellectual work of characters such as Tom Peters. Their specificity is given, in the first instance, by the economically liberal Anglo-economies of the UK, US, New Zealand and Australia. In this new order, as Scott and Weiskopf suggest, passion is not an option; it is demanded by the new forms of post-bureaucratic organization that Peters endorses. Those who cannot commit utterly to the passions unleashed are not welcome. While the bureaucratic subject was dominated by the rules of the bureau the new post-bureaucratic subject's organizational behaviour will be dominated by no one but their self. However, the freedom is somewhat illusory because only those subjects who willingly constitute themselves as freely entrepreneurial, as subjects able to conduct their own conduct as (self) responsible entrepreneurs, who are, in a word, *enterprising*, can be allowed to be free. The freedom allowed is, in fact, an obligation. We have to manage our selves and our career as a series of projects in which we can only blame ourselves for any failure or disappointments. Where all life takes place in a market – from schools, through dating, to job-seeking, employment, insurance, and including all general life-chances, the market and marketization becomes a governing principle that structures life itself. Foucault's (1979) neologism of 'governmentality' (a combination of government and rationality, which becomes fused in the mentality of the subject) comprises the complex of notions, calculations and strategies through which diverse authorities act upon the lives and conduct of others by constituting these subjects as their own arbiters of the degrees of freedom and unfreedom that they will tolerate in their day-to-day life. Life becomes a project in which the chief investor is the person whose life supports the many projects in which they engage. At all points in these projects, the expertise of the behaviourist is applicable: the

autonomous subject is governed at work by organizational behavioural technologies that allow them to reflect on possibilities and opportunities in terms of the discursive categories provided by behavioural experts just as much as they are governed in sport or dating by coaches or life-style trainers.

Organizationally, choice frees organizational oligarchies from responsibility for the success or failure of projects in which subaltern teams, set in competition with and against each other within the internal market, are made free to make their own strategic decisions but are made also to bear a correspondingly greater responsibility for their own fate. The oligarchs can simply set the efficiency benchmarks that freedom must aspire to by simultaneously lowering costs and raising the level of activity. The post-bureaucratic organization becomes a network of nodal points connecting different projects and project teams in which audit and activity-based cost accounting are the central steering mechanism. For Scott and Weiskopf the exemplar industry for their location are the new creative industries.

The new creative industries represent the shock troops of the new organizational behaviour: their workers are both highly qualified and underemployed, often on short-term contracts and project-based work. Above all, flexibility in all things is demanded and self-organization and self-management are seen as the mechanisms that will deliver this flexibility, as projects are bid for, worked on, and negotiated and shared with others who are similarly highly organizationally mobile, flexible in their work times and habits, working always on temporary assignments with high levels of self-responsibility, unclear boundaries and insecure incomes. And on top of everything, the subject is expected, in their organizational behaviour, to embrace these new

conditions with passion, to invest emotional commitment into their projects, to revitalize the organizational life worlds that they traverse with charismatic conviction and enthusiasm. The recent enthusiasms of empowerment, spirituality and teams take on a very different appearance viewed through the lens of this chapter.

What links Ray's, Scott and Weiskopf's and the following chapter on managerialism by Martin Parker is a similar concern with the much-vaunted end of bureaucracy and the emergence of a post-bureaucratic space, peopled by autonomous creative knowledge workers. Bureaucracy conceived on a rational-legal basis was a revolutionary project, attacking aristocratic privilege and instilling liberal norms everywhere it touched. Left critics railed against the illiberality of its liberalism at the apex of power – where the military-industrial complex meant that technocrats could move freely from one sphere of influence to another. As we have seen in Scott and Weiskopf's discussion of Tom Peters, bureaucracy has come under attack as too slow and too hierarchical. Running through all these critiques and those of the new 'new left' – the ecologists, feminists, and contemporary syndicalists – is a strong anti-managerialism, where managerialism is defined as a fusion of bureaucracy and a belief in the power of reason as the vehicle for delivering more scientifically efficient solutions to whatever problems presented themselves. Saint-Simon is its earliest figure but in contemporary times, the criticism of managerialism proceeds on at least four fronts, which broadly cover complaints rooted in nostalgia, modernization, everyday cultural experience, and anti-authoritarianism.

Nostalgia isn't what it is cracked up to be when viewed historically because it often appears as an infinite regress as each generation displays nostalgia for the world that

they believe they have lost. Thus, themes that appear distinctly modern when read in the twenty-first century can be seen to be but echoes of concerns that have rattled the iron cages of bureaucracy and industrialism almost from their inception. Such critiques are often those of elites who feel themselves by-passed by the rationalization they abhor. More contemporary critiques come from the radical utopians, the modernisers, whom Scott and Weiskopf associated with Tom Peters. For Parker, the criticisms are associated with consultants who sell ideas about culture, re-engineering, spirit, networks and transformational leadership. When associated with reform of state organizations and the public sector the criticisms are not as full-bloodedly marketizing but offer instead various simulacra for markets. The sphere in which most people will be familiar with criticisms of managerialism is cultural, as it is regularly exhibited in shows such as *The Simpsons* and *Futurama*, and strip-cartoons such as Dilbert. These are critiques that resonate with the sympathies of those who toil under authority figures for whom, on the whole, they have little respect. However, as with the nostalgic, the critiques just keep on coming – at least since the days of mid-nineteenth century critics such as Dickens, through early twentieth century critics such as Kafka. They were differentially developed in different markets: in the US community and common virtue were opposed as wholesome alternatives to big business whilst in Europe opposition to bureaucratic rationalisation more often than not was expressed through workers councils, and a general commitment to socialism. From Dickens' Gradgrind to *The Office's* David Brent, suggests Parker, managers are figures of unease, objects of derision, and ill-regard. The best-developed critiques of managerialism derive from anarchist tendencies, suggest Parker, and stretch back at least to the cooperative ideas of the early nineteenth century, and have spread into not only anarchist but also workerist, feminist, and environmentalist criticisms of

organization and management. On the whole, these are criticisms from the margins of modernity, from various groups who feel unrepresented or marginalized by modernity. What is remarkable, suggests Parker, is that there are deep traditions from each of these tendencies that are highly critical of managerialism as the dominant expression of organizational behaviour yet which are rarely articulated within the field of organizational behaviour itself, other than in the somewhat closed and unreflective project of a Critical Management Studies that largely fails to connect with what most organizational behaviourists do. There is a history; it is worth retrieving, and it has much to teach us about the general and pervasive sense of the dark side of organizational behaviour.

If Parker dwells on the dark side, the final chapter in Part One of the Handbook by Arran Caza and Kim Cameron seeks to develop positive lessons for organizational behaviour. The authors are advocates of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS). While these authors do not search the historical depths noted by Martin Parker they characterize traditional organization behaviour in terms of a hypothetical world of greed, manipulation, and distrust to which they seek, positively, to oppose appreciation, collaboration, and meaningfulness. As they explain it, "positive" is meant to signal an affirmative attitude to life-enhancing rather than negative experiences, "organizational" is meant to stress the emphasis on organized contexts, as opposed to purely individual phenomena, while "scholarship" indexes the importance of research and theory. What is positive, they suggest, are elevating processes, excellence, human strength, resilience, vitality, and meaningfulness. Intellectually, POS draws on positive psychology, community psychology, positive organizational behaviour, prosocial organizational behaviour, organization

development, and corporate social performance. While these are all reasonably well-developed fields, there is, of course, always the matter of interpretation – one person's excellence can be another person's nightmare, as the three previous chapters have been at pains to elaborate.

The major assumption that is made by POS is that people desire positive, happy experiences and that the desire to improve the human condition is universal and the capacity to do so is latent in most systems. Perhaps it could only be in a nation whose constitution establishes a right to human happiness that such a sanguine view could flourish. It is certainly a long way from the gloomy view of human neuroses that Freud developed at the start of modern psychology; or from a Hobbesian view of human nature and social order as nasty, poor, brutish and short, or from the anti-foundational biases of much contemporary and post-modern thinking, in philosophers such as Richard Rorty. Behind the affirmative assumptions is a commitment to a heliotropic principle which sees living systems as seeking that which is life-giving and avoiding that which is life-depleting. Various studies – from psychology and from linguistics – are cited to support the existence of the heliotropic principle in social life, as well as noting its existence in the biological sciences. The chapter then explains its categorical principles and, using these, proceeds to discuss twenty one recent empirical papers that elaborate the POS agenda. These are discussed in terms of six themes – Individual Virtue and Social Concern, Leadership, Organizational Virtue, Positive Relationships and Performance, Psychological Capital and Absence of Negativity – that can be found in the research literature. Taken together, they provide a significant set of signposts for those who want to develop more positive theories and studies.

Caza and Cameron do not simply elaborate the usefulness of POS in research terms, however; they also look at its applications in practice, including case studies that document especially positive organizational performance, specific tools and techniques for generating positive effects, and instructional programs centred on POS knowledge. With all this positiveness in evidence it would be encouraging if the posited eudemonic nature of individuals and their organizations did lead to positive behavior, create positive dynamics, and produce positive results, but, this is not the case. The empirical evidence suggests more complex relationships where positive emotions can produce negative behaviours, negative emotions can produce positive behaviours and positive behaviours may produce negative results. These findings, once again, suggest that what is positive must be considered more complex than the heliotropic orientation suggested. If human conflict, travail and misery can produce positive outcomes does this mean that we should encourage such phenomena because, in the long run, they can facilitate positive outcomes? Some solutions to the definition of positive are suggested: being positive is better than a median point in a normal distribution or being positive could be defined in contextual terms. The latter would seem to be fraught with the difficulties identified earlier by Spicer: how does one aggregate a general theory from the specificities of local contexts? Moreover, there is a more general issue of cultural specificity – thus far the majority of studies come from developed Western societies, although there are some few exceptions. In these exceptions there appear to be counter-factual tendencies to those observed in the US, suggesting that, not surprisingly, what is positive is culturally contingent. Nonetheless, with all the careful caveats that Caza and Cameron articulate, it is

evident from the extensive literature reviewed that POS has already made a significant impact on the field and should continue to do so.

Macro Organizational Behaviour and Immanent Processes

The most fundamental human capacity is the capability of learning one which is, of course, shared with other primates, but in a far less developed way. By extension, organization behaviour has increasingly talked of the capacity of organizations to learn. When organizations learn they change, it is assumed but Antonacopoulou argues that this is too simple: organizations that learn might learn in such a way that the social, emotional and political forces at play lead not to change and transformation but a degree of stability. Learning reinforces the status quo through a focus on what is known rather than a drive towards the unknown. One reason why learning is so often equated with effective change is that learning and changing has so often been conceptualized in terms of stable patterns of routines and practices. Hence, if one changes the independent variable, learning, then one knows that it has been effective by the changes displayed in the dependent variables of routines and practices. The latter changes stand as ciphers for the effectiveness of the former interventions.

A part of the issue with restricted approaches to learning is that they often betray their disciplinary auspices in one or other of the social sciences; Antonacopoulou calls for a more trans-disciplinary approach, learning from approaches to complexity theory and process approaches to becoming, which she terms trialectical, focussing on the unfolding of phenomena in time and space. From complexity theory three key principles are employed: *inter-connectivity*, *diversity* and *self-organisation*, to which she adds a fourth element neglected by both complexity and learning debates –

politics. Greater interconnectivity, diversity and self-organization are all conducive to more complex learning, but all learning takes place in a political world that might equally hinder or facilitate certain privileged and less-privileged forms of learning.

Learning is a practice – in a double sense: it is both something done and something honed through practice. Conceptualizing learning as practice enables us to focus on the co-existence of multiple adjoining and interlocking practices as they co-evolve. Unlike institutional theory that tends to see learning as dominated by the end of that which is institutionally valued, the approach that Antonacopoulou develops sees learning as a much more open, less reductive, practice – one that is captured in the notion of practising. While practice and practicing refer to the institutionalization of activities and routines, practise and practising focus on the holistic and emergent nature of practice. There are, she suggests, significant epistemological and ontological implications of the shift in focus that she recommends. Epistemologically the focus moves to the gerund, to practices of learning and working in different contexts, paying attention to dynamic relations between individual agency, social structures and systems surrounding complex tasks. Ontologically, the focus shifts to the study of process, to research into how practice is practised or rehearsed in performance.

Although influenced by the initial US literature on learning, from major figures such as Schon and Argyris, Antonacopoulou's chapter also draws heavily on more European sources.

That there are quite distinct emphases between the two sides of the Atlantic is further reinforced by the chapter by Robert Roe, Omar Solinger and Woody Van Olfen. This chapter offers a critical discussion of the background, meaning and operational

significance of the concept of organizational commitment in organizational research. The notion of organizational commitment had its roots in the contract-based labor relations that are prevalent in North America, and gained popularity as a conceptual counterweight to the deteriorating labor relations that resulted from the 1980s wave of industrial restructuring. To a large degree, commitment expresses a concern about unwanted employee turnover. Since most studies have been cross-sectional, little is known about the way in which commitment emerges and how it develops over time. A temporal perspective would provide a better understanding of what commitment actually is and how it affects the way in which people in organizations behave. While much of the literature addresses the “best” level of commitment the authors show that the idea of “the more the better” is untenable. They discuss the question of ‘what can be done to shape commitment’, a question that they see as a managerial paradox. The more commitment is under pressure because of threat of job loss or poor employment conditions, the less managers can do to prevent it from falling – let alone raise it. In as far as commitment can be shaped it is at the start of the employment relationship.

The need for commitment parallels the exercise of power; the more power has to be exercised in order to restore control the less strong the power relations that precipitated the need for its exercise. In such situations, the exercise of power is a sign of relational weakness. Similarly, while commitment is often seen as diametrically opposed to power, the structural and relational situation is very similar. The greater the need for commitment to be present, the less likely it is to be evident. If commitment is the central currency of soft domination and power (Courpasson 2006), efforts to increase it signal a currency deficit just as much as do attempts to reassert domination through the exercise of power. Neither soft power gloved in commitment,

nor its harder exercise without the protective covering, can be exercised without advertising, precisely, the deficit of that which is desired: a settled order. Maintaining commitment seems to be a matter of keeping promises and striking a balance between organizational and employee interests, and interests, as we shall see, have been seen to be central to power.

Power is precisely the topic of the next chapter by Raymond Gordon. The chapter begins by making a distinction between two distinct streams of literature: one with an idealist orientation, the other with an orientation that is pragmatist. Standard organizational behavioural approaches to power are, Gordon suggests, idealist, as are critical theory approaches because both operate with a normative model of what power relations should be like. The lineages of these approaches derive from Weber and Marx respectively and a major point of passage was the debate generated in American political science about the nature of community power, which developed from the late 1950s. Many of the definitions and ideas about power generated therein, which were remarkably behaviourist and mechanical in their conception, were to influence notable organization contributions. By contrast, the pragmatists owe a debt to Nietzsche and Machiavelli, and the main point of passage in their debates has been the work of Foucault. On the whole, while this work has been enormously influential in some of the most significant contributions to the organizational literature, it has hardly defined the normal science of power – that has been much closer to the behavioural models developed within what Lukes (1974; 2005) termed the one-dimensional view of power, conceived as an A getting a B to do something that they would not otherwise do. Additionally, in the organizations literature, there is usually a tacit acceptance that power is something that is exercised illegitimately; power is

counter-posed to authority – which is the name for power when exercised by management. Hence, power is something that is done by less legitimate and marginal actors, who are seen to generate conflict in organizations – usually because of a lack of commitment to the normative order of the organization.

The Community Power Debate gave rise to what became known as the second face of power; the kind of power that occurs without conflict, without an explicit clash of polarities. From these perspectives derives the idea that all organizations have a certain mobilization of bias inherent to them; that some issues never materialize and remain regarded as non-issues because the balance of power relations is against making them issues. That some issues are not raised as problematic and thus do not generate conflict does not mean that they do not exist; they do exist, but in the under-life of the organization, rather than being on the formal agendas and policy directions.

A decade after the political scientists Morton Bartaz and Peter Bachrach first articulated the second face of power, an Oxford don, named Steven Lukes, a major-league social theorist, published a slim little book on power. In this text he introduced the idea that there was a third-dimension to power: power could be exercised through the management of meaning in such a way that people – members of organizations, for instance – were unable to formulate an independent account of where their interests lay. They could think about and see the world only through subaltern concepts that already positioned them as subjected, and subjects of, a power that had no need to exercise itself crudely through one-dimensional manoeuvres. In fact, he saw power as operating much more insidiously through the way in which the categories of consciousness were already pervade by the taken-for-granted world

views and categories of the powerful – a conception that he related to the idea of hegemony as promulgated by the noted Italian political theorist, Antonio Gramsci (1971).

What makes the aforementioned streams idealist is that each of the accounts proffered has a normative view of what power is and should be. For the one-dimensional theorists the ideal is clearly a world of plural power relations; for the two-dimensional theorists the ideal is clearly a world in which those things that are issues for those who feel the yoke of power relations are not regarded as so hot to handle that they languish as unspoken and unarticulated but barely repressed non-issues. Theorists of ethnicity, gender, and of intersectional issues that fuse with these, have, not surprisingly, been attracted to this perspective.

Contributors to the ‘pragmatist stream’ are not concerned with telling people how power ‘ought’ to be in organizations, rather they are concerned with studying ‘how’ power comes to be exercised in the way that it is, says Gordon. Here the impulse is resolutely empirical and descriptive, and is often regarded as dangerously amoral because of the emphasis on the workings of power irrespective of the niceties of its actual deployment. The description, Machiavellian, named after the founding father of this stream, is often applied to such analysis as if it were a term of opprobrium. Rather, for theorists of this persuasion, it should be considered a compliment, a way of capturing a determined anthropological desire to follow the actors and the action wherever it takes one. Moreover, there is a strong resistance to subscribing to the idealism of other accounts in which certain positions, practices, authorities are a priori positioned as legitimate and others as illegitimate. Such matters are a question of

empirics, not principle: not surprisingly then, Nietzsche is also a major influence on this stream, often through the influence of Foucault. With few exceptions, much of the work shaped by this stream has hardly been a significant influence on the OB field; of the major post-Foucauldian figures that Gordon address Haugaard and Flyvbjerg have largely influenced cognate fields such as political theory and planning while only Clegg is a recognized contributor to the organizations literature.

Gordon's sympathies are clearly with the more pragmatist orientation rather than the more idealist, despite the good work that has been done under its auspices. The pragmatist accounts stress the interpenetration of power with knowledge as socially constructed and thus culturally significant and context dependent, used as resources in strategic local games of politics. For these theorists, ultimately, all politics is local.

At the core of Gordon's conception of pragmatic politics is the centrality of the ways that people make sense. Surprisingly, politics has not been central to the development of the sensemaking perspective on organizations. Nor does it feature in Colville's insightful chapter on organizational change and sensemaking. That this is the case is hardly surprising because the progenitor of sensemaking as a perspective, Karl Weick, has also had very little to say about how the politics of power/knowledge are tied up with those of sensemaking. There is a connection to be made here and a gap to be filled.

The main focus of Colville's chapter is on how organizational change episodes can be illuminated by a sensemaking perspective. The status of sensemaking as a perspective is contested, in part because of the enormous signature that attaches to Karl Weick's

writings, a signature that a number of commentators have noted as poetic. The writing – for those familiar with Weick – stands out from the run of the mill organizational behaviour literature because he is one of the few people working in the area whose clear and deep care about the prose that he writes results in writing that, much as another maverick, Jim March, stands out for its authentic voice and quality – what Van Maanen refers to as presence – but, as Colville says, for sensemaking to have a future after Weick, others will have to step up to the mark. Weick's writing is in part a response to the 'double dialectic' identified by Davis: briefly, what specialists find interesting is often unfathomable to laypersons; what laypersons find interesting is often a bore for specialists. Translated into management terms there is every chance that management theory and management practice will fail to connect. The competitive advantage of sensemaking theory, according to Colville, is that it stands a better chance of resolving the dilemma of the double dialectic because it takes as its point of departure the everyday world of practice. In this respect, it demonstrates its origins in Schutz's (1967) phenomenology and Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology, both of which start from the premise that the proper object of a social science should be the ways in which the social world is a profound achievement of practical action and practical rationality, and its affinity with the work of Erving Goffman (1959) as an investigation of the practical strategies of everyday life.

Weick abhors nouns and prefers verbs. Hence, it is not surprising to find Colville rejecting the study of organizational change in favour of organizational changing. Uniquely, amongst our authors thus far, Colville demonstrates the utility of the sensemaking perspective as he has developed it by addressing an empirical case – a

short story about banking – a story with, as befits a Weickian tale, much presence and a great many twists. We won't spoil it by abridging it here.

As Colville makes sense of the banking story he notes that sensemaking can act *both* as a resource *and* a topic. That is, sensemaking theory as a resource can be applied to the ways in which people make sense as a topic. If the topic in hand is of immediate relevance to managers then the chances of solving the dilemma of the double dialectic also increase. Provocatively, Colville uses this probability to make a nuanced plea for more 'claptrap' in theory – by which he means writing that wins applause from its audience. Clearly, he says, the way to do this is to engage with what the audience want and enjoy rather than treating them as benighted, indifferent, intellectually untutored spectators. Elitism in the arts rarely sustains an audience outwith public subsidy; Colville seems to be suggesting something similar about the elitism of the sciences, in this case organizational behaviour. If the audience is the elite that read the specialist journals then don't be surprised if those who are the ostensive consumers of the knowledge produced, the lumpen intellectuals one finds in practice, turn off rather than tune in. In other words, Weick rocks because he connects all ways.

Ian Colville works at the University of Bath as does Andrew Brown the author of the next chapter. Was it chance or some other mechanism that assigned them adjacency as a pair? The reader may care to speculate. Certainly, it allowed a nice transition for the writer of this prose. Colville's focus on sensemaking is not too far removed from Brown's attention to identity: before we make sense of the world, for many people, it is first necessary to make sense of their self – or should we say selves? The management of multiple identities and identifications is *the* key issue for modern

organizations, suggests Brown, emerging from the broad social sciences and humanities interest in identity issues as well as a focus on the cultures of organizations. Further, there is the postmodern fascination for fragmentation, discontinuity and difference, which encourages scholars to see any and all conceptions of identity as sites of struggle, conflict and ambiguity.

Organizationally, identity is most often regarded as an internalized cognitive structure that defines what an organization stands for, and what it wants to become. It is this view that one finds in what has probably been the most influential of the organizational contributions to the literature on identity: Albert and Whetten's (1985) statement of organization identity as representing a distinctive, continuous essence of an organization. As Brown elaborates there are good foundations for such a view in predecessor work, especially in sociology and social psychology.

Contemporary work on identity is differentiated, in ideal type terms, as 'functionalist', 'interpretive', 'psychodynamic' and 'postmodern'. Functionalist accounts of identity see it in terms of clear branding, often tagged as corporate identity, with objective properties, something essential about it. Interpretive perspectives look at the ways that members and stakeholders of organizations interpret it – the sense they share and the sense that they do not share, with different sorts of actors seeing the organization, interpretively, in different ways. Psychodynamic perspectives build on the work of Freud in seeing conceptions of identity as a bulwark against the vagaries of a world that is indifferent or hostile; organizational identity is a 'defensive solution' to psychological threats to members which may or may not be articulated at the level of consciousness. Organizations are means for regulating collective self-esteem through

individual, group, and organizational defensive mechanisms that seek to ameliorate anxieties. Where psychodynamics work at their best organizations are able to learn, develop and to adapt through critical self-reflexivity; sophisticated dialogues, and a willingness to explore sources of anxiety. Postmodern conceptions of identity see it as provisional, discursively and textually produced and represented, sometimes almost mythical in so far as it is represented in any stable articulation. At its core it is a narrative without end, or at least for as long as the organization endures and people in and around it tell others about it, through whatever media.

The chapter concludes with some directions for future research oriented around five key questions, which at present are more arenas for debate than questions to which agreed answers will likely be found. Is organizational identity a construct, a question or a metaphor? Do organizations have one or multiple identities? Do these identities endure or are they mutable? What's the relation between organizational identity and cognate terms such as 'reputation' and 'image'? How does organizational identity relate to processes of identification? The discussion of these issues is sufficient to launch any number of future research projects, most of which would seem more likely to explore the concept as 'essentially contested' rather than as one or other of the ways in which the four ideal types posit it as being, and to realize that any questions of identity are necessarily suffused with power.

Although we have been careful to argue that power relations in organizations need not necessarily be accompanied by conflict, in many cases they will be, if only because, in situations of neither hegemonic domination by one party over others nor gross inequalities of access to relational resources, the most likely form of action by parties

that perceive themselves as weaker is to attack and create conflict that disrupts normalcy: think of classical industrial relations scenarios in which unions strike – the balance of power relations will always reside with those who own and control means of production, administration, and distribution, yet they may be vulnerable to disruptions of normalcy, and so the strike weapon becomes a tool of power. Of course, conversely, employers can use the lockout as a form of counter-attack when they perceive that the balance of industrial relations power has shifted against the terms of trade that they want to normalize on the labour market.

Stephen Ackroyd discusses some of the major approaches to organizational conflict. The basic proposition with which he works is that the development of numerous organisations significantly increases the number and variety of the relationships in which people are tangled up; the more lives become tangled together clear lines of cleavage and allegiance become more difficult to sustain. Thus, modern social life rests on a complicated gradation of indifferences, aversions and antipathies. However, to the extent that conflicts do occur, organisations are amongst the most significant sites for its expression because they act to channel conflict.

The basic organizing principles of the chapter are quite clear and simple: to divide discussion of organizational conflict into intra and inter-organizational instances, and then to interrogate these instances through some classical resources of social theory. In terms of intra-organizational conflict the key dimensions are the degree of intensity and duration of conflict, which, in a 2x2 table, serve to categorize much of the substantive particularity of the field. A great many of the conflicts so categorised arise from the structuring of antagonisms characteristic of a market economy, with a labour

market, that typifies private capitalism. However, as Ackroyd notes, a great deal of the work on conflict displays its functionalist presuppositions. The similarities with the standard OB literature on power that Gordon reviews are remarkably close. Conflict is regarded as a bad thing, a case of organizational misbehaviour, or a sign of deviance. These assumptions were built into the earliest management theories from F. W. Taylor onwards.

In the post-Second World War era a number of anthropologically influenced studies of workplaces discovered that employees and employers were often acting rationally by their own lights but that these were specific – and often conflicting – rationalities. Such conflicting rationalities need not merely be the effect of vertical stratification between employees and employers but can occur horizontally, between different types of employees as well as horizontally between different units of capital (see Clegg 1981 for a systematic elaboration of these points). Any of the conflicts that occur in organizations may be decisive; organizations are not fixed entities but continuously renegotiated entities in which conflicts – and their decisions and non-decisions – figure heavily in the negotiation of the order.

Looking at the employer/employee axis, alternate rationalities may be constructed around what are taken to be (often diverging) interests, the negotiation of whose meaning is often expressed in terms of the amount of effort employees are prepared to expend: what the British industrial sociologist Baldamus (1961) called the ‘effort bargain’. Where the assumptions of one parties’ rationality are violated then organizational conflict ensues over issues such as the duration and intensity of work effort, the use of tools and technologies, the assignment of tasks, teams and

colleagues, recognition of status, membership of key committees, boards, etc.. Such conflict varies on a continuum for spontaneous and informal resistance to more formal and organized resistance.

Much of the focus, historically, in studies of conflict has focussed on the labour process. However, organizational conflict is not something confined merely to divergent interests over the pace, duration, organization, and remuneration of employment relations. It can also occur at much more senior level in organizations, as a cursory acquaintance with the financial press, animated by accounts of boardroom struggles, take-over attempts, managerial coups, and stakeholder revolts indicates. Categories of member such as shareholders, senior managers, and directors are by no means homogenous in their interests or placid in their behaviours, nor do the interests and behaviours of the different categories necessarily align with each other. Substantial business school discourses, such as principal-agency theory and transaction costs economics have developed around these routine antagonisms.

Additionally, there is a rich and fertile field of inter-organizational research topics ripe for cultivation. Changes in populations of organisations, as charted through population ecology perspectives, and organisational fields, seen in terms of institutional theory, can also reflect struggles that find expression in inter-organizational conflicts that are often encoded as competing strategies, whose effects may range anywhere from being mild and ephemeral to acute and temporally long-term. These occur not only in terms of conventional competitive strategies or the periodic creative destruction that bunches around clusters of innovations that punctuate long waves in economic development, but can also relate to other, non-

competitor organizations, such as regulatory authorities, the state, the judiciary and criminal justice system, where strategy entails suspected malfeasance. One case that Ackroyd discusses that meets all these criteria is the extensive period of transformation of US industry in the nineteen eighties that was created by new organizations of financial capital.

Historically, of course, the major organizational conflicts have been between collective workers and specific units of capital embedded in specific organizations confronted with particular trades unions that fought these organizations over specific issues of remuneration, organization, acknowledgement, entitlement and so on. The incidence of such conflicts has varied comparatively and historically anywhere from riotous assembly, through insurrection, to full-blown revolutionary struggle but has most often been normalized in terms of trade union activities, notably the withdrawal of labour through the mechanism of the strike and associated picketing. Just as with conflict about the nature of capitalism itself, in terms of the legality of new forms of financial organization, these conflicts have often been moderated by regulatory authorities, the state, the judiciary and criminal justice system, as the state has changed the parameters of what are construed as legal methods of mobilization. In this perspective, the strike is but one of the repertoires of collective action available to disgruntled employees, and one which only developed its acuity in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In the latter part of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, it is a device that, judging by comparative statistics from bodies such as the International Labor Organization (ILO), may well have peaked in the strike waves of the 1970s, although some authorities argue that such a commonly held view may be in part a statistical artefact (Gall 1999).

If Marx was the first theorist to systematically address the nature of organizational conflict in a theory of history it is fair to say that the times have not been kind either to the theory that he advanced or that many subsequent political proponents argued that he advanced. Conflicts do not necessarily lead to contradictions and contradictions need not be cataclysmic for system reproduction where they occur; as Simmel (1902) suggested, conflict is both constitutive of organisational and social systems and a major source of their reproduction as such. Conflicts can persist, endure, be channelled, change shape, become more or less latent, and often not be resolved at all. Even though traditional forms of industrial conflict may have declined in recent times this should not be regarded, normatively, as some regression to a more ideal mean: conflict is normal, endemic and constitutive of organisations albeit that its structuration varies comparatively and historically. Despite the emphasis given to employee satisfaction and effective organizations there is no reason to assume that an organization bereft of conflict is either possible or desirable.

Once upon a time organizational careers were what many employees aspired to, seeking employment with organizations that seemed blue-chip, whether private or public, which offered many opportunities for promotion, training, and development. The notion of a career is a construct that only makes sense in societies organized around status-achievement rather than status ascription principles. Where statuses are ascribed, the notion of a career is, by definition, highly unlikely, as the determinations of caste, status and other sources of social ascription, such as gender or tribe, are determinant in shaping one's life-chances. Even in early modern society in Western Europe for most people the notion of career, if held at all, was tied up in a parallel

system of task and status structure administered through guilds as custodians of traditional knowledge. Few organizational careers existed outside of the Church, Navy, and Army, except with the major trading companies, such as the Dutch East India Company, and these were often systematically skewed towards wealth and privilege.

In more contemporary times the idea that one has a career has become a major constituent part of the way that one organizes and accounts for one's life. The classical definition of a career is of a series of progressions through the offices of an organization or organizations. The development of powerful internal labour markets and organizational careers, particularly for staff in technical, professional and managerial roles, became part of a powerful recipe for organizational success in the post-war era as Inkson and Baruch note in their chapter on organizational careers. Even as late as the 1980s the normalcy of large organizations with stable and progressive organizational careers was a staple of thinking about management and organizations, and even in these more flexible times, oligarchs require some means of reproducing themselves as the strategic elites of organizations, and thus need some form of organizational career management system that organizations for managing organizational succession.

The authors introduce the *Career Active System Triad* (the CAST), as a multi-level conceptual framework developed to help understand the human side of career management. The CAST comprises values, approaches, and behaviours as three levels of analysis. Values are the basis from which the others emerge. Management approaches are meant to transform and translate values into third level behaviours

shaping action and practice. Inkson and Baruch regard the key managerial question as how fit the person to the organization and how to provide organizational support for the fit. Ideally, values shape individual aspirations and strategy and percolate into individual attitudes and organizational policies. The process of alignment is always dynamic and ongoing; responding to the external environment of structured labour markets shaping demand and supply of particular types of occupations as well as internal organizational politics dynamics. Typically, top management teams will strive to make the alignment strategic. Career management strategies will be subordinated to organizational strategies in this view.

Sociologically, organizational careers can be seen as largely structurally determined by class, education, race, and gender, while educationalists, psychologists and career counsellors see occupational careers as the result of personal choices, rational decision making, and personal maturation. Both sociological and psychological perspectives focus on the individual whose career is seen as more or less the repository of social forces or social choices rather than as something organizationally managed. The latter perspective is developed in perspectives on Organizational Career Management (OCM).

Organizational Career Management (OCM) strategies involve activities relevant to career development, such as selection, training, employee development, appraisal and compensation practices, as well as the design of formal career paths, career planning and development exercises, mentoring and career counselling. Such strategies may entail significant investment of organizational personnel's time and resources and should be calibrated according to the available disposition of these rather than ideal

strategy. Not all careers will be organizational in a conventional sense of personal advancement and status; careers may be organized in terms of professions, developing specialist skills, or entrepreneurial, oriented towards value creation rather than personal or professional development.

From an integrationist perspective that strives to combine sociological, psychological and organizational perspectives on careers four significant issues for future research are identified. The first of these is a tension between a focus on structure and a focus on action, which is a sign of the lack of resolution between more sociological and psychological approaches. The second question addresses the tension between stasis and adaptation in careers: are careers relatively stable or do they change over time? The third question addresses whether or not careers can only be studied in their particularity or whether or not there are generalizations that can be made universally? As the authors note, there is little or no consensus on this issue in the field. Attempts at generalization seem to generate many exceptions. Finally, the authors suggest that the question of knowledge in relation to careers needs to be posed: where does career knowledge reside? In individuals or in institutions related to their careers?

There will be organizational careers to manage the more that these careers are determined by structure rather than action; are stable rather than adaptive; are not structured according to idiosyncratic behaviour and change, and are based on institutional rather than individual knowledge. The assumptions of vocational areas such as Human Resource Management are based on these precepts. The individual's career is considered to be at the disposal of the organisation's planning, performance evaluation, employee development, and succession planning to extract maximum

value from each unit of labour under management's control. Organizational careers are of particular value, because they maximise opportunities to develop human assets to company advantage.

These conditions have been in decline over the past twenty-five years in the developed world, as organizations have grown leaner and meaner, specialized on core competencies and outsourced other areas of activity, such that is appropriate to speak of the decline of organizational careers. Consequently, new models of career have developed as something that the individual manages as a project in external labour markets, between rather than within organizations. Careers become increasingly boundaryless, traversing organizations, laced through specific projects. People invest their careers in organizations and organizations invest in their careers; however, some investments may turn out, on either side, to have been duds. In the dynamics of labour markets in which one will participate for forty or more years it is always going to be difficult to make successful investments.

Changing circumstances mean that the concept of the organizational career may mean a commitment that lasts organizations a lifetime as a precious resource, or it may be something that they partake of fleetingly, as the individual manages a portfolio of career-related projects. The challenge for future organizations will be to find forms of engagement and relationships that adequately reflect the range of employees' career objectives and strategies.

Successful management careers take one to the top; increasingly the heights of organizations are explored through the burgeoning literature on top management

teams (TMT). Sarah MacCurtain and Michael West guide us through the TMT literature of the past twenty years or so. The literature suggests that TMT dynamics can enhance creativity and decision making but do not always do so; hence, it is important to identify the factors that enhance or impede effective top team working and performance.

Although the terminology of the TMT is relatively new the idea clearly has auspices in Cyert and March's (1963) notion of the dominant coalition – the powerful people who span the boundary between the organization and the external environment and make decisions that have a significant impact on the organization's future. Who these individual might be is not agreed upon. Some researchers suggest job titles hold the key; others focus on board membership, while still others propose that it is the decision-making circles to which they belong that are important. Whomsoever they are designated as being, one thing is for sure: TMTs comprise senior players in power games in and around organizations, people who have high levels of education, well-developed expertise, who are able to command significant organizational and professional resources, and who are paid to have firm views on many things.

Moreover, if the organizations in question follow the lead of research, and compose these teams on the basis of functional, if not social diversity, then these teams are likely to be more creative and innovative. Not surprisingly, in Ackroyd's terms, TMTs are likely repositories of organizational conflict. A dilemma faces top management teams: task conflict is necessary in order to discuss problems in an open and critical manner but is vital that such conflict does not trigger affective conflict that may potentially destroy the team's commitment to implementing the decision.

Conflict will be specially prevalent when an oligarchic elite has clung on to the seats of power so long that there is a considerable age difference in the successor cohort: research on age diversity suggests that dysfunctional conflict, lack of consensus and ineffective communication will occur when the development of a shared language between individuals that results from similar background and experiences is lacking. Obviously, from this perspective, elite reproduction is a matter to be constantly attending to rather than something to be left until the patriarchs have almost quit the scene. Difference in age is associated with difference in worldviews.

Too much diversity may be as dangerous as too much homogeneity: the relationship between tenure heterogeneity and outcomes is curvilinear, the literature suggests. Diversity has different effects on different aspects of team performance: high diversity has negative effects on social integration but is positive for cognitive outcomes, such as producing a more polyphonic culture. However, it is likely to be polyphony within bounded rationality: despite demographic diversity there is likely to be similarity in world views and beliefs, as certain behaviours, values and experiences such as loyalty, commitment, dedication, and success, which all serve to facilitate membership of the top team. These are the types of phenomena that students of power usually discuss in terms of hegemony, and some sociologists refer to as anticipatory socialization – a propensity to assume elite views if one presumes to aspire to the elite. Shared views are insufficient in themselves: the processes that make them especially effective will be contingently specific to the situation at hand, MacCurtain and West argue. A certain amount of debate is necessary but there needs to be a degree of consensus in order to achieve decision. Consensus involves both shared

understanding and shared commitment, yet if there is too much consensus, creativity and innovation may suffer.

Top teams have to be reflexive, have to be able to learn from their reflection of what they do and have done, in order to inform what they will do. What is necessary is an entwined process of reflection (retrospective reflection), planning (prospective reflection) and doing (immersion in action). There must be delicate balancing of power relations within the TMT. Leaders should not dominate but they must lead through conscientiousness, and emotional stability. Dysfunctional leaders, such as the narcissist, the paranoid, and the controlling, encourage irrational and unconscious processes more than rational consideration of the issues at hand; indeed, as MacCurtain and West observe, there is considerable empirical evidence suggesting that the top management team in general, as well as the leader, influence organizational climate as a direct behavioural manifestation of organizational culture. Central to the climate in the organization is the management of emotions at work. Demographics have a significant relation with TMT characteristics that have an impact on a firm's global strategy: TMTs with lower average age, higher average tenure, higher average education, higher average international experience, and higher tenure heterogeneity lead to a climate in which organizations being more internationally diversified.

Top management teams have complex psychodynamics. Often we glimpse these in snatches of insight into political leaders' lives provided by diaries, memoirs, and leaks. Often these relationships are driven by intense emotions: Alan Clarke's (1993) diaries of the Thatcher years provide a good case in point, signifying a diminishingly

consistent or homogenous affective reaction within the Tory TMT – the Cabinet – towards the end of Mrs. Thatcher’ ascendancy as Prime Minister. There is a sense in which the hubris of TMTs that have been successful for some time can lead them to overstep the limits of what they can achieve and in doing so sow the seeds of their own decline and fall.

One of the crucial issues in TMTs, as we have seen, is their composition in terms of the balance between oligarchical reproduction and renewal. If the issue has been important in the past it can only become even more critical in the immediate future, because, as Conger argues in his chapter on succession management, as a result of the imminent demographic retirement of the baby boomer generation, most organizations will have to replace a considerable number of TMT members at the same time, to the extent that their teams have been fairly homogenous in age terms. Moreover, as the boomers retire and Gen X and Y move into TMT positions, they bring with them quite different attitudes and dispositions from those formed in the 1940s and 1950s. Witness to the massive downsizing initiatives of large corporations in the late 1980s and 1990s, cynical about the world that the boomers enjoyed and whose rules they then changed for the next generation (fees for universities rather than state support, for instance), younger generations have little commitment to traditional notions of organizational commitment, having a strong sense that they have to manage their careers because they cannot rely on external authorities – whether state or private sector – to do it for them. The internet and the easy availability of comparative information and opportunities make it easier for the web-savvy generation to be managers of their own careers.

In the past, says Conger, succession management's primary purpose was to identify replacements for senior executives who would eventually depart the organization. Often dead men's shoes or retirees seats were filled in a mechanical lock-step progression up the list of seniority. The possibility that career succession might be used to develop or retain talent remained largely unrealized. By the late 1980s things began to change a little, suggests Conger. Succession management came to be deployed as a mechanism for identifying and cultivating leadership talent across the different organizational generations. The shift in focus was from replacing those exiting to developing all those who entered. In doing so, the focus became much more transparently developmental; members are aware they are on potential career tracks in competition with others and senior managers realize that developing those who report to them is an important part of their leadership portfolio.

Highly effective succession management systems provide a continuous stream of talent capable of meeting the changing circumstances with which organizations must cope. In doing so they serve to keep members challenged and motivated and thus retain them within the organization, rather than seeing them flit to greener pastures and greater opportunities elsewhere. Such systems should be easy to use by executives and line managers and easy for members to access and understand, as well as being evidently developmental of opportunities tailored to particular individuals. Moreover, they are dynamic systems, constantly being revised in the light of experience and changing situations. Nonetheless, the contours of a best practice model are elaborated by Conger in terms of a number of characteristics that the chapter goes on to elaborate:

- Alignment of the succession strategy to the organization's overarching strategy
- Senior level sponsorship and HR 'process' ownership
- Identification and effective deployment of key linchpin positions
- Rigorous talent identification processes
- Strong developmental linkages that accompany talent identification
- Multiple stakeholders assessments with developmental feedback
- Rigorous tracking and feedback metrics.

The TMT must be focused on talent recruitment, training, development, retention and succession in this mode and must feel comfortable addressing both high flyers and low achievers. The former should be rewarded with opportunities and assignments that stretch and develop their capabilities while low achievers must be led to greater heights, rather than being tolerated, with the effect of lowering performance and the attractiveness of the organization to high achievers. If that means speaking truth to power – and to weakness – so be it.

Much of the remit of the good advice and sound research results that have been covered in the chapters to present can only be delivered by highly effective leadership and, as Collinson addresses in his contribution, leadership requires followership. Although leadership is one of the topics most widely discussed and researched in macro-organizational behaviour, the conditions of its existence and generation have been remarkably homogenous because the vast bulk of research has been done using US assumptions and models, with a tacit model of society that corresponds to the US, suggests Collinson, even when these models are applied elsewhere. Thus, highly

individualist models of leadership have flourished as the norm – even when there are large parts of the globe where their cultural fit cannot easily be assumed. One consequence of these dominant US models has been an underplaying of issues of power. To illuminate a power perspective on leadership and followership, Collinson draws on critical, post-structuralist and feminist insights.

Leadership studies are usually informed by a desire to describe in some way what makes an effective leader, a question to which the literature provides no clear answer. It all depends on the type of leadership theory one elects to follow! There are several approaches that have flourished in the mainstream of leadership research that Collinson reviews. He concludes that, irrespective of which of these approaches one chooses, followers are often taken-for-granted and the dynamics of power that relate leaders and followers underspecified. Moreover, leaders are often romanticized and lionized as if they were solitary and extraordinary individuals. More realistically, the relations between leaders and followers should be considered in terms of dialectics of control characterized by inter-dependencies and power asymmetries. Power relations between leaders and followers are likely to be interdependent, asymmetrical, and contested. Reciprocal resistance of either to the actions of the other is to be expected as a normal feature of organizational life; its pervasiveness depends on contextual factors that leadership can shape: followers value leaders who exercise control and take responsibility and do so in clear, fair and transparent ways while, when leaders exercise control in unfair, dictatorial, coercive, nepotistic, narcissistic and/or self-interested ways, resistance is much more likely, when views have not been considered, leaders are seen as ‘out of touch’ and there are discrepancies between leaders’ policies and practices. In such situations, which Collinson’s research suggests

are quite common, members who feel relatively marginalized or excluded will tend to withdraw psychologically from the organization, operating subtly but cynically through small acts of resistance and subversion that are hardly starkly confrontational and thus difficult for leaders to detect, and will project their dissent and dissatisfaction outside into the broader community. Vicious circles can be enacted as leaders find their leadership failing and tighten their surveillance and control of subordinates in order to try and deliver better results, which merely exacerbates the behaviour that they seek to rectify by demonstrating one of the same behaviours that is occasioning the withdrawal responses.

Conventional approaches to leadership are not good at addressing the more covert, subtle dialectics relating leaders to followers, which is why Collinson draws on feminist post-structuralist analyses that seem better able to address these dynamics, which are often a constitutive part of gender relations. The gender aspects of leadership – as a mostly masculine activity – also need to be addressed as Collinson demonstrates. What are often taken for granted as gender neutral attributes of leadership are, in fact, highly masculine gender-specific characteristics. Organizations and their leadership are riddled through with the biases of masculinity, as Collinson argues. The traditional dualism of leader and follower in many respects resembles and draws from the patriarchal dualism of superordinate males and subordinate females.

Macro Organizational Behaviour and Key Practices

The “Labour Process” is a familiar term in industrial sociology and related disciplines, would be well known in European and Australasian organization theory, but is not really a mainstream term in organizational behaviour. The origins of the

term are usually attributed to Marx's (1976) *Capital*, where he analyses what he terms the labour process. For Marx, what was important about the work done in organizations – the labour process – was that it was done under conditions of control by Capitalist in order to reproduce Capital – which he discussed in terms such as 'surplus value'. Basically, he argued that unless the labour employed was exploited – that is, created more value for the capital that employed it than it was rewarded with in terms of wages – the labour process would not be productive and the organization would be inefficient. Efficient capital exploited the labour process. In his chapter Graham Sewell recognizes that this view might be somewhat limited as a useful basis for contemporary discussion, given the assumptions of 'naked' and 'rampant' exploitation that Marx saw in Victorian English factories. Nonetheless, the value of labour process analysis has been the ability to link what happens inside organizations at the point of intersection of organization control and production with the changing macro-economic and societal circumstances in which these encounters occur, as Sewell recognizes.

The core of employee relations and labour process theory is the notion of a contract between a fictional entity – the organization in question – and a real individual, monitored and implemented by other real individuals, often and usually in the organization's employ. The employment relationship is normally constituted by a written contract that places certain expectations on employers and employees in terms of their conduct towards each other. Such explicit contract and implicit reciprocity as it contains is a relatively recent historical phenomenon, when set aside the many great achievements of antiquity founded on coerced, involuntary and slave labour. It was an emergent nexus of relations among a changing balance of feudal power, as free men

and women began to emerge, changing conceptions of property and of the rights of man, tied up with the transition from feudalism to capitalism, the Reformation, and the development of civil society, that signalled a shift towards a widespread contractual basis for employment relations. The expenditure of effort, the reward of that effort, and the creation of value through employment of organized labour became increasingly related in formal organizations. As these changes took place the traditional patterns of work relations, holidays and holy days broke down and working life intensified, a fact noted by many early commentators, as well as Marx. Marx's innovation was to note that the labour nominally employed – measured in time – and that actually deployed would usually differ and the difference was an object of struggle between the labour employed and the employee. Labourers sought to minimize the amount of time and effort expended in work, often for very long hours indeed, in order to preserve what energies they could – for the little of life that occurred outside work. Bear in mind that working class people started work as children and that the length of the working day was typically twice as long as we would think normal today, with the work taking place often in conditions that were dark, dangerous, extremely physically demanding and with little labour-saving technology. Thus, the individual employee had an interest in minimizing their individual labour effort while the individual employer had an interest in maximizing it. The scene was set for what Marx believed would be the central struggle in society – between individual employees who came to realize the commonality of their collective situation as mere labour power, against the employers who were well aware of their common interest, one based on their ownership of the means of production, is using this labour power as much as they were able. Thus, in the labour process approach, the effective organization of the labour power employed, in order to

produce useful value for employers, will be the central problem for employers and analysts alike, regardless of the social conditions under which the contractual exchange takes place. As Sewell remarks, provided we can still observe a separation of mental supervisory and managerial from manual labour that is supervised and managed then Marx's fundamental observations apropos the subordination of labour to capital through management's monopoly of the conception of work are still as valid today as they were in 1867 when he first published them.

Sewell argues that the labour process approach is still useful today for understanding subordination and work intensification but it requires a shift from an exclusive focus on the separation of conception and execution in labour and a focus on instances where employees exercise a formally acknowledged degree of discretion, not only over *what* work is done but also *how* it is done. By doing this, he argues, labour process theory can be related to contemporary social theory that places surveillance, superordinate or lateral vision of the person at the heart of its conceptualization of social order and cohesion. In particular, it connects the theory of the employee in organizations with the central focus of some of the influential the work of Michel Foucault (1977) on discipline, surveillance, and control, a literature that Sewell explores with reference to an interesting historical context and cast of characters.

In contemporary terms, the task that Sewell sees as central for labour process analysis is to be able to provide a plausible account of contemporary – rather than nineteenth century – forms of the organization of work. Above all, he argues, this means an appreciation of the role that enhanced autonomy at work through team work, delegation and empowerment, for example, can play in ensuring, seemingly

paradoxically, that there is a greater intensification of work and exploitation, and the creation of increased levels of surplus and thus profits, from the labour deployed.

From this tack there are many points of affinity with some of the contemporary and past classics of organization theory and behaviour, with the work of Alvin Gouldner providing key contributions. The implementation of totalizing systems of control is seen as a frequent corollary of many forms of organization. Whether these are pursued through the physical sequestration of an individual in time and space, through bureaucratic means, or through electronic surveillance, is immaterial. From this perspective, a great deal of organizational behaviour, in as much as it consists of relations between subordinates and superordinates (and sometimes fellow team workers) should be recast as a discourse of coercion focused on two main roles: the activities of managers who wish to guarantee the constant visibility of employees in order to maximize their effort and the activities of employees who wish to avoid this scrutiny in order to minimize their subordination to managers. Thus, managers become seen as agents of oppression and, in this respect, the discourse of coercion concentrates on how surveillance allows the more powerful to dominate the less powerful. Sewell characterizes the work that flows from this perspective as a 'radical' research program. By contrast, there is a 'liberal' research program that is closely related. Here, the person is problematized as an individual who has the potential to indulge in self-interested behaviour left to their own devices. Thus, organizational surveillance (usually in the guise of individual performance monitoring) is deemed to be legitimate so long as it protects the organization and fellow employee interests as judged by the watchful eyes of impartial managers, where all members recognize that organizational surveillance is reasonable and where they trust in the impartiality of those responsible for its operation. However, as Sewell

suggests in his conclusion, the dream (or nightmare) of total control will always be unachievable. People's ingenuity in resistance and the unanticipated opportunities offered by all technological advancement will see to that. The failure of present surveillance projects merely becomes the sufficient and necessary cause for the pursuit of further ones. As the indeterminacy of labour has moved to incorporate a cognitive as well as corporeal element in contemporary work, the labour process can be characterized as a problem of the "indeterminacy of knowledge" where surveillance is implicated in a process of expropriating cognitive faculties including imagination, ingenuity, problem-solving skills, and other forms of embodied knowledge. These can be exercised in ways that managers applaud – but they can also be used in projects that they would not approve of if they knew of them, projects that may be deeply corrosive of existing authority relations and discipline. As Sewell concludes, the analyst – whether consultant or researcher – is irremediably caught up in the ethics of workplace surveillance as questions of whose control and whose autonomy, whose privacy and whose rights, will always intrude into any analysis of actual organization practice.

There are some immediate echoes between Sewell's chapter and that which follows it. Notably, Judith Pringle, Alison Konrad, and Anne-Marie Greene argue that organizational behaviour requires a 'new structuralism' that looks at how society shapes organizations, more in line with what has typically been normal practice in European rather than North American work. More multi-level approaches are required that combine what is usually thought of as the micro, macro and meso. One would expect this to be especially the case from a perspective that focuses on practical aspects of organizational behaviour and lived experience – as their focus on gender

does. One's experience of gender does not come bundled up in levels of analysis but is experienced as all of a piece in various situated actions and practices, especially where, as they remark, gender equality in the workplace remains a distant goal and where the division of unpaid household labour continues to be unequally skewed against women, and women are routinely the subjects of representational practices that are sexually exploitative. In this environment – which they see as characteristic of contemporary times – it is unlikely that women's equality will be well-served by organizational behaviour.

Women still occupy a small minority of elite organizational positions, they establish, even in those societies where symbolically important positions have been or are occupied by women. Norway is in the vanguard, with nearly 30% of top management positions being filled by women; the figures rapidly decline as one considers the southern European countries. Elsewhere, of course, outside the OECD nations, in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, the numbers would be even lower.

In the household sphere research consistently establishes that women take responsibility for two-thirds or more of caretaking and household labour in almost every country researched. For many women in contemporary industrialised societies full-time or part-time employment is combined with demanding family responsibilities and employers are finding that they need to provide work-life flexibility benefits to retain female workers, which are associated with positive outcomes for women's careers, where the organization has a supportive work-family culture. This is rarely the case for those who make it to the top, whether men or

women, although most of the men will have a wife supplying that two thirds of domestic work which women do.

Women do not fit the stereotypes of successful business leaders as dominant, aggressive, achievement-oriented, autonomous, exhibitionist, and with high levels of endurance: these are represented not as female but male characteristics. Gender stereotypes prescribe as well as describe, and in doing so affect how people are judged by others as gendered entities. Leadership is still viewed cross-culturally as more consistent with masculinity than with femininity; organization is taken-for-granted as it is and the assumption is often that it is individual women who have to change if they desire to advance in their careers, rather than the organizations that employ them. The default position of many organizations is that masculinity is normal. Amongst other reasons more widely-distributed in societal practice, such as representational norms, this is one explanation of why women are often treated as objectified sexual objects, defined by their bodies and dress rather than their professionalism or accomplishments. To the extent that organizations themselves endorse or practise such representational norms they are hardly being sincere in any professed commitment that they might make to the equality of opportunity on a gendered basis, even where they offer work-life flexibility, women's networks, and sexual harassment training programs as positive organizational programs.

There are various ways of gauging the progress of organizational programs to counter discrimination and the extent of negatively gendered practices. For instance, one can look at the overall demographics of female participation rates, where, just about everywhere, patriarchy trumps equality of demographic representation; of course,

when intersectional concerns of ethnicity and sexual identity are factored in the situation is even more skewed. These vary with historical context although, even in those contexts where women's issues have been raised they have often been somewhat neglected in the ways that they intersect with other non-gendered bases of identity. Often the formal rituals of nations assure everyone of equality in terms of legislation although almost everywhere the practice may lag behind the legislation; one should not be surprised for if there were no gap there would be no need for legislation. While legislation can shape labour market conditions it is most likely to do so where practice is less problematic, in public sector and corporate organizations, rather than in the very large number of small and medium enterprises which often escape the legislative framework.

Of course, organizational behaviour as a discourse has a role to play in the gendering of organizations. Equal opportunity and diversity practitioners are often employed to implement policies that redress gender inequities – does the continuance of these mean that such people are ineffective? Not really, the authors suggest: these practitioners often operate with limited resources and difficult role conflicts that make positive outcomes harder to achieve. Moreover, as they elaborate, such practitioners operate in an area of conceptual confusion about what constitutes 'equality' and 'diversity', which can have a potential impact on the efficacy of policies.

What is referred to in the literature as the 'business case' strategy has provided the keystone for policy making and regulation in most countries in the equity area in recent times. Taking this approach, each organization is expected to move to a less gendered set of practices because it enables them to make best use of their human

resources. The strategy is opposed to those top-down legislative approaches that mandate practices. Proponents of the business case argue that, as it is in the interests of organizations to make the best use of their talents it is only rational to allow them to do so, as they know best how what to do locally. Legal compulsion forces a one-best way on a wide variety of different, contingent contexts. Of course, there is a degree of circular logic to this: if organizations did what the business case strategy suggests, the problem that legislation strives to address would hardly exist.

Within many organizations Equal Opportunity offices have been constructed largely as institutional responses to a legislative demand. One consequence is that they are often institutionally isolated from the wider concerns of the business and there is often little organizational commitment amongst managerial and other ranks for the policies and practices that they espouse. Where a social or joint regulatory approach that provides a significant role for representatives of lower level, non-managerial employees, and in particular for trade unions, is used, then it tends to build more commitment and espousal.

Gender equity is just one aspect of diversity in organizations, as Pringle and her colleagues are at pains to articulate. Diversity has been identified as an area of organizational behaviour that typically offers prescriptive techniques and tools for managing 'difference'. Of course, in the early days of research this 'difference' was constituted in terms of being other than a national, as well as someone white, male and middle class. As Gill Kirton establishes in her chapter on 'Managing multi-culturally in organizations in a diverse society' the diversity literature is now far richer and is influenced by a variety of (sometimes overlapping) theoretical

perspectives, including post-colonial theory, feminism, postmodernism, critical approaches, and social identity theory. Increased academic interest in diversity reflects the rapid growth in organizational policies seeking to ‘manage’ diversity. Such management is seen as a corollary of employing people from increasingly hybrid and multicultural societies, requiring that systematic attention is paid to recruiting and retaining employees from diverse demographic backgrounds, and not merely recruiting people who look like those who are already *in situ*. The practice of diversity management arose initially in the United States where the legacy of slavery and the multiplicity of immigrations meant that there were very obvious and ostensive differences between potential applicants for positions as well as legislative programs designed to ensure that organizations did not systematically discriminate. In such a context many of the more progressive organizations decided it was not enough just not to be caught being discriminatory but that they should take positive steps to see that they were actively managing both multiculturally, as a form of practice, and multiculturalism, as a phenomenon. As in the previous chapter, we see that there is a common business case for doing this which has to do with utilizing *all* the talents – not just those that fit the look of the present management team.

Diversity is a highly problematic term, suggests Kirton. In part this is because it emerged from the specificities of American experience and has been globally exported – often to contexts that have very different peoples and histories. Diversity can be understood in various ways: it can be used as a descriptor of employee differences (workforce diversity); it can be used as an organizational policy approach explicitly focused on utilising and valuing employee differences – usually referred to as diversity management or managing diversity; it can be seen as a conceptual

construct, or even as a discourse or set of discursive practises. Seeing it in each of these different ways has specific consequences for organizational behaviour as Kirton elaborates and deconstructs.

One of the reasons why there is often a gap between the rhetoric and reality of diversity management is that most organizations propose generic business case arguments, often based on some espousal of multiculturalism as a generically good thing. However, in some organizations, differences might be seen as a potential problem hindering, rather than assisting, effective service delivery. Think of the religious edicts of some faiths, such as Islam, where there are strict rules about gendered dress and who can do what with whom in normal social interaction. A concern with diversity can extend from managing differences in the workforce or responding appropriately to differences in a customer or client base. In the Islamic example, for instance, there would often be a customer case for non-difference rather than difference in a public sector field such as health care that might sit ill with broader commitments to equity. As Kirton explains the field of managing diversity can be highly problematic for managers. Some groups and individuals, from a variety of motives, may well be opposed to diversity in specific organizations. Others, who have been denied power and opportunities in organizations, may seize the opportunity to use the rhetoric of diversity to pursue sectional rather than business goals, in a Trojan horse strategy. Managers who assume that they will be doing the right thing by promoting diversity may well ferment troubles that they had barely imagined.

Being 'for diversity' is no guarantee of more equal opportunity. The rhetoric of diversity can also be used to argue that, as everyone is different and has different

needs, aspirations etc, different outcomes, are to be expected and do not need to be addressed. The celebration of diversity can be used to deny the existence of injustice, inequalities, discrimination and exploitation or become so inclusive as to become meaningless, both as a concept and as a policy approach. It can also undercut other approaches to equity such as those based on gender. Diversity management is not the simple managerial recipe that it initially appears to be.

Issues of equity and diversity often fall under the sway of human resource management (HRM) practices. What role does human resource management play in the organisational structures and strategies of organizations? Miguel Martínez Lucio identifies what he terms five projects of HRM in recent times, each of which enables one to answer this question in a slightly different way. First, there was the attempt to relocate HRM and ‘push it down the line’ in a context of decentralised organisations. Second, HRM was to be a link between internal and external providers and sub-units in network organizations. Third the focus on ethics and corporate social responsibility positioned HRM departments at the core of organisational value systems. Fourth, training and human resource development remained core HRM issues. Finally, HRM has had a key role in achieving the effectiveness and quality of ‘high performance’ organisational outputs.

HRM as a label effectively re-badged many personnel managers and industrial relations specialists from the 1980s onwards, not always happily in academic departments in which the industrial relations specialist often saw themselves as more pro-worker than the personnel specialists who were sometimes seen as more likely to be pro-management. As HRM developed it often split into binaries: the Harvard

versus the Michigan School, hard versus soft HRM, and so on. Overlain on this was a search for universalistic 'best practices', a search that many colleagues who were committed to contingency theory might have thought strangely universalistic and inappropriate. Contingently, evident differences of emphasis between European and US approaches began to coalesce. European approaches were more attuned to political contexts and realities and less intra-organizational in focus than those that were identified as US-centric. HRM became rhetorically intensive with the rhetoric often connecting new HRM paradigms to performance, strategy, and core business. The rhetoric often exceeded the limits of practice. HRM increasingly took on the contours of a professional and professionalizing project which sought to re-position its practitioners, with only limited success, in the top management team. Competing interests, changing environmental factors, particularly in the political/industrial relations arena, and changing professional strategies saw HRM attempt to legitimate the role of people management in the core of business, much as finance or accounting. The neo-liberal climate that has prevailed in most Western nations from the 1980s onwards saw this struggle expressed in terms of HRMs promise to offer more flexible employment solutions, individually tailored, to replace the collectivism of an earlier age. HRM allied itself implicitly with the 'new right' against the 'old left'.

The alignment was usually expressed as a shift towards a more strategic emphasis for HRM, often captured as Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM), representing the de-bureaucratization of people management. However, the 1980s also began to see a greater emphasis on the local, the immediate and the tangible in terms of how workers and local managers engaged with the challenge of change; consultancies began to deal with this more directly; for example, this was especially

so in terms of team-working, and the idea that every manager had to become something of a people manager – not just leave it to a distant personnel department – but become do-it-yourself HRM managers. The strength of the shift to decentralization somewhat undercut the SHRM project.

What began to emerge within the narratives of HRM was an alternative view of the organisation based on changing organisational boundaries, greater subcontracting, and increased interest in the relations between organisational units. The emergence of *networking* or the *network firm* became a more mature version of the decentralisation thesis. However, HRM's role is not clear: is it the solution to problems with the immediate employment issues of each unit within a network or a link in and within corporate alliances and network structures – a cultural facilitator? Is its future to provide coherence to the external boundaries of the firm and its flexible strategists? Or, should it also become flexible, networked and outsourced as HRM as the mechanism by which the network firm can be coordinated and the relationships across the network managed finds its most extreme expression in the fact that it may itself be subject to the logic of networking and new organisational forms and be subcontracted or even largely digitalized into systems that personnel are supposed to self-manage.

In the 1990s as work-life balance issues were added to equity issues and diversity management, HRM departments could become internal moral auditors and sanction, or warn, wayward departments who were not doing the 'right thing'. They could help departments navigate the ethical minefields of current management practice, legislation, political correctness and changing values. New issues offered plenty of

opportunity for new training and learning – both individually and organizationally – opportunities that HRM might colonize so as to attach themselves to fashionable signifiers such as knowledge work, knowledge workers and the knowledge economy.

The knowledge that counts most in business is how to improve the bottom line.

Increasingly, the challenge for HRM is to identify and correlate work practices with performance. For many HRM scholars this direction represents a possible way into the harder and more glamorous world of accounting and financial legitimacy, as a part of the professionalizing project. However, it is evident that the re-branding of HRM is still less than wholly convincing or successful.

What is the moral responsibility of managers in contemporary organizations? At one extreme, there are views that see responsibility as a relation primarily between managers and shareholders – the principal responsibility of the managers is to be a good steward of assets and to increase their return for those who own them. In recent years there has been a significant broadening of the discourse of responsibility as it applies to organizations; from these perspectives the shareholder value argument is a somewhat restricted view, as the development of broader stakeholder models suggests. Indeed, a new field of macro-organizational behaviour, that of ‘corporate social responsibility’ (CSR) has developed to address the relations between organizations, their management and a range of stakeholders.

The widespread publicity given to a number of major corporate scandals in recent times has done much to place the issue of responsibility on the business school agenda. Of course, it is fairly clear that responsibility can be attributed in legal

proceedings. Doing wrong is a clear instance of being less than morally responsible, even when it serves organizational self-interest. Reference to moral responsibility in business is largely concerned with the relation between self and other interests. Being responsible to the interests of others as one might be to the interests of ones self is, in Christian tradition, the basis of certain conceptions of morality, but, as Carl Rhodes and Alison Pullen argue, it has long been a central consideration of moral philosophy that can be traced back to Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*.

Rhodes and Pullen chart the notion of moral responsibility as it has evolved in modern business discourse from Adam Smith's day to its contemporary incarnation in Milton Friedman (1970) famous dictum that 'the social responsibility of business is to increase profits'. As they note, Friedman's views were developed in opposition to the questioning of this narrow purpose by those who assumed that business might have social responsibilities, and that it was not an oxymoron to speak of 'corporate social responsibilities'. Indeed, as the authors chart, there are plenty of accounts that argue that if business looks after its corporate social responsibilities it will also be good for the bottom line, although other accounts note the importance of being socially responsible as a desirable end in itself rather than seeing it as a means to the ultimate ends of business being defined as being profitable. As such a desirable end, the idea of social responsibility can be attached to what are assumed to be various 'interests', such as 'community', 'ecology', and so on. As they note, in terms of a moralizing turn away from the pursuit of shareholder value, it is not uncommon for the ethical position taken in stakeholder theory and CSR to be self-righteous, simplistic and lacking in deliberation. It is also, as they go on to argue, often based on an ethic of calculation, a 'calculus of advantage' that sees good strategy in being responsible.

What might be an alternative to a calculative ethics? Rhodes and Pullen find inspiration in the recent ethical theory developed by the sociologist, Zygmunt Bauman. Here the notion of responsibility can be located in terms of the relations between the business organization and the 'social' as a more or less generalized other. Following Bauman, consideration of the others to whom an organization might be responsible is achieved differently depending on the relative proximity with which those others are conceived. Some such as employees and local communities may be relatively close at hand; others such as suppliers or customers may be quite distant. Building on Lévinas' (1969) ethics, how the organization assumes responsibility will be evident in the way in which it deals with these others both close and far as both particular and unknowable. At best, the authors suggest, responsibility requires a relation that does not violate the particularity of the other by subsuming them under category headings but as treating them as authentic selves and others. The categories of stakeholder are an organization construct, serving organization self-interest, an attempt to manage any potentially authentic selves by denying their authenticity through categorization devices. As they say, 'to consider others as stakeholders can easily become a glib excuse for *not* dealing with others as real and particular people – an easy way out of the very question of responsibility.' It becomes a way of evading the moral mazes of everyday organizational life. Using Derridean terms they suggest that responsibility requires undecidability, which can never be pre-empted by organizational rules, rationalities and codes of ethics. It entails managers *being responsible beings* and that entails constant attention. The upshot is that managers need to be their own moral philosophers – a fairly daunting process, perhaps. The

freedom of the manager to act and make decisions is, they suggest, the very condition of responsibility. It is a kind of *phronesis*, or practical wisdom (Flyvbjerg 2006).

The issues of responsibility are, perhaps, no more evident than when considered in the context of what has come to be called ‘sustainability’. As Suzanne Benn writes, discourses of sustainability developed as attempts to resolve increasingly evident tensions between the goals of economic growth, the desire for social equity and the limits to natural resources. Development is, broadly, defined as sustainable when it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs; in means in even simpler terms, taking nothing away from nature and adding nothing that impairs or blights that nature. Judged thus, the whole project of industrialization has been a grievously unsustainable trajectory that scholars and practitioners have only recently sought to arrest and redirect. The redirection has been promulgated in terms of three principles: intergenerational equity; intragenerational equity, and the precautionary principle. As Benn observes, however, beyond these broad brush strokes the discourse is essentially contested, with little agreement on its key tenets, texts, or topics. Nonetheless, she establishes a case for organizational decision-makers to exercise their ethical responsibilities in terms of balancing relationships between humans and the rest of the biosphere, present and future generation, and the developing and developed worlds. In organizational behaviour to the present, these relations have been conceptualized in terms of two dominant schemas within the overall discourse: the win-win and the moral imperative. Win-win discourses stress the good business case for being sustainable: minimizing waste, cutting costs, and being a good organizational citizen. The moral imperative case is based on various formulations of the manager as a *social* being: it is

normative, drawing on business ethics principles to advocate sustainability as ethical practice morally transformational leaders should engage in. The tone is one of ecological evangelism, sure in the certainty of the correctness of its own beliefs, and often associated with various consultancy models and practices that can help organizational behaviour 'go green'. Benn explores the growth of these discourses and their ramifications on organizational behaviour.

More recently, in making the links between sustainable development and organizational behaviour Ben notes that there will have to be a profound cognitive and cultural change in individual attitudes and beliefs if the agenda is to be developed in both theory and practice. One positive sign might be the emergence of the 'Bottom of the Pyramid' market — the 4 billion people living on less than \$2 per day who organizations are increasingly being urged to target with affordable goods and services, who can be reached by engaging with civil society organizations and local governments to stimulate local innovations and entrepreneurship. Promising as this might seem, however, Benn argues that we need an organizational behaviour discourse that draws on the field of environmental sociology, especially that strand within it known as reflexive ecological modernization. For ecological modernists, a form of hyper-industrialisation, premised on technological innovation, needs to be developed under different conditions of leadership, notably a commitment to the precautionary principle.

Reflexive ecological modernization sees sustainability issues arising as unintended risks produced by the success of rationality, such as global warming, competition and conflict over increasingly scarce natural resources such as water, toxic environments,

and weapons of terrorism. The reflexive component refers to the need constantly to question and interrogate existing modes of rationality, in order to implement increasingly precautionary and sustainable forms of development. Often the questioning will be led by non-conventional stakeholders, such as green activists, NGOs, and other civil society organizations that impose themselves as stakeholders on previously less reflective organizational behaviour.

The key issue for organizational behaviour is the development of its discourse as sufficiently critically self-aware, learning-oriented, and open to broadly based conversations, while giving regard to precaution, ensuring concern with the international dimensions of development, and giving consideration to the multiple and interdisciplinary possibilities for environmental and social solutions to negative impacts of development. Organizational behaviour has nothing to lose but its blinkers as a handmaiden only of organizational orthodoxy according to these perspectives. It has to open itself to new stakeholders, issues and develop authentic concerns that are quite distinct from the traditional pursuits of leadership or OD. The study of the social production and use of statistics could facilitate our understanding of how managers, leaders, employees, make sense of risks facing them, their organization, society and the planet. Thus, rather than merely helping interpret existing tools for calculation or developing new tools for performance appraisal considered in terms of traditional role requirements, the new macro-organizational behaviour should be changing the priorities and changing the tools.

Three priorities are essential. Corporate leaders have to accept the precautionary principle. Organizations need to become less centralized and more networked into

grass-roots movements, understandings and politics. Business and industry need to work within the context of a more active civil society, in which government organizations support less resourced actors with knowledge and other tools and facilities in order to ensure a more inclusive political community. Fittingly, the chapter concludes with a discussion of a case in point: the Chinese city of Dongtan, an attempt to build a community based on ecologically reflexive modernization principles.

The previous three chapters clearly point to the centrality of how organizations express who they are and what they stand for to all of their internal and external stakeholders, which is the topic of the chapters by Majken Schultz and Mary Jo Hatch. There are, they suggest, many reasons why organizations are devoting increasing energy and resources to expressive organizational practices: competitive pressures to differentiate the business offering; stakeholder pressures from new actors in their environment, such as those that Benn has described, and changing norms about the meanings that should surround the cash and customer nexus. The expression of the organization is an important arena in which organization control is tested; the occasions for expression are often quite local and uncoupled from central management control; they are often contested, sometimes by highly resourceful and provocative organizations and other actors who ‘target’ specific corporate or other organizational expressions.

The field of organizational expression is challenging for the organization behaviour specialist also. No one academic discipline ‘owns’ it: researching how the managing

of organizational expression is done entails a multidisciplinary and multi-functional approach. It means looking at what organization's do not merely in the terms of any one specialism but in terms that capture the members' usage and sense of what they are doing. In this context, organization theory approaches such as institutional theory, can be useful: what are the forms of mimesis shaping organizational expression? But they are limiting – because the whole point of organizational expression is to situate the organization as distinct, different, apart from the crowd. Additionally, organizational expression should not just tell generalized others what the organization is, what it means; it should also be expressive of the identity that those significant others who are employees or customers are encouraged to develop.

Expressiveness depends on context as well as the uses made and meanings given to them by their audiences. These shift fast and subtly and study of the semiotics of symbolic meaning must be a core task in researching organizational expression. How members and users of organizations embed their understanding of culture, identity and difference is of the utmost significance. What are the significant rites, rituals and rhetoric that do this work? Thus, organization culture studies have a key role to play in research into organizational expression, as do studies of corporate identity, branding, and communication. A cross-disciplinary framework is required that builds on these approaches and incorporates other elements as necessary. For instance, the study of organizational communication, audiences and message reception will be important.

In practical terms this means that organizational expression will be an activity in which cross-functional boundaries must be spanned, local professional politics will flourish, and disciplinary identities will be blurred in practice. Management needs to pay attention to the macro-cultural context within which meaning are constituted, circulate, and change as well as the identity conflicts that are important to their key audiences. Doing this will often mean sacrificing a few sacred tenets held by some of the disciplines, such as marketing. Additionally, it will mean acknowledging that some of the most important shapers of organizational expression may not be at all amenable to managerial design and control – think of the impact of the McLibel campaign on McDonalds, for instance. It is all too easy for organizational expressions, dominated by consumerism, to be transformed by culture-jammers from once meaningful expressions originating in the organization's culture into empty speech cluttering the marketplace, subject to derision. Fiat's campaign for the Fiat 127 comes to mind: the catchline went something like: "If this car was a woman, it would get its bottom pinched." The graffiti artist who corrupted one poster with the riposte "If this woman was a car, she'd run you down", gained a permanent place in advertising folklore, and spawned a huge industry of feminist culture-jamming. In the future managers will have to learn to manage organizational expressiveness with all its semiotic complexity, subtlety and political nuances. Stakeholders will often push and twist messages where they were not intended to go and managers need to be reflexive about these possibilities, and understand local cultures, styles and tastes, as well as the nature of the local politics of gender, of class, of ethnicity, that might appropriate their expressions. (Think of US rappers and Cristal champagne or UK 'chavs' and Burberry.)

René ten Bos and Stefan Heusinkveld contribute the last chapter in this part of the book, on 'management fashion and organizational behaviour'. They open with a fascinating history of self-help manuals, spiritual tracts, and their increasingly bizarre 'new age' descendants, all oriented to fashioning employees and entrepreneurs that fit the changing times. One focus was on self-helping working men and another on their organizational adaptability. In the first, a focus on religion was evident; in the second set, organizational aspects as well as the emotional posture of the employee were engaged. Emotion was regarded with ambivalence, as potentially useful, if managed properly, and threatening if not. Both sets of discourses become interrelated into contemporary management fashion. As the authors observe, notions such as self-help, spirituality, emotion, harmony, and many more are still prevalent in the work of consultants, gurus, and others who have the wish to appeal to contemporary managerial taste.

Three distinct 'lines' may be identified in this contemporary advice industry shaping management fashions. First, those rationalist accounts that use a conception of science which is general, timeless, abstract, objective, and axiomatic. Second the more politically engaged argument that popular management ideas should be condemned for their manipulative and inhumane tendencies. As the authors note, the 'humanistic-political approach' shares a desire to debunk the managerial 'hypes' and 'fads' with the rational approach but from a political rather than rationalist perspective. A third approach accepts that fashion in general is an unmistakable part of current developments in our society and that what is important is to study how fashion stylists, such as management gurus, express themselves. These ideas are then developed and worked out in the chapter.

For the future, they argue that overly normative approaches of management fashion will not dominate future research. Some key areas for further research are identified. These include the role of knowledge entrepreneurs, such as consultants and guru's; the necessity of studying the social-cultural context of fashion, especially, in a liquid modernity, in which the authority of science in legislating everyday truths seems to have declined from its rationalist heyday. Hence, it is not so much to the production of science that we should look for the recipe knowledge that circulates in the market-place but more commercial circuits of production. Additionally, there should be continuing attention paid to the consumption of management fashions: *how* and *why* does *what* get to be widely consumed or not by *whom*? What are the dynamics of 'cool'? Moreover, what are the ethical implications of all this consumption?

Organizing on a macro-scale

Organizational behaviour might have begun in psychology with a primarily individual focus but it soon moved on to more collective phenomena, such as organization change, which David Wilson explore in his contribution to the volume. In this chapter Wilson traces the theoretical and empirical development of research into change as a discrete phenomenon of organized society. It shows how management theory colonized change theories and, at first, assumed that change could be planned and implemented via managerial agency. The chapter then develops a series of perspectives in which managerial agency is questioned and in which change and organization are viewed as inextricably inter-linked processes.

Exploring the antecedents for change involves a wide range of disciplines including philosophy, psychology, economics and sociology as well as disciplines explicitly attached to researching organizing and organization. Within each of these disciplinary

areas there will be rival accounts of change phenomena. Between disciplines there is a great deal of incommensurability – but this also characterizes within disciplinary discourses, such as microeconomics, macroeconomics and international economics.

An adequate account of change has to include reference to the importance of context (primarily an assessment of where change takes place such as the type of organization or society – is it highly developed or less developed, for instance); content (meaning what the change is about, such as the adoption of a new technology – does it have system transforming implications or does it slot in to what is already extant) and process (describing the characteristics of the change journey from first idea to implementation – is the journey straightforward, highly problematic, involve many others or few, are there many recursive loops or few, and so on), argues Wilson. Temporality is also important: change can be slower or faster; evolutionary or revolutionary; its scope may be highly focused or diffuse, specific or general, long term or immediate. Despite the importance of these features, increasingly identified in the research literature, there are still many apparent tendencies to talk about change as if it were linear, rational, and easily manageable – especially in the organizational behaviour literature.

Amongst macro-organizational behaviour approaches to change, that known as Organizational Development (OD) is one of the best known. OD approaches involve senior managers creating a vision, developing commitment and motivation for its accomplishment, by capturing and developing political and behavioural support from various stakeholders within and outside the organization.

Wilson suggests we should consider whether change is envisaged as a planned or *emergent* process and the extent to which the course of change might be seen as

voluntarist or *determined*. Planned change describes a sequence of steps or stages which prescribe what managers should do. Emergent perspectives view change as a process which is almost never planned, but is one which emerges from a host of organizational and individual activities. Four distinct perspectives can be mapped on to these broad-brush accounts: life-cycle theories; teleological theories; dialectic theories, and evolutionary theories.

For the future, the agenda of change research should focus on change across levels of analysis and emphasize the interplay of organization, group and individual levels.

The organizations studied should be extended from large commercial enterprises to small and medium firms, public sector and not-for-profit organizations. New hybrid forms of networks are emerging that demand analysis likely to uncover quite different mechanisms at work compared with classical bureaucracy. Of course, as the previous analysis of management fashions established, there will be no shortage of nostrums, solutions and recipes available in the market for managing change and sometimes the analysis of change and the prescriptions for change will become entangled.

Change and its direction is seen as serious work in organizations, best done by those serious people who populate the top management teams – the elites, in other words. In his contribution titled “We have always been oligarchs”, David Courpasson considers the actual power of leaders. To understand how certain actors have the power to change things significantly we need to grasp how structural forces constrain elites and how, nonetheless, individuals can still shape phenomena in more or less determinate ways by mobilizing diverse actors. In considering the role of elites in the past debate has often veered between accounts of oligarchy and bureaucracy; Courpasson wants

to introduce a more ‘hybrid’ context that he terms *polyarchy*. The chapter addresses the sort of leaders that are being shaped that fit these polyarchies.

The existence of organization as more or less similar to an archetype of polyarchy or bureaucracy is a matter of organizational design, which Gerard Fairtlough and Rosemary Beckham address in their chapter on ‘organizational design’. (Sadly, Gerard died whilst this volume was being finalized.) As in so much else of consequence in the field the origins of a concern with organizational design were established by Max Weber. Weber was concerned principally with the bureaucratic type; today the design of new organizations and the redesign of existing ones is a widespread practice within business, government and civil society. Whatever the design, the authors contend, the main reason why organization design can be contentious or emotional is its connection with power and status – usually organized in a hierarchical way – as in a bureaucracy.

There are, according to Fairtlough (2005), two fundamental alternatives to hierarchy. The first is heterarchy, which involves multiple sources of rule rather than the single rule of hierarchy. An organizational example is the relationship between the partners in a traditional law firm, where all partners are of roughly equal status, sharing decision-making, risks and rewards. The second alternative is responsible autonomy, under which an individual or a group has autonomy to decide what to do, but is accountable for the outcome of the decision, as in privately-owned businesses that operate autonomously, providing they satisfy their creditors, and basic scientific research, in which principal investigators are free to choose their line of enquiry, providing it leads to results judged valuable by peer-review. The chapter elaborates the corollaries and consequences of these ‘three ways of getting things done’ and

relates them a broader set of theories from the field as well as providing examples drawn from practice.

Increasingly, organizational behaviour is likely to take place in projects. Projects are a form of organizing in which individuals are temporarily but interdependently linked to achieve a specific outcome or set of outcomes. These outcomes can include the production of ideas or products, solutions to problems, provision of a service, or the construction of public or private infrastructure; they may be innovation projects, where the outcomes are very exploratory or they may be explicitly mission-based – such as putting a man on the moon.

Carlsen and Pitsis argue that projects, even ones that fail to come in on time and budget – which is the vast majority of mega-projects – can, nonetheless, be ideal arenas of positive personal and organizational change. They demonstrate this proposition through three carefully delineated case studies of the development of an IT-application for collecting dependency allowance debt; the case of oil exploration in a peripheral license in the North Sea, and a major construction project for cleaning up Sydney's waterways. What they see unifying these three very different projects is that they are typified by the production of narrative capital that generates positive organizational change. Narrative capital is repeatedly drawn upon and used for future oriented purposive action.

A focus on projects and projection may be considered particularly valuable in studying processes of positive organizational change and their temporal-relational contexts. The authors note many examples of projects that affirm life in the sense that they continue to capture the imagination of people irrespective of generation or nationality. What is attractive in projects, they argue, even those that are more

mundane than the major historical ones that they enumerate, is how projects constitute moving horizons of collective engagement and meaning that live on and inform organizational behaviour long after the project has elapsed. To understand this meaningfulness they draw on phenomenological psychology, seeing it as an underutilized resource in the construction of positive organizational psychology (see Chapter 5). To this end, they draw out and develop the four key processes of expansive connecting, extending, instantiating and creating deviance that inform their view of projects for life.

Corporate governance provides a focus upon the organizational and political processes involved in resolving disputes and conflicts of interest between participants in corporate organizations. Corporate governance varies widely between societies but the main focus of its reform in recent years has been in the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially the UK and the US, which are the focus of the concluding chapter by Rob Watson. It is in these societies that shareholder capitalism has flourished. In the US and UK, the institutional and legal framework has always supported the principle that, in the absence of financial distress, executive discretion ought to be exercised in accordance with the financial interests of the company's shareholders. The chapter, taking this corporate context for granted, discusses the major advantages of the corporate model and the unique governance problems associated with this organisational structure. The distinctive and novel feature of this organisational form is that it has a separate legal status completely independent from that of its owners (i.e., the shareholders that provide the firms' risk capital) and/or its senior executives (i.e., the employees responsible for corporate strategy and operational management). This legal fiction, the product of 18th and 19th century legislators in the UK and US, implies that the company, not its owner-managers, is the contracting party with

respect to all business dealings and that, as a consequence, the owner-managers ought not to be held personally responsible should the company at some stage be unable to honour its financial obligations.

Of course, most corporations today are not owner-managed but exist under conditions of a separation of ownership and control. Corporate strategy and the control of resources reside in the hands of professional managers, so shareholders have to rely on the decision making discretion of senior executives. Senior executives, however, may have different interests from those of shareholders. Thus, a central issue for corporate governance, as Watson elaborates, is how these differing interests might be aligned. It is the effectiveness of the various legal, organizational and market-based incentives and constraints upon managerial discretion that constitute the primary concern of corporate governance. Not surprisingly, given the publicity that has attached to a number of spectacular corporate cases of collapse and malfeasance, the traditional solutions to governance problems have been found lacking. The chapter concludes with a brief review of alternative “stakeholder” views regarding objectives of corporate decision making and the corporate governance systems found in other developed and developing economies that appear to embody in their systems of corporate law and practice similar stakeholder notions. This includes an analysis of how these alternatives differ from the Anglo-US model and an assessment of whether they appear to have any advantages that could usefully be incorporated into the current shareholder oriented systems of the UK and US.

Finally, what is constituted as organizational behaviour is increasingly framed by the phenomena collectively labelled as ‘globalization’. In the final chapter Clegg and

Carter address globalization and its impact on and implications for organizational behaviour. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Conclusion

We have no doubt that much of organizational behaviour in the future will engage with the macro-concerns and agenda sketched here; it will need to if it is to remain relevant to the changing conditions of contemporary existence. However, much will remain more tightly coupled to the psychology roots of the organizational behaviour discourse. There are many good reasons of professional formation, tradition and disciplinary training and inclinations why this should be the case. Nonetheless, as we have sought to argue in this volume, there are even more compelling reasons why the field needs to drop its blinkers and address the rich vistas that a concern with macro-organizational behaviour opens up.

References

- Clarke, A. (1993) *Diaries*. London: Wiedenfield & Nicholson.
- Albert, S. and Whetten, D (1985) 'Organizational identity', *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 7: 263-295
- Aristotle (2004) *The Nichomachean Ethics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Baldamus, W. I. (1961) *Efficiency and Effort: An Analysis of Industrial Administration*, London: Tavistock.
- Clegg, S. R, Hardy, C., Lawrence, T and Nord W. R. (2006) *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*, London: Sage.
- Courpasson, D. (2006) *Soft Constraint: Liberal Organizations and Democracy*, Oslo/Copenhagen: Liber/ CBS Press.

- Cyert R. M. and March, J. G. (1963) *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fairtlough, G. (2005) *The Three Ways of Getting Things Done: Hierarchy, Heterarchy, and Responsible Autonomy in Organizations*, Axminster: Triarchy Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) 'Making Organization Research Matter: Power, Values and Phronesis', pp. 370-287 in Clegg et al (*op.cit.*)
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Harmondsworth: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (1979). Governmentality. Ideology and Consciousness, 6, 5-21.
- Friedman (1970) 'The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits', *New York Times Magazine*, September 30
- Gall, G. (1999) A review of strike activity in Western Europe at the end of the second millennium, *Employee Relations*, 21(4): 357-377.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goffman, E. (1959) *Asylums*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Excerpts from the Prison Notebooks*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Lévinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity*, trans. Alphonso Lingis, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View*, London: Macmillan.
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*, (Second Edition) London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Marx, K. (1976) *Capital*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Schutz, A. (1967) *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, Evanston, Ill:

Northwestern University Press.

Simmel, G. (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, (edited and translated by Kurt

Woolf), New York: The Free Press.

Viber (2004) *Theories of Macro-organizational Behavior: A Handbook of Ideas and*

Explanations, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

