



ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT ODC NEWSLETTER

Organization Development and Change Division

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Winter 2015

Published by the ODC Division

2015 ODC DIVISION SCHOLARLY PROGRAM: CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Julie Wolfram Cox
Monash University
Program Chair

The ODC division is devoted to empirical research, theory development, and practical application concerning all forms of organization change. The ODC content domain focuses on the processes and outcomes of organization change and development at the individual, group, organizational, and institutional levels using multiple methods and perspectives. Major topics include:

- the causes and dynamics of different forms and types of change, such as emergent change, evolutionary change, planned change, continuous change, and strategic change;
- the forms, processes, and types of interventions—e.g. individual, group, and large scale—and the factors that influence their use and effectiveness;
- the leadership and facilitation of organization change and development, such as forms and functions of leadership; leaders’ approaches, behaviors, and activities of leaders and change agents; leadership and change agent effectiveness, and the contextual factors that influence these;
- the reactions and responses of people to change such as readiness for change, engagement in change, and resistance to change and the individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors that contribute to these responses and reactions;
- the impact of contexts, such as organizational type, industry structure and dynamics, institutions, and nationality on the content and processes of organization change and development;
- the integration of change outcomes such as human-social, financial, and environmental as system goals and measures of success;
- the development of paradigms and methods that address values such as sustainability, justice,

(see Cox, page 2)

A COMMENTARY ON ODC 2014 DISTINGUISHED SPEAKER GARETH MORGAN’S TALK: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

David Grant
UNSW Business School, Australia
ODC Division Chair Elect
Cliff Oswick
Cass Business School, UK

The ODC Distinguished Speaker at the 2014 Academy of Management Meetings was Gareth Morgan. Gareth is Distinguished Research Professor at the Schulich School of Business, York University, Canada. He is known for his numerous and significant contributions to the study of organizations and to social science research more broadly.

(see Grant and Oswick, page 4)

Table of Contents

Julie Wolfram Cox, 2015 ODC Division Scholarly Program: Call for Submissions	1
David Grant & Cliff Oswick, A Commentary on ODC 2014 Distinguished Speaker Gareth Morgan’s Talk: Some Reflections on the Evolution of Organization and Management Research	1
ODC Division Executive Committee 2014-2015	2
John Amis, 2015 ODC Division Professional Development Workshops: Call for Proposals	8
David Grant & Kate Elgayeva, ODC Doctoral Consortium August 8, 2015	9
Haridimos Tsoukas, Thinking About Organizational Change as if Change Mattered: Insights from Bergson’s Process Philosophy, ODC Division 2013 Distinguished Speaker	10
Wade P. Smith, Emergent Logistics and Institutional Work: Evidence from the Field of the Armed Forces, ODC 2012 Best Student Paper Award	15
Organization Development and Change Division Bylaws	17
Feedback to the Editor	23

**ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE 2014-2015**

Sonja Sackmann, Division Chair
University Bw Munich, Germany
Email: sonja.sackmann@unibw.de

David Grant, Division Chair Elect
University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
Email: david.grant@sydney.edu.au

Julie Wolfram Cox, Program Chair
Monash University, Victoria, Australia
Email: julie.wolfram.cox@monash.edu

John M. Amis, PDW Chair
University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Email: john.amis@ed.ac.uk

*Danielle Zandee, Representative-at-Large
(5-year term)*
Nyenrode Business Universiteit, Amsterdam,
The Netherlands
Email: d.zandee@nyenrode.nl

Bill Cooke, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
York University Management School, United Kingdom
Email: b.cooke@lancaster.ac.uk

Patrice Rosenthal, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
Fielding Graduate University
Email: prosenthal@fielding.edu

Quy Nguyen Huy, Research Committee Chair
INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France
Email: quy.huy@insead.edu

Kate Elgayeva, Student Representative
Chicago School of Professional Psychology
Email: kelgayeva@thechicagoschool.edu

*Robert Carpino, Executive Scholar-Practitioner
(2-year term)*
Quest Diagnostics
Email: robert.carpino@calstatela.edu

*Katherine (Kate) Heynoski, Executive Scholar-
Practitioner (2-year term)*
Battelle for Kids
Email: kheynoski@battelleforkids.org

Julie Smendzuik-O'Brien, Division Membership Chair
Fielding Graduate University
Email: jsmendzuik@gmail.com

Gavin Schwarz, Secretary/Treasurer
University of New South Wales
Email: g.schwarz@unsw.edu.au

Andre Avramchuk, Director of Communications
California State University
Email: arttooz@aol.com

Teri Michael, Webmaster
CTU—Colorado Technical University
Email: tmichael@fairpoint.net

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor
University of Colorado at Boulder
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(from Cox, page 1)

dignity, and integrity in ODC contexts and generate ethical, positive, and meaningful contributions as they relate to organizational change and its processes.

Instructions for Submissions to the Scholarly Program of the AOM 2015 Meeting in Vancouver

The ODC division invites submission of innovative empirical or conceptual papers and symposia that develop theory and practice relevant to strategic and organizational change, development, transformation, and leadership. Topics and explorations specifically oriented to the 2015 all-Academy theme: “Opening Governance” are especially encouraged. The all-Academy theme encourages submissions that focus on the many forms, and uses, of governance in organizations, and the ways in which the term *governance* facilitates or hinders the outcomes

that various organizational stakeholders seek. The term is used in the broadest sense, i.e., systems, structures, rights and practices that give organizations their authority and mandates for action. Analyses that focus on changes in and to governance by, with and within organizations are encouraged, as is attention to parallel and related changes at individual, group and institutional levels of analysis. Contributions that address the problems and possibilities of contemporary life and which reconsider traditional organizational, conceptual (and divisional!) boundaries are encouraged.

As ODC scholars and practitioners, governance processes and structures deeply influence our understanding of change and the ways in which we carry out our research, practice and teaching. The 2015 All-Academy theme therefore encourages us to consider issues such as:

- To what extent, and how, does the theory and practice of ODC acknowledge the concept of open governance in bringing about various forms of change?
- What do we actually mean by ‘opening governance’ in the context of ODC? What fundamental assumptions and ethical considerations in relation to ODC does this raise?
- What can we learn about ODC from theory and research into governance in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors, and how might ODC contribute to such theory and research? How can our theories, models and pedagogical frameworks be further specified, extended and developed as a result of drawing on such fields of enquiry?
- How might using specific methods and approaches inform the study and practice of ODC in the context of opening governance? How can these methods and approaches unveil the potential tensions between ‘opening’, which implies movement, transparency and procedural justice, and ‘governance’, which may imply control and performative imperatives?
- How is the concept of ‘good governance’ related to the process of ‘opening governance’? How may recent developments in ODC such as ‘New OD’ or ‘Dialogic’ OD and change contribute to the study and practice of opening governance in various settings?
- In what ways, and to what effect, do leaders and other stakeholders involved in the planning and execution of change draw on principles of good governance? How might an open governance lens add gravitas and legitimacy to the work of such leaders as they aspire to change behavior and attitudes and to build emotional commitment to change? When might leaders choose to distinguish their change efforts from those aimed toward opening governance?
- What is the role of opening governance in the constitution of other reactions to change, including acceptance, commitment, ambivalence and cynicism? For example, in what ways, and to what effect, does the opening of governance mobilize people to accept and or resist change?
- Is governance something that can be opened or closed, and by whom? Is opening governance a

reality, an imaginary or a fiction? How is the concept and practice of opening governance affected by socio-political, situational, geographical and historical contexts?

- How is opening governance affected by or related to other efforts aimed toward greater democracy and transparency in organizational systems and structures? To what extent do intervention processes and technologies used in ODC assist (or even restrain) such translations? How does new technology/new media play a role in the scope and speed of such change, in the inclusion of new or more diverse stakeholders, and in the promotion of creative processes and innovative solutions and potentials?
- How is a value on open governance reflected in the ways we write about ODC? How might we be more reflexive about writing and publication conventions in ODC and about whose interests are privileged by such conventions?

Papers and Symposia submitted to the ODC Division might address these or the many other issues that emanate from this year’s AOM theme. Please note that we also welcome submissions that are related to the ODC domain but are not necessarily related to this year’s theme. If you are interested in submitting a paper or a symposium proposal through the ODC Division, please visit <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/> and refer to the section on submission information for papers and symposia. The submission deadline is **January 13, 2015, at 5:00 p.m. ET (NY Time)**.

Division Awards

Awards, some with an honorarium, will be given for the best paper in the following categories:

- Best Paper Overall
- Rupe Chisolm Best Practice-to-Theory Paper
- Best Paper based on a Dissertation
- Best Student Paper (written exclusively by students, individually or with other students, no faculty or practitioner co-authors permitted)
- Best Action Research Paper

Please refer to our website for more detail on these awards: <http://division.aonline.org/odc>. Papers based on a dissertation, written exclusively by students (individually or with other students), or writ-

ten about action research should be clearly identified as such at the time of submission (make a note on the title page and also in the accompanying email indicating the award for which you want the paper to be considered).

The ODC Division also recognizes a Best Reviewer Award. All award winners are celebrated at the ODC Business Meeting.

(From Grant and Oswick, page 1)

His work includes prestigious publications such as *Riding the Waves of Change, Imagination: New Mindsets for Seeing, Organizing and Managing*, and, with Gibson Burrell, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*.

Gareth is perhaps best known for one particular book: *Images of Organization*. Published nearly 30 years ago this work can justifiably be described as seminal and ground-breaking. A highly original and somewhat unorthodox text, it offers innovative and evocative ways of thinking about organizations and organizing that continue to stimulate theory building and debate within the academy while also serving as a valuable teaching resource—particularly at the executive and masters levels. At the same time, many organization development and change practitioners have sought to apply the metaphorical processes as well as the key metaphors that the book highlights in order to assist them in the diagnosis and implementation of change.

Given the impact of *Images of Organization*, and the fact that after nearly three decades it remains highly salient to the scholarly and academic work of the ODC Division and its members, the Division invited Gareth to be our 2014 Distinguished Speaker. This, we felt, was an opportunity for him to reflect on the impact of the book to date and where it might take us. In a well-received talk to over 500 people at the AoM 2014 meeting, he considered why the eight organizational images the book describes remain relevant in a world subject to rapid change and where new forms of organization and organizing are increasingly apparent; forms of organization and organizing that are often both fluid and virtual in both meaning and practice. In addressing these sorts of issues he also discussed whether there are new metaphors that might need to be added to the existing eight and shared some of

his latest thinking on the development of organization and management theory and the role played by metaphor in shaping how we currently understand organizations and related domains of practice, including organization development and change.

It is hard to do Gareth's talk justice in a commentary such as this, but the following highlights a number of the key issues he covered. We hope that you find it of some interest and value.

Introduction: Conceptualising Metaphor

Gareth commenced his talk with a conceptual overview of metaphor and the process of metaphorisation. Metaphors influence the way we describe, analyse, and theorize organizations and other phenomena. The creation of a metaphor involves the literal meaning of a phrase or word being applied to a new context in a figurative sense. Metaphors enable the transfer of information about a relatively familiar subject (the source or base domain) to a new and relatively unknown subject (the target domain). By way of example, when people assert that an organization is, or is like, a machine, the processes of comparison, substitution, and interaction between the images of the organization and a machine act in combination to create a metaphor that generates a new meaning; the organization is seen as mechanical, comprising interrelated parts, and as operating in a rational determinist manner.

Early on in his talk Gareth also highlighted the influence and significance of metaphors in relation to his early research. Referring to his seminal work with Gibson Burrell (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) he showed social science is best analyzed in terms of four key paradigms—the functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical-structuralist. Burrell and Morgan's pioneering work demonstrated that each of these paradigms is underpinned by sets of metatheoretical assumptions.

Turning his attention to organization studies specifically, Gareth argued that metaphors are, in line with their generative capacity, "liberating" (Grant and Oswick, 1996) in orientation. They can be viewed as powerful educational devices that are highly correlated with learning and are important to the advancement of knowledge and understanding about organizations. His presentation suggested that *Images of Organization*, along with several other of his early publications, demonstrates how this liberating orientation can manifest itself in three ways,

all of which assist in understanding organizations and organizing. First, the application of a metaphor may generate fresh and innovative insights into a familiar situation. In this sense, metaphors can generate alternative social realities. Specifically, metaphors can be used to encourage different ways of thinking among organizational researchers and practitioners that enable them to identify, explain, and influence complex organizational phenomena. For example, in one of his early publications on metaphor, Gareth proposed the “schismatic” metaphor (Morgan, 1981). This showed that despite management efforts to maintain prevailing organizational structures and processes, there is a potential for the various contradictions, conflicts, and tensions within organizations to rise to the surface so that organizations implode, fragment, or disintegrate.

Second, and in contrast to the capacity of metaphors to encourage new ways of thinking about already known phenomena, they can also facilitate the learning of new knowledge where something is encountered that is a completely new experience. An example is provided by organizational change Scholars Frank Barrett and David Cooperrider (1990). They use the illustration of a science student seeking to grasp the structure of the atom. Getting the student to use the metaphor “the atom is a solar system” portrays the electrons orbiting about a central nucleus and allows new understanding to emerge.

Third, proponents of metaphors emphasize that their application to either new or existing phenomena is an important process of experimentation. Metaphor should therefore be deliberately used as an investigative tool, and such an approach is highly apparent in numerous analyses of organizations. For example, metaphors have been widely applied within the field of organizational change and development as a diagnostic tool (see: Oswick and Grant in 1996; Marshak, 1993).

Images of Organization: Eight Influential Metaphors

Having talked about concepts and processes related to metaphor, Gareth turned his attention to *Images of Organization* and its significance. First published in 1986, the book encourages management practitioners and researchers to identify and apply eight key metaphors. These are to be used to instigate new ways of thinking about organizations and the way they are managed. In presenting these metaphors Gareth reminded the audience of the need for orga-

nizational researchers to practice a degree of reflexivity so that they are able to recognize that their activities—whether as researchers or practitioners—are often linked to favoured metaphors and therefore a favoured view of reality. In the context of organization development and change, the problem with this could be that an inappropriate metaphor might influence the ways in which change related analysis, diagnosis and intervention occurs and the impact of these on change outcomes.

The first metaphor discussed in the book is the metaphor of organizations as machines. Gareth noted that this metaphor underlies much classical management theory, such as scientific management and the design of bureaucratic organizations. It continues to dominate the way that we think about, research and teach organization and influences the ways in which we talk about and practice management.

Gareth moved on to discuss the second metaphor that appears in *Images of organization* and which has also contributed significantly to organization theory. This portrays organizations as organisms - living entities seeking to interact with and survive within their environment. The ascription of organismic status to organizations also leads to the idea that organizations are subject to evolutionary patterns discernible in the broader ecology.

The third metaphor that appears in *Images of Organization* is that of organizations as brains. This suggests that when designing organizations we should regard them as capable of information processing, intelligence, and learning. In certain respects, the metaphor is closely aligned with more recent organizational and management thinking about the learning organization and the ideas of knowledge management and knowledge intensive firms.

The fourth metaphor proposed in the book is that of organizations as cultures. The metaphor highlights the socially constructed nature of culture within organizational settings and depicts the organization as a web of social activities based on values, ideas, beliefs, norms, rituals etc. As with the brain metaphor, it is important that we recognize the salience of this metaphor when designing contemporary organizations.

The fifth metaphor highlighted in the book explores organizations as political systems. Under such circumstances competing interests, conflict, and power come to the fore. Organizations can be thought of as

systems of government that vary according to the principles (authoritarian, democratic, etc.) underlying their management and design. This is a metaphor that reveals the day-to-day politics of organizational life, such as the covert advancement of group or individual interests and the use of resources in order to enhance power. At the same time, the metaphor can be used to appreciate ways of using politics in order to create a non-coercive form of social order, and it also suggests that political processes and behaviours can lead to the recognition and management of competing interests in the interests of the organization as a whole.

A sixth metaphor in *Images of Organization* examines the idea of the organization as a psychic prison. This metaphor suggests that psychic and social process imprison organizational members within the parameters of the reality that they have constructed for themselves and stop them from reaching their true potential. The metaphor opens up the possibility that favoured modes of organizing might be influenced by an unconscious preoccupation within society with particular behaviours most notably, control. It is a metaphor that underpins the work of social theorists, especially Marx, whereby members of an organization are viewed as prisoners of an ideologically formulated mode of consciousness.

A seventh metaphor proposes that we consider organization as flux and in transformation and suggests that this might be best understood where it is linked to particular forms of logic. Such logics draw on theories from modern physics a number of which have also been discussed by change scholars (see: Marshak and Grant 2008; Olson, and Eoyang, 2001). These include, for example, autopoiesis, which provides an innovate perspective into organizations as systems that must interact with their environment; chaos and complexity theory, which might be used to explain how ordered patterns of organizing might emerge from spontaneous self-organization; cybernetic theory, which can be used to demonstrate how organizations often create and instantiate vicious or virtuous circular processes and relationships that impact on the capacity for change; and theories that demonstrate how organizations can be viewed as comprising various dialectics, such that organizational change can be seen as the product of tensions between opposites. In sum, and importantly from and Organization Development and Change this metaphor and its associated logics

offers a useful metaphorical framework for understanding and managing organizational change.

The final metaphor in *Images of Organization* depicts organizations as powerful instruments of domination. As such, they are part of a wider, seemingly inevitable, process of domination that exists within society overall—one where it is in the interests of those with power to keep social order in its present form rather than to allow radical change. This metaphor underpins, for example, Michels' iron law of oligarchy, Weber's analysis of the iron cage of bureaucracy, and Marxist examinations of organizational behavior such as those provided by labour process theorists who see capitalism as a mode of ideological domination that alienates people from important thoughts and actions. The metaphor is particularly useful for understanding organizations from the perspective of the exploited and for understanding how actions that may appear rational to one interest group may appear exploitative to another.

Future Directions: Where to Next with Metaphor and Organization?

In the second half of his talk Gareth reflected on 'where to next' with metaphor suggesting that its influence over the way we think about organization and its continuing role in developing the discipline of organization studies should not be underestimated. In doing so, he expressed some concern that the eight metaphors outlined in *Images in Organization* may have come to be seen as the only metaphors available to us in order to examine organization. He advocated researchers identifying alternative new metaphors—metaphors that are as legitimate as those in *Images of Organization*—and attempting to develop and use these. He believed that without such new metaphors it could become increasingly hard to think about and meaningfully analyse and organize in ways that reflect the new organizational forms that may come into existence as a result of, for example, digitalisation.

Gareth proposed a number of possible new and alternative metaphors of his own. Of these, particular attention was paid to the idea of organization(s) as a "networks". This metaphor captures the idea that we are now all part of a "global brain": In an age where technological advances mean that the physical is fast being replaced by the digital, the ways that we work and socially interact with one another work are increasingly organised though digital intelli-

gence, virtual reality and information networks. These networks, in turn, are organised around key actors, based on, for example, power and influence or particular professions or markets or other economic structures. Other metaphors that were offered included organizations as psychopaths (drawing on Bakan's (2004) work *The Corporation*), as markets (with a specific focus on economic structures), as class domains (with a focus on race, gender and religion), or as media (drawing on McLuhan's (1964) work where "the media is the message").

In proposing that organizational researchers consider new metaphors, Gareth noted that metaphor is one of the four master tropes-the other three being metonymy, synecdoche, and irony. While metaphor is considered to be the source of the comparison between two objects or situations, metonymy extends this by taking one entity and using it to refer to another to which it has some logical relation; that is, connections are made between two things within the same domain. For example, when people use the term "the office", they may well be using it in order to refer to their employing organization rather than the actual space they work in. Synecdoche refers to a figure of speech where a part is used to refer to the whole or the whole stands for a part. For example, synecdoche would be evident where globalization is used to explain and legitimate an unwelcome managerial decision such as job loss or pay cuts. In this instance, the term globalization draws on and represents the way that subsets of, for example, market relationships, business strategy, and other economic factors relate to globalization as a whole. Irony may involve the use of metaphors that are paradoxical and contradictory in nature.

Gareth drew particular attention to the relationships between metaphor and the master trope of metonymy and how this partnership leads to theory and knowledge construction. While metaphor is expansive and generative, metonymy is reductionist; it is essential for the knowing and doing of specific things or the deeper processes that come into play in relation to the broader concept captured by the original metaphor. By way of example, Gareth talked about how institutional research can be seen as a domain where metonymical reductions have been drawn from numerous sources (e.g. politics, culture theatre ecology) in order to provide the basis for detailed empirical research into organizations.

As valuable as this relationship between metaphor and metonymy can be in progressing knowledge

about organization and organizing, it is not without its problems. For instance, where the source concept of the metaphor is located in a different discipline or field from that to which it is being applied, the borrowing of any such concept needs to be informed. Often organizational researchers have insufficient knowledge of the other discipline for this to occur, selecting instead metaphors that they intuitively believe to have high levels of resonance and the potential for goodness of fit and then applying metonymical thinking to them. The metonymical thinking that then occurs is overly reductive and this may have unintended and unhelpful consequences. For example, concepts become reified or can become the 'be all and end all' or there is insufficient appreciation of the context in which a concept is being applied such that its value can be questioned.

Conclusions

Gareth concluded his talk with a passionate reminder that metaphors, where appropriately used in combination with metonymy, encourage both expansive and reductionist thinking and that this in turn can be used to generate powerful and illuminating insights into particular organizational phenomena. Where applied, they often lead to a furtherance of knowledge and an increased understanding about organization and management. He believed that the application of new metaphors, such as those he had highlighted could be used to generate new ways of thinking about organizations and overcome the weaknesses and problems of more established, traditional metaphors. Such new metaphors can often throw up contradictory and thought-provoking analyses of organizational phenomena that cause reconsideration of what has previously been taken for granted. This, he asserted, can enable management practitioners and researchers alike to appreciate better the complexities of organizations and to provide alternative perspectives and approaches to organization development and change.

References

- Bakan, J.C. (2004) *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power*. Free Press: New York.
- Barrett, F. J., & Cooperrider, D. L. (1990). Generative metaphor intervention: A new behavioral approach for working with systems divided by conflict and caught in defensive perception. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 23(4), 219-244.

- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.
- Grant, D., & Oswick, C. (1996). Getting the measure of metaphor. In D. Grant. & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Metaphor and organization* (pp. 1-20). London: Sage.
- Marshak, R. J. (1993). Managing the metaphors of change. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22(1), 44-56.
- Marshak, R. (2002). Changing the language of change: How new contexts and concepts are challenging the ways we think and talk about organizational change. *Strategic Change*, 11(5), 279-286.
- Marshak, R. and Grant, D. (2008). Organizational discourse and new OD practices. *British Journal of Management*, 19(1): 7-19.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Morgan, G. (1981). The schismatic metaphor and its implications for organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 2(1), 23-44.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Olson, E. E. and G. H. Eoyang. (2001). *Facilitating organization change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oswick, C., & Grant, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Organization development: Metaphorical explorations*. London: Pitman.

2015 ODC DIVISION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS: CALL FOR PROPOSALS

John Amis
University of Edinburgh
PDW Chair

Professional Development Workshops are intended to create a forum in which Academy members can share knowledge and foster personal development. They differ from regular Academy paper and symposia sessions in that they offer a long time frame and use a more interactive format. As such, there are usually opportunities for direct interaction with other participants and the PDW organisers around issues of mutual interest. Professional Development Workshop

sessions will be held between 8am on Friday 7th August and 8pm Saturday 8th August 2015, immediately prior to the AOM scholarly program.

Professional Development Workshops are encouraged, but not required, to tie in with the Annual Meeting theme. This year, the theme is “Opening Governance.” The theme is intended to be interpreted in its broadest possible sense, and can relate to the ways in which organizations are constructed and operated in particular ways to facilitate forms of communication and decision-making, understanding of practices by stakeholders, and effective operations. The full Call for Submissions is at <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/callforsubmissions> and the 2014 call for PDWs and related instructions can be found at <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/pdw/>.

Members of the ODC group will find particular resonance with this year’s theme. As scholars and practitioners, we are regularly involved in trying to understand how particular governance structures work, and how attempts to change them are implemented in more and less effective ways. The theme thus encourages us to consider how we can develop PDWs that address issues that may include, but are not limited to, the following questions:

- How do we change governance systems to be more transparent?
- How might opening governance influence power distributions within organizations?
- What ethical issues are involved in changing, and not changing, systems of governance?
- How are governance systems interlinked at different levels—society, field, organization, sub-unit—and what might be the consequences of this for realizing changes to more open forms of governance?
- What influence does language have on governance systems, and thus how are changes in language dialectically connected to changes in governance?
- What methods of inquiry might be most appropriate for understanding how governance systems operate, and for studying transformations to those systems?
- How might advances in technology lead to the creation of more open systems of governance, and how might these be implemented?

- How might opening governance impact the legitimacy of the organization with various stakeholder groups?
- What can we learn from different systems of governance employed in different countries? What are the contextual imperatives that we should consider when trying to implement new forms of governance from other settings?
- What processes should organization leaders develop to bring about more open forms of governance within their organizations?
- How might new developments in ODC that have encouraged greater reflexivity enhance the implementation of more open governance?
- How do forms of governance differ across private, public and non-profit organizations? What might be transferred from one sector to another to develop more open forms of governance?

Proposals for PDWs may address these or other issues that emanate from this year's AOM theme. They may also focus on issues that are unrelated to the theme, but that align with the ODC Division Domain Statement. Professional Development Workshops that relate to research, teaching and/or practice are equally encouraged.

Professional Development Workshop proposals that would be of interest to several divisions or interest groups are encouraged, although a PDW can only be submitted to **one** Division. We also encourage PDWs that create a meeting place for ODC practitioners and academics as well as for members of different divisions. (Any co-sponsors will be determined after submission). A doctoral consortium will be included and a submission for a mid-career PDW for ODC members is encouraged. Organizers of successful past PDWs are encouraged to propose a further PDW for 2015.

The submission deadline is **January 13, 2015, 5:00 p.m. ET (NY Time)** (earlier submissions are strongly encouraged). All submissions must be sent via the AOM submissions system (<http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/>), which is now open.

If you have any questions, or have an idea for a possible proposal that you would like to discuss, please contact the ODC PDW Program Chair, John Amis at odc@ed.ac.uk before December 13, 2014.

ODC DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM

AUGUST 8, 2015

David Grant
Division Chair Elect
Kate Elgayeva
Student Representative

The 2015 **ODC Doctoral Consortium** will be held on **Saturday, August 8th**, as part of the pre-conference program at the **Academy of Management** meetings in Vancouver.

This Doctoral Student Consortium is for doctoral students interested in studying issues associated with organizational change and human systems. We welcome and encourage students at all stages of their dissertation – those who are well advanced in their dissertation work as well as those who are in an early stages of their dissertation.

The consortium will provide opportunities for structured discussion and informal interaction between doctoral students and faculty concerning research, publishing and early career issues. In small group coaching sessions, participants will have the opportunity to present and discuss their dissertation research with faculty members who will give feedback and help further advance participants' work toward successful completion, publishable results, and smooth transitions into their academic careers. This is a great opportunity to meet prominent scholars in the field from around the world and to network with peers.

Participating faculty / panelists will include:

André Avramchuk, Cal. State U., Los Angeles, USA

Julia Balogun, U. of Bath, UK

Rune By, Editor, Journal of Change Management, Staffordshire U., UK.

Stephen Cummings, Victoria U., NZ

Richard Dunford, University of Newcastle, Australia

Charles Fenner, SUNY, USA

Jeffrey Ford, Ohio State U., USA

Ronald Fry, Case Western Reserve U., USA

Bill Harley, U. of Melbourne, Australia

Richard Hall, University of Sydney, Australia

Cliff Oswick, Cass Business School, UK

Bill Pasmore, Editor, JABS, Teachers College, Columbia U., USA

Huy Quy, INSEAD, France

Sonja Sackmann, U., Bw Munich, Germany

Patrice Rosenthal, Fielding Graduate University, USA

Inger Stensaker, NHH, Norway

Robyn Thomas, Editor, Organization, Cardiff Business School, UK.

Julie Wolfram Cox, Monash U., Australia

Richard Woodman, Texas A&M, USA

Danielle Zandee, Nyenrode Business U.

Those whose dissertation focuses on any aspect of organization development and change at the individual, group, organizational, and institutional levels are welcome to apply. Examples of relevant topical areas of dissertation work might include, but are not confined to:

- organization growth and development
- change management
- strategic change
- strategy-as-practice
- culture change
- social movements in organizations
- organizational improvisation
- organizational learning
- responses to change
- network dynamics
- leadership and change
- innovation
- discourse and change
- dialogic OD
- micro-dynamics of change
- multi-cultural dimensions of change
- institutional change

Applications to participate in the consortium will be assessed on a first come first serve basis and you are therefore advised to apply early as places are

limited. To apply, please send an email with the following three documents attached to **David Grant (david.grant2@unsw.edu.au)** by **May 15, 2015**:

- A recommendation letter from your dean, department chair, **or** major advisor/supervisor that verifies your (a) status/progress and (b) year in your school's doctoral program.
- A **one-page bio** summarizing your contact information, research and teaching interests, and publications.
- A **3-5 page** (typed and double-spaced) **summary of your dissertation project**, including the research question, rationale, hypotheses/propositions, proposed methods and results (if applicable).

*Note: If accepted for the consortium, your **one-page bio and summary of your dissertation project** will be distributed among consortium faculty and participants in advance of the August session.*

Please direct any questions you may have about this consortium to the consortium organizers: **David Grant (david.grant2@unsw.edu.au)** or **Kate Elgayeva (KElgayeva@thechicagoschool.edu)**.

THINKING ABOUT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AS IF CHANGED MATTERED: INSIGHTS FROM BERGSON'S PROCESS PHILOSOPHY

Haridimos Tsoukas

University of Cyprus, Cyprus & University of Warwick, UK

ODC Division 2013 Distinguished Speaker

We do not fully understand change. Perhaps we never will. And certainly we are not the only ones having such difficulties. Since the pre-Socratic philosophers, change has been a mystery. Zeno's paradox captures the difficulty (Sainsbury, 1988: Ch.1): the fast runner Achilles can never overtake the slow-moving tortoise, since by the time Achilles reaches the tortoise's starting point, the tortoise will have already moved ahead, and so on ad infinitum. The paradox is created by the assumption that space and time are infinitely divisible.

As William James (1996: 216-9) remarked, it is our "intellectualist" impulse to transform the perceptual

order into a conceptual order that is the root cause of our difficulty to understand change in its own terms. Consider the case of motion. If motion is defined as a “the occupancy of serially successive points of space at serially successive instants of time” (James, 1996: 234), then *getting* from point A to point B cannot be described. Strangely, motion is thought to be made up of immobilities! As James (1996: 236) remarked, “the stages into which you analyze a change are states, the change itself goes on between them. It lies along their intervals, inhabits what your definition fails to gather up [...]”.

However, we experience change. Like St. Augustine’s remark on time, we know what it is but, when asked, we find it difficult to articulate that knowledge. Being a temporal process, change is ubiquitous, yet we often fail to grasp it. Consider, for example, Peter Vaill’s experience of becoming Dean of a Business School. As a management professor, notes Vaill, “I had been confining myself to studying what a manager does and how, and how a manager’s effectiveness could be improved”. However, as a Dean, he reflects, “I quickly learned that the good things we professors were saying managers should do are *all* time-dependent processes”. But what was worrying for Vaill was that the time-dependent quality of organizational life had not been acknowledged, nor well understood, in the scholarly literature (Vaill, 1998:28).

Vaill provides a vivid description of organizational life as continuously bubbling, evolving, and differentiated. He writes: “Furthermore, there was the problem of the intrusiveness of events: things did not occur one at a time; no competency could be practiced in pristine singularity. Instead, at any moment I was flowing with the multiple, disjointed time streams of the various projects in which I was involved. Sometimes I had a little bit of influence over the pace and sequence of things in one of these streams, but as often I was “playing catch-up”, “dodging someone else’s bullets”, “being overtaken by events”, or “trying to get ahead” of a situation. The multiple time streams were, of course, not coordinated in space: they competed for my attention” (Vaill, 1998: 29).

What is striking in this description is the experienced ongoing character of change: change is *immanent* in the organization, rather than a series of distinct stages. It is not necessarily the outcome of intended action but simply the way organizational

life is. Change is not the exception: if one looks carefully into the bowels of organizations, it is a permanent state of affairs (Orlikowski, 1996; Tsoukas and Chia, 2002; Carlsen, 2006; Gehman, et al, 2013; Lok and de Rond, 2013).

But if change is immanent, how might it be further understood? What kind of language do we need to enable us, organizational researchers and practitioners alike, to account for, facilitate and deliberately direct organizational change? It is here where the received vocabulary of change reaches its limits. For if change is viewed through the “logic of replacement” (“episodic change”—see Weick and Quinn, 1999), we encounter the problem of motion again: since change occurs between stages, it remains unaccounted. Even when, instead, “the logic of attraction” (“continuous change”) is promisingly offered, vestiges of stage-based thinking remain (“freeze, rebalance, unfreeze”, Weick and Quinn, 1999: 379).

However, notice Vaill’s experiential language: he does not report a series of stages but “multiple time streams” (p.29) and a “field of relationships, flowing and shifting” (p.29). His experience of change is more fluid, continuous, and filled with novelty than stage-based models allow for. Moreover, even when deliberate change is discussed, the importance of chance events, unintended consequences and latent possibilities, and incomplete understanding cannot be underestimated (MacKay and Chia, 2013).

The question remains: if reality is so fluid how can change, especially deliberate change, be rethought without treating it as an object? To address this question I will draw on process philosophy, especially on the work of Henri Bergson, to show how his philosophical vocabulary enables us to better appreciate the immanence of change.

Bergson draws a distinction between “abstract time” and “concrete time” (Bergson, 1998:21; Hernes, 2014). Abstract time is time represented through symbols (e.g. clock time), while concrete time is experienced time, or what Bergson calls “duration”. Thus, Vaill begins to notice the importance of temporality in his organization insofar as he experiences the organization from *within*—he is no longer writing *about* what managers should do but he is acting from within the flow of actions embedded in multiple time streams. While the management professor thought *about* time (abstract time), the Dean lived *in* time (concrete time).

Abstract time is time spatialized: it consists of symbolic representations of time that capture positions but not the change between positions. Abstract time represents something that has already happened or refers to a projection to the future. It is static, lacking the fluidity of lived experience. By contrast, concrete time is *duration*—“the *happening* of what happens” (Guerlac, 2015: 31), an immediate awareness of flowing experience. For Bergson (1998:4), “our duration is not merely one instant replacing another. If it were, there would never be anything but the present—no prolonging of the past into the actual, no evolution, no concrete duration. Duration is the continuous progress of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances. And as the past grows without ceasing, so also there is no limit to its preservation”. The past is constantly drawn into the present like, when listening to a melody, present notes necessarily draw on past ones to form a coherent musical experience.

At any point in time, we think only with a small part of our past. However, our past, the whole past, is felt as an “impulse”, a “tendency” to act in a particular way (Bergson, 1998:5). The whole past can never be fully present, yet it is real, existing in a *virtual* dimension. Action in the present draws only on a few aspects of the whole past, according to the interests and priorities of the agent at the time. Vaill (1998:29) was “shocked to realize that something of great significance to me did not even exist, so to speak, for the person I was talking to [...]”. Insofar as the priorities, agendas and interests of organizational members differ, they focus on different aspects of organizational reality and draw on their differentiated immediate individual pasts. The rest of the past that is not brought forward to the present remains untapped in the unconscious (Bergson, 1998: 5).

Thus, for Bergson and his interpreters, to act is to induce the memory of the whole past to shrink according to the needs of the present. In the interest of action, attention is necessarily focused on the present, thus reducing the *intensity* of the whole past to a spatialized (extensive) conception of time (Hallward, 2006: 32). Insofar as we are typically interested in what we can do in the present, we assume that such a reduction is lasting, forgetting that the solidity of the actual is only apparent. However, the whole past does not go away. On the contrary, it may be selectively evoked in reconstructing present identity (Schultz and Hernes, 2013).

Access to the virtual can happen through *intuition*, not intellectual analysis, suggests Bergson. While analysis reduces an object to discrete elements already known, intuition involves “the *sympathy* by which one is transported into the interior of an object in order to coincide with what there is unique and constantly inexpressible in it” (Bergson, 1992: 161). Intuition provides knowledge from within—the kind of knowledge that involves the knower drawing on his/her experiences to identify with the characters in the situation at hand.

Knowledge from within furnishes the agent with an immediate awareness of the seamless web of reality. It dissolves dualistic thinking, making room for holistic awareness: from looking *at* a situation as a detached observer, an agent looks from *within* what is being observed. Such a shift in awareness *redirects* attention (Senge, 2005: 42): it both reveals connections and leads to a heightened sense of change. Reality is viewed more dynamically once one’s agency is appreciated. “What first appeared as fixed or even rigid begins to appear more dynamic because we’re sensing the reality as it is being created, and we sense our part in creating it” (Senge et al, 2005: 43).

Now, what does all this have to do with managing organizational change? A lot, I think. Change in organizations does not occur only as a visible outcome of deliberate managerial action. Even the mere lack of change may change people in the organization! The feeling of stagnation, for example, may transform those experiencing it. While actors cannot help but see themselves as standing separately from the world, thus privileging the action needs of the present and the particularism dualistic thinking implies (what this or that observer sees out there), a Bergsonian metaphysical stance enables actors to step back and strive for an intuitive grasp of organizational becoming.

There are benefits in doing so. If reality is intuitively grasped as continuous, indivisible and qualitatively diverse, practitioners may widen their perspective of how change is generated and managed. What escapes focal attention, because of the inescapable priority of the immediate needs of action, may turn out to be relevant and return later in the form of unintended consequences (MacKay and Chia, 2013: 211).

Consider the study of Gehman et al (2013). The authors studied the introduction of an honor code in

a large US business school over a ten-year period. They found that the development of the code was not a merely top-down initiative, although it may have appeared to be so from the outside, since it was initiated by a newly appointed Dean in 2006. “We found that”, note the authors, “the honor code emerged through a distributed and interactive process that stretched back over many years” (Gehman et al, 2013: 94). The honor code came about through what the authors call a process of “entanglement”: “concerned stakeholders were catalyzed by precipitating events, becoming spokespersons for specific values practices (collectively referred to as an “honor code”), and later, associating with each other” (op. cit., pp.94-95). For example, concerned stakeholders, such as advisory board members, turned out to be critical. Some of them brought their experiences along from their own organizations and/or from their children’s universities. Those experiences were critical in shaping their views of the need for an honor code.

A Bergsonian view of change enables one to grasp the importance of timing—the concreteness of lived time that is conducive to the likely synchronizing of diverse “time streams”. It also helps better understand duration—an awareness of how the past is drawn into the present and how the past preserved may become relevant at some point in the future (Schultz and Hernes, 2013).

Prior to the adoption of the particular honor code, following the appointment of a new Dean, there had been attempts to implement an honor code. Alas, they had not come to fruition. But their impact had not been lost, either. As the authors note, the stage had been set about five years prior to the new Dean’s arrival, “providing him with one of the possible initiatives that he could pursue in his new role” (Gehman et al, 2013:94). That the stage had been set did not mean that the development of the honor code was inevitable. The potential, however, was there. Initiatives and projects from five years ago were not immediately relevant to the present “integrity” drive of the new Dean (part of a strategic response to wider concerns with integrity, in the aftermath of well publicized corporate scandals), but *became* so in the present juncture. The virtuality of the whole organizational past provided an “impulse” (Bergson, 1998:5), a “preparedness for action” (Matthews, 1999: 130). Personal past experiences of key stakeholders, such as the accounting alumna’s (an advisory board member) sensitivity to

professional integrity, were brought to bear on the development of the code.

Although Gehman et al (2013) do not offer detailed first-person accounts, we can better understand key stakeholders’ concerns through the notion of intuition. Intuiting the undivided continuity of reality, rather than separating parts of one’s life, enables agents to install themselves into the moving reality itself (Bergson, 1992: 192). Thus, the accounting alumna’s membership of several networks (a mother of a student, an accounting professional and a financial services executive) enabled her to access different experiences, which she mindfully linked up to the situation at hand—the development of the honor code. Intuitive awareness overcomes boundaries—between objects or between internal and external perspectives. Facets of one’s reality are seamlessly joined up. Just like in intuiting the color orange, we enter into the spectrum of colors and sense a variety of shades between yellow and red (Bergson, 1992: 187), so, in intuiting a particular organizational reality, we sense a continuity of experiences. As Lawlor and Leonard (2013: 14) remark, “Bergsonian intuition is always an intuition of what is other”.

Failing to engage in intuition amounts to failing to identify with the situation at hand and thus, risk missing its uniqueness. In change management, the consequences are important, since the change agent tends to act out of pre-formed judgments of the situation (pre-judices) rather than enter it and strive to coincide with what is unique in it. In so far as this is the case, the change agent’s understanding is impoverished. Resistance, then, seems incomprehensible stubbornness or the pursuit of narrow-minded self-interest, whereas it may well be due to efforts to preserve identity (Goldstein, 1988; Tsoukas & Papoulias, 2005) or to being bound by unbeknown commitments (Kagan and Lahey, 2001; Hirschhorn, 1988). Intuition is likely to reveal the identity threats or the competing commitments that often stifle individual or collective ability to change. On this view, the change agent acts more like a therapist and less like a designer or an engineer.

In conclusion, I have argued that to understand change in its own terms, we need to appreciate its immanence. We will accomplish this to the extent we take seriously the insights from process philosophy (Mesle, 2008; Hernes, 2014; Langely et al, 2013). I have drawn here on the philosophical

vocabulary of Henri Bergson, although it should be noted that, philosophical subtleties aside, similar insights have been provided by the pragmatists, especially William James, and Alfred North Whitehead. Bergson, in particular, enables us to grasp the concreteness of lived time, the constitutive role of the past in the experienced present, and the recovery of aspects of the whole past through intuition. An intuitive grasp of organizational becoming is what is needed if change is to be fully appreciated and effectively handled.

From a research point of view, much remains to be done. We need to further understand how the past is brought forward to the present with what effects (paying particular attention to the role of language), how conceptions of the future influence the present, how predispositions to act orient change agents in particular ways, how redirection of attention is accomplished (or not), how emotions shape change processes, how the coordination of multiple time streams is (or is not) achieved, and so on. More importantly, perhaps, we need to insist, in terms of concepts used and research designs adopted, that change is not cast in the mould of receiving thinking, namely in terms of stage-based models, but that its vital impetus (Bergson's "élan vital") is grasped and explored.

References

- Bergson, H. (1992). *The creative mind*. New York: Citadel Press.
- Bergson H. (1998). *Creative evolution*. Mineola, NY: Dover, Authorized translation by A. Mitchell.
- Carlsen, A. (2006). Organizational becoming as dialogic imagination of practice: The case of the indomitable Gauls. *Organization Science*, 17, 132-149.
- Gehman, J., Trevino, L. & Garud, R. (2013). Values work: A process study of the emergence and performance of organizational values practices, *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 84-112.
- Goldstein, J. (1988). A far-from-equilibrium systems approach to resistance to change. *Organizational Dynamics*, 17, 16-26
- Guerlac, S. (2014). Time of emergence/emergence of time: Life in the age of mechanical (re)production. In R. Garud, B. Simpson, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The emergence of novelty in organizations* (pp. 27-55). Oxford: Oxford University Press,
- Hallward, P. (2006). *Deleuze and the philosophy of creation*. London: Verso.
- Hernes, T. (2014). *A Process theory of organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschhorn, L. (1988). *The workplace within*. Cambridge, MS.: The MIT Press.
- James, W. (1996). *A pluralistic universe*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kegan, R. & Lahey, L.L. (2001, November). The real reason people won't change. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 85-92.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H. & Van de Ven, A. (2013). Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 1-13.
- Lawlor, L. & Leonard, V.M. (2013). Henri Bergson. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/bergson/>
- Lok, J. & de Rond, M. (2013). On the plasticity of institutions: Containing and restoring practice breakdowns at the Cambridge University Boat Club. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 185-207.
- MacKay, B.R. & Chia, R. (2013). Choice, chance, and unintended consequences in strategic change: A process understanding of the rise and fall of NorthCo Automotive. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 208-230.
- Matthews, E. (1999). Bergson's concept of a person. In J. Mullarkey (Ed.), *The new Bergson* (pp. 118-134). Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.
- Mesle, R. C. (2008). *Process-relational philosophy*. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press.
- Orlikowski, W. (1996). Improvising organizational transformation over time: A situated change perspective. *Information Systems Research*, 7, 63-92.
- Sainsbury, R.M. (1988). *Paradoxes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schultz, M. & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity, *Organization Science*, 24, 1-21.
- Senge, P., Scharmer, O.C., Jaworski, J. & Flowers, B.S. (2005). *Presence*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Tsoukas, H. & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13, 567-582.
- Tsoukas, H. & D.B. Papoulias (2005). Managing third-order change: The case of the Public Power Corporation in Greece. *Long Range Planning*, 38, 79-95.
- Vaill, P. (1998). The unspeakable texture of process wisdom. In D.L. Cooperrider and S. Srivastva (Eds.), *Organizational wisdom and executive courage* (pp. 25-39). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Weick, K. E. & Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.

**EMERGENT LOGICS AND
INSTITUTIONAL WORK:
EVIDENCE FROM THE FIELD
OF THE ARMED FORCES**

Wade P. Smith

Norwich University

ODC 2012 Best Student Paper Award

With an emphasis on isomorphism, early neoinstitutional theory was criticized for lacking the theoretical tools necessary to explain change. In response, Friedland and Alford (1991) introduced the institutional logic perspective suggesting that the structural, normative, and symbolic dimensions of societal sectors are “available to organizations and individuals to elaborate” (p. 248). With a focus on “the purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at creating, maintaining, and disrupting” the taken-for-granted aspects of the fields in which they operate, studies of institutional work are able to shed light on how logics are changed and maintained (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 215). Though organizations are central players in such institutional processes, the scholarly attention given intra-organizational activities amidst change proj-

ects has remained limited to date. I thus explore the dynamic ways organizations are both responsive to and supportive of institutional change processes.

With an empirical focus on the rhetorical properties of managerially endorsed stories, the general research question I seek to answer is: As institutional logics change at the field-level, how do organizations rely on official stories to manage the internal pressures that arise from such change? To answer this question, I conducted a case study of the U.S. Army’s distribution of narrative accounts of history as the field of the armed forces experienced a transition from a uniquely Cold War to distinctly post-Cold War logic in the Cold War’s wake.

Case Study

Military scholars have identified the beginning and end of the Cold War as watershed events corresponding to dramatic changes in the material and symbolic dimensions that characterize the field of the armed forces. With these events, the primary perceived threat to national security shifted from concerns of enemy invasion to one of nuclear war with the onset of the Cold War, and to subnational and nonmilitary actors in its wake. With each distinct era, the values and principles of military service significantly changed, as did the focus, size, composition, principles, and measures of success for military organizations. It is thus my contention that each transition involved the replacement of one institutional logic with another.

For my research I analyzed the official stories included in the two primary leadership manuals produced by the U.S. Army during the post-Cold War era; a manual that self-admittedly serves to establish the fundamental principles of Army service. In support of such ends, these manuals contain 79 narrative accounts of events that extend throughout the organization’s long history. Following my analysis of the manifest and latent content of these official stories, I identified two categories of institutional work that I argue support the field-level transition from a Cold War to post-Cold War logic: mythologizing stability and legitimizing change.

Findings: Narratives of Continuity and Change

My analysis suggests that amidst field-level changes in the institutional logic that prevails, key organizational actors may support the change project by engaging in practices that, paradoxically, blur

boundaries between the current era and prior eras guided by dissimilar institutional logics, and build boundaries between these eras. While the blurring of boundaries relies on narratives of continuity, building boundaries relies on narratives of change.

Many of the stories I analyzed leverage institutional vocabulary to present a seamless history in terms of the logic that serves the field. Though distinct institutional logics have prevailed across time, many of the accounts suggest that unique characteristics of the emergent post-Cold War logic served the field in previous, notably dissimilar, eras. One story, for example, suggests in conclusion that an Army unit during the Korean War was successful because the unit's leader embraced "the Warrior Ethos and... Army Values that the Army currently espouses" (HQDA, 2006, p. 4-11). To imply that the Army's current values and ethos are the explanatory factors of success in prior eras is to imply that the current principles of Army service have been those that previously defined the organization.

Perhaps the most insightful examples of blurring boundaries, however, are less transparent than in the previous example but no less meaningful as they involve the embedding of emergent vocabularies of practice. As one example, many of the official stories I analyzed attribute battlefield successes extending to the Civil War to an unyielding reliance on "commander's intent" and "disciplined initiative" as opposed to direct orders that would likely have been valorized in prior eras. These concepts, embedded in the Army's lexicon and defined in detail during the 1990s, were developed to support unique characteristics of the post-Cold War battlefield and emergent conceptualizations of command and control. The strategic use of such a distinctly post-Cold War institutional vocabulary to characterize thought and action in prior eras effectively blurs the boundaries that exist between dissimilar eras.

In contrast to narratives of continuity, narratives of change build boundaries by rendering distinct eras visible. One means of building boundaries relies on comparisons of the material and symbolic dimensions of the post-Cold War Army to those that characterized earlier eras. In one account, for example, the soldier replacement system employed during World War II is noted to have been "seriously flawed" because soldiers were viewed as "just numbers" and reported to units inadequately trained. Textually embedded within a discussion of the

Army's current replacement system, the narrative renders the pre-Cold War logic supportive of a mass Army prepared to defend against an enemy invasion not only visible, but grossly inferior to the post-Cold War Army that embraces the development of a small, well-trained force.

Beyond such direct comparisons, other stories connect change to broader social discourses and establish a metanarrative of progress. One account, for example, describes the emergence of women in Army service. As the nation prepared for World War II, the Women's Army Corps was established "to fill administrative jobs, freeing men for service with combat units... [thus] contribut[ing] to winning WWII and open[ing] the door for employing the tremendous capabilities of female soldiers" (HQDA, 2006, p. 12-4). Drawing on a broader social discourse of gender equality and noting the progressive nature of the change—one in which the 'tremendous capabilities' offered by women in military service was accepted and contributed to the nation's success in a field-defining war—effectively serve to legitimize the changes taking shape. Such accounts build distinguishable and seemingly desirable boundaries between eras.

Discussion

Scholars suggest that with the emergence of a new dominant logic, the prior dominant logic will continue to be an influential factor in the field. Scholars have thus suggested that delegitimation of prior logics may be a necessary part of change processes. My results suggest that through the blurring of boundaries, delegitimation may not be required as the new logic may be recast as the long-standing logic for the field. Such a practice may overcome the obstacles to change posed by status quo defenders as such practices leave such actors with nothing unique to defend. Similarly, my findings suggest that via the building of boundaries, key actors distributing official stories leave status quo defenders with a discernibly inferior logic to defend, thus decreasing the legitimacy of their defense. In essence, my findings suggest that compliance with prevailing logics is partially made possible through 1) blurred boundaries that imply that this is not just 'how we do things around here,' but 'how we've *always* done things around here,' and 2) built boundaries that imply that this is 'how we *should* do things around here.' Paradoxically, through establishing such alignment and misalignment, key organizational

actors are seemingly able to restrict the actions of status quo defenders. In light of these suggestions, it is my hope that future studies will continue to take seriously the recent calls for scholars to consider intra-organizational efforts as institutional work when they constrain or enable change projects.

References

- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232-263). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA). (2006). *Army leadership: Competent, confident, and agile*. Field Manual No. 6-22. Washington, D.C.
- Lawrence, T., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed., pp. 215-254). London: Sage.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE DIVISION BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management, hereinafter referred to as the Division.

ARTICLE II. MISSION, COMMITMENT, and OBJECTIVES

1. Mission: The Organization Development and Change division represents scholars and practitioners who create and disseminate knowledge or extend the practice of constructive change management and organization development.

2. Commitment: We are committed to high quality academic research that makes a difference to both theory and practice. We are also committed to organization and individual success, the fulfillment of humanity's spirit and potential, and the creation of enduring global communities. Our research, teaching, and practice affirm the importance of integrat-

ing human-social, financial, and environmental outcomes; valuing justice, dignity, and trust; and generating ethical, positive, and meaningful contributions.

3. Objectives: We will fulfil our mission and commitment by:

- a. Providing a place in which scholars from various divisions can share a common bond of intellectual and research interest;
- b. Encouraging innovative research and non-traditional modes of thinking and scholarship;
- c. Fostering links between researchers, practitioners, and teachers to enhance our research, teaching and practice;
- d. Serving the developmental needs of our members;
- e. Providing a link to other professional groups; and
- f. Representing the Division and its members' interests within the broader AOM community and beyond.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this Division is open to any member of the Academy of Management who shares the Division's mission, commitment, and objectives.

ARTICLE IV. MEETINGS

1. Business Meetings: The Division shall hold one regularly scheduled business meeting each year at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (Annual Meeting). The Board may schedule other business meetings as necessary.

2. Board Meetings: The Board shall meet at the Annual Meeting and at least one more time annually, to consider policy and planning for the Division. The additional meetings may be either face-to-face or virtual. Between Board meetings, additional business shall be conducted electronically / using communication methods that are commonly accessible to all members.

ARTICLE V. OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES

1. Officers: The officers of the Division shall be elected and appointed.

- a. The elected officers of the Division shall be the Division Chair, Division Chair-Elect, Program Chair, PDW Chair, PDW Chair-Elect, two General Representatives-at-Large, one Doctoral

Student Representative-at-Large, and one Executive/ Practitioner Representative-at-Large

- b. The appointed officers of the Division shall be Secretary/Treasurer, Member Engagement Coordinator, Newsletter Editor, Communications Director, and other officers appointed as necessary by the Board.

2. Board: The ODC Board's Executive Committee shall consist of officers elected by the ODC membership and the ODC Board shall be comprised of all elected officers and officers appointed by the Executive Committee.

- a. The Board shall approve any operating policies or procedures necessary for the functioning of ODC.
- b. The Board shall appoint additional officers as needed. Appointed officers shall attend Board meetings and have voting rights unless otherwise specified.
- c. The Board may fill elected officer positions that become vacant prior to the end of a term as set for in Article V.3.e below.
- d. All issues presented to the Board for a vote will be deemed approved or disapproved when:
 - i. a majority of a quorum of the Board votes in the affirmative, AND
 - ii. a majority of a quorum of the Executive Committee votes in the affirmative. (Should an issue receive a majority of Board votes, but a minority of Executive Committee votes, the issue is defeated.)
 - iii. A quorum is defined as a majority of voting members for the Board and the Executive Committee.
- e. The Board shall perform other activities as necessary to execute the responsibilities specified in these bylaws.

3. Terms of Office of Elected Officers

- a. All elected officers except Representatives-at-Large shall hold office for a period of one year. The term of office shall begin at the end of the Business Meeting held at the Annual Meeting and terminate at the end of the Business Meeting at the next Annual Meeting. After serving one year in their current office, the order of succession for officers other than Representatives-at-Large shall be:

- i. Division Chair-Elect to Division Chair
- ii. Program Chair to Division Chair-Elect
- iii. PDW Chair to Program Chair
- iv. PDW Chair-Elect to PDW Chair.

- b. The General Representatives-at-Large shall be elected for a period of three years.
- c. The Doctoral Student-at-Large Representative shall be elected for a period of two years.
- d. The Executive/Practitioner Representative-at-Large shall be elected for a period of three years.
- e. Should a vacancy occur in any office because of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or otherwise, the Executive Committee will determine how the responsibilities of the office in question will be executed, including the appointment of a Division member to serve in the position until the next election cycle or to complete the officer's term.

4. Duties of Elected Officers

- a. The Division Chair shall:
 - i. Serve as chief officer of the Division and administer all affairs of the Division in coordination with the Division's Executive Committee, the officers of the Academy of Management, and in compliance with the Academy's policies for Professional Divisions;
 - ii. Chair the Board and the Executive Committee;
 - iii. Preside over the annual Business Meeting of the Division at the Annual Meeting and present a report on the status of the Division at that meeting;
 - iv. Plan and Chair Board meetings held in conjunction with, and independent of, the Annual Meeting;
 - v. Oversee the expenditures of the Division's budget and be accountable to the membership for proper management of all Divisional expenditures and activities;
 - vi. Coordinate sponsorships and fundraising opportunities;
 - vii. Each year identify for the Program Chair those individuals due to be recognized by

the Division for services rendered as an elected or appointed officer, subject to the relevant criteria; and

viii. Manage the process of amending these bylaws in accordance with Article IX below.

b. The Division Chair-Elect shall:

i. Succeed the Division Chair at the end of the Business Meeting at the Annual Meeting;

ii. Serve as the Chair of the Nominating Committee for the election of new officers;

iii. Organize, schedule, and preside over the Doctoral Student Consortium

iv. Act for the Division Chair in the Chair's absence or disability; and

v. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.

c. The Program Chair shall:

i. Develop and schedule the ODC scholarly program at the Annual Meeting;

ii. Recruit a Program Committee (as needed) to assist in planning and developing the program for the Annual Meeting including scheduling the meeting of the Executive Committee and any other meetings as may be necessary;

iii. Coordinate the selection of the Divisions' paper and reviewer award winners at the Annual Meeting;

iv. Plan and scheduled the ODC Division Social Hour and other meetings as necessary at the Annual Meeting;

v. Recruit the Distinguished Speaker for the Annual Meeting the final selection of whom is to be approved by a vote of the Executive Committee; and

vi. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.

d. The PDW Chair shall:

i. Develop and coordinate the ODC Professional Development Workshops (PDWs) and other

pre-conference activities at the Annual Meeting;

ii. Coordinate with the Chair-Elect the scheduling of the Doctoral Student Consortium; and

iii. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.

e. The PDW Chair-Elect shall:

i. Work with the PDW Chair in developing the ODC PDW Program at the Annual Meeting;

ii. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agree to.

f. General Representatives-at-Large (2) shall (as necessary):

i. Assist with the planning and implementation of divisional and/or joint divisional activities during his/her term in office. These efforts may include acting as liaison with counterparts in other divisions as well as coordinating ODC Division volunteers recruited for the purposes of assisting in these events;

ii. Act as a conduit for communication with Divisional members by gathering news on and of interest to members for inclusion in all Division communications;

iii. Represent the views of the general membership at Executive Committee and Business Meetings; and

iv. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.

g. The Doctoral Student Representative-at-Large (1) shall:

i. Act as a conduit for communication with Division student members by gathering news on and of interest to student members for inclusion in all Division communications;

ii. Represent the views of student members at Executive Committee and Business meetings;

iii. Assist the Division Chair-Elect with the Doctoral Student Consortium; and

- iv. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.
- h. The Executive/Practitioner Representative-at-Large (1) shall:
 - i. Act as a conduit for communication with Division Executive/Practitioner members by gathering news on and of interest to executive/practitioner members for inclusion in Division communications
 - ii. Represent the views of executive/practitioner members at Executive Committee and Business meetings;
 - iii. Assist the Program Chair and PDW Chair with the development and selection of scholarly sessions and PDW's at the Annual Meeting that address the interests of executive/practitioner members;
 - iv. Serve as liaison between Division and other professional practitioner organizations; and
 - v. Assume any other responsibilities requested by the Division Chair and/or Executive Committee and agreed to.

5. Terms of Office of Appointed Officers

Unless otherwise specified, all appointed officers shall serve for a period of two years. The term of office shall begin at the close of the Business Meeting at the Annual Meeting and terminate at the close of the Business Meeting at the following Annual Meeting two years hence. Reappointment for additional terms may be made at the discretion of the Executive Committee with the agreement of the appointed officer.

6. Duties of Appointed Officers

- a. The Division Secretary/Treasurer shall:
 - i. Be responsible for all aspects of the division's finances and maintaining compliance with Academy of Management financial guidelines;
 - ii. Forecast and monitor division expenses to align with the division's allocated funding;
 - iii. Update the division's Executive Committee on the status of the division's finances; and
 - iv. Generate invoices and requests for funds to facilitate the flow of funds into and out of the division's financial accounts.

- v. Keep and distribute minutes of each of the semi-annual Board meetings;
- vi. Collect and maintain the historical and current records of the Division; and
- vii. The Secretary/Treasurer is a voting member of the Board.
- b. The Communication Director shall:
 - i. In coordination with the Chair, manage and oversee all aspects of the Division's communications with its members.
 - ii. Chair the Communications Committee;
 - iii. Gather communications from each of the officers for inclusion in all of the Division's communications;
 - iv. The Communication Director is a voting member of the Board.
- c. The Member Engagement Coordinator
 - i. In coordination with the Communication Director, communicate with all new members welcoming them to the Division;
 - ii. Organize events and processes for introducing new members to the Annual Meeting and to the membership in general;
 - iii. Work in close cooperation with other members of the board to develop and deliver opportunities for member engagement;
 - iv. The Member Engagement Coordinator is a voting member of the Board
- d. The Newsletter Editor shall:
 - i. Coordinate the content and delivery of the Newsletter with the Communication Director and Membership Engagement Coordinator;
 - ii. Gather news on the Division and its members of interest to the membership for inclusion in the Newsletter;
 - iii. Prepare two Divisional Newsletters per year, deliver them to the Webmaster for uploading to the ODC website, and notify the Communication Director so that members may be notified about the availability and highlights of the Newsletter.

- iv. The Newsletter Editor is a voting member of the Board
- e. The Webmaster shall:
 - i. Manage the ODC Division's website and keep it up-to-date in coordination with the Communication Director.
 - ii. The Webmaster is not a voting member of the Board
- f. The Chair of the Research Committee shall:
 - i. Help fulfil the research elements of the ODC Division's mission by working to develop and promote high scholarship across the division.
 - ii. The Chair of the Research Committee is a voting member of the Board.

ARTICLE VI. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. The elected officers of the Division shall be the Division Chair, Division Chair Elect, Program Chair, PDW Chair, PDW Chair Elect, two (2) General Representatives-at-Large, the Executive / Practitioner Representative-at-Large, and the Doctoral Student Representative-at-Large. Division Chair, Division Chair Elect, Program Chair, and PDW Chair are not subject to new election but assume their roles by succession outlined in Article V.3.a.
2. The Nominating Committee shall consist of the Division Chair-Elect, the PDW Chair and a Division member who is not an officer, appointed by the Executive Committee. The Division Chair-Elect shall serve as Chair of the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee shall follow the processes specified in these bylaws in nominating and electing officers.
3. The Nominating Committee shall annually, and prior to the end of February, send the membership a nominating ballot, calling for nominations for the positions of PDW Chair-Elect and any other elected positions that may have come open. This process is coordinated with the AoM office who provides the online tool for collecting nominations. The name of the member receiving the highest number of nominations will be listed on the election ballot with other names as specified below.
 - The Board is committed to diversity within its membership. Consistent with this commitment, the Nominating Committee is directed to find

candidates that ensure diversity, particularly in terms of gender and geographic location.

4. There will be a minimum of two and a maximum of three names on the election ballot for each open position. In addition to the name or names identified through the nominating ballot above, the Nominating Committee may suggest one or two additional names based on the Nominating Committee's judgment of the potential leadership contributions possible nominees might make to the Division. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Nominating Committee to ensure that each individual appearing on the ballot is a member of the Division and is willing and able to serve the full term in the position for which he or she is nominated.
5. No more than two elected officers may serve from the same institution at a time. Therefore, no individual may be placed on the ballot who is employed at the same institution as two current officers.
6. No person can appear on the final ballot as a nominee for more than one office. If the nomination process results in a person qualifying as a nominee for more than one office, this person will be a nominee for the office s/he designates.
7. In the event that no one is nominated for an open position, the nominee with the highest number of nominations declines the opportunity to appear on the ballot or is not appropriate for the position, the Nominating Committee shall develop a slate of candidates for that position, subject to Article VI. 4.
8. The election ballot will list the candidates for each position together, in alphabetical order. The ballot will also include a brief biographical sketch (maximum of 250 words) and picture for each candidate running for a specific position. The Chair-Elect shall be responsible for coordinating the election with the Academy of Management Office to conduct the election by electronic ballot.
9. The final ballot results shall be communicated to the membership immediately upon completion of the election after the candidates have been personally notified by the Chair-Elect of the outcome.
10. The vote count shall be considered confidential information and shall not be disseminated further.

ARTICLE VII. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

1. An elected officer may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting by electronic

ballot provided that at least 25 per cent of the membership votes. In the event that less than 25 per cent of the membership votes, ballots will continue to be conducted until the matter is resolved.

2. A vote for removal may be initiated by a majority vote of the Executive Committee or a petition submitted to the Division Executive Committee bearing verified signatures of 10% of Division members in good standing as of 1 July in the year during which the petition is submitted.

3. The Nominating Committee shall be responsible for conducting the removal vote, assuring a fair vote and reporting the results to the membership. Should a sitting officer be removed in this manner, the Executive Committee shall determine the disposition of the officer's duties during the remainder of the term, subject to Article V.3.e.

4. Should a member of the Nominating Committee be the subject of the removal process, the Executive Committee shall replace that individual with an appropriate ODC Division Member for the duration of the process.

5. An appointed member of the Board may be removed by a majority vote of Board members.

ARTICLE VIII. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1. The Division Chair shall be assisted in policy formulation and the operation of the Division by such standing and special committees as are authorized in the Bylaws.

2. Standing committees shall include the Program Committee, Nominating Committee, Membership Engagement Committee, Communications Committee, Research Committee, and the Awards Committee. The Division Chair shall be an ex officio member of each committee. The respective committee chairs shall recruit/appoint members of their committees as necessary, subject to these by-laws. Unless otherwise specified by the by-laws and/or the Executive Committee, composition and responsibilities of these committees will be determined by the respective committee chairs.

3. The Division Chair may appoint, with the advice of the Executive Committee, special committees, as necessary. The life of all such committees shall expire with the completion of the specified assignment.

ARTICLE IX. AMENDMENTS

1. Any proposed amendment(s) to these Bylaws must be made available to the Division's members at least one month prior to a vote on the amendment(s).

2. Amendment(s) to the Bylaws sponsored by the Executive Committee shall require a two-thirds vote of the membership voting by electronic ballot provided that at least 25 per cent of the membership vote.

3. Counting and certification of ballots shall be the responsibility of the Division Chair with assistance from the Academy of Management Headquarters Office.

ARTICLE X. STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Nomination Committee

- a. Chair: Chair-Elect
- b. Members:
 - i. PDW Chair
 - ii. Division member who is not an officer
- c. Duties are specified in Article VI

2. Program Committee

- a. Chair: Program Chair
- b. Members: as needed
- b. Duties:
 - i. Development and scheduling of scholarly program at Annual Meeting
 - ii. Selection of Distinguished Scholar
 - iii. Selection of best paper and best reviewer award winners

3. Communications Committee

- a. Chair: Communication Director
- b. Members:
 - i. Newsletter Editor
 - ii. Webmaster
 - iii. others as needed
- c. Duties:
 - i. Execution of communication strategy

- ii. Reliable and regular communications with members

4. Membership Engagement Committee

- a. Chair: Member Engagement Coordinator
- b. Members:
 - i. Executive / Practitioner / Student Representative-at-Large
 - ii. Other members as appropriate
- c. Duties: The Committee shall create activities and opportunities to foster linkages among Division members and engage in professional and social activities of interest to members throughout the year.

5. Research Committee

- a. Chair: Appointed by the Executive Committee
- b. Members: General Representative-at-Large, Doctoral Student Representative-at-Large
- c. Duties: Work with and act in a supporting function to members of the Executive Committee to help fulfil the research elements of the Division’s mission by offering opportunities to develop and promote high quality academic scholarship. Examples of supporting activities may include: encouraging cooperation among members of the division on doing research; encouraging the plurality of research perspectives and methods to support the mission of the division; providing the Newsletter editor with state-of-the art research findings/insights on ODC topics suggesting/organizing research-based PDWs and/or symposia for the AOM meeting.

6. Awards Committee

- a. Chair: Chair-Elect
- b. Members:
 - i. General Representative-at-Large (1)
 - ii. others as needed
- c. Duties: Identify and select recipient(s) of non-program based awards

These Bylaws were

- Proposed by ODC Board, September 2014
- Adopted by vote of ODC membership, November 2014

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the *ODC Newsletter* may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. Please address all correspondence to:

R. Wayne Boss
 Academy of Management ODC Newsletter
 Leeds School of Business
 Campus Box 419
 University of Colorado at Boulder
 Boulder, Colorado 80309
 (303)492-8488
 Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

1. Do you have any comments that you would like to share with the editor (comments on articles from the last issue, comments on this issue, suggestions, etc.)?

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

2. Is there any important information about you or a colleague that you would like to have appear in the next issue?

PUBLICATIONS

3. Please list all recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague. (Indicate full citation.)
