

ANZAM 2006 CONFERENCE

**BALANCING CONTINUITY AND CHANGE THROUGH FORMS OF
ORGANISING**

AUTHORS:

Fiona Graetz

Bowater School of Management & Marketing
Deakin University
Melbourne
graetzf@deakin.edu.au

Aaron Smith

School of Sport, Tourism & Hospitality Management
La Trobe University
Melbourne
aaron.smith@latrobe.edu.au

BALANCING CONTINUITY AND CHANGE THROUGH FORMS OF ORGANISING

ABSTRACT

Faced with increasing environmental complexity and uncertainty, organisations have been urged to replace traditional bureaucratic structures with more flexible, responsive forms of organising. However, the emerging paradox is that exploration and experimentation, features of new forms of organising, benefit from the planning, coordinating and direction-setting mechanisms that underpin traditional forms of organising. It is therefore important to recognise the distinctive and complementary features of traditional and new forms of organising. This demands a dualities-sensitive perspective which encourages, rather than tries to resolve, a constructive tension between seemingly contradictory organising forms such as flexibility and efficiency, autonomy and control, hierarchy and networks, focus and diversification. Managing continuity and change through forms of organising becomes central to building healthy organisations.

TRADITIONAL VERSUS NEW FORMS OF ORGANISING

A substantial body of literature on new forms of organising has emerged over the last two decades of the twentieth century. Nohria and Berkley (1994: 108) suggested that the quest for the new organisation has spawned its own industry from as early as the 1950s. The literature on new forms of organising, while divergent in approach and conclusion, embodies a shared rhetorical framework: 'the world is changing, traditional bureaucracy is bankrupt and the future is now—or at least soon' (Nohria and Berkley 1994: 108). It advocates a horizontal, boundaryless organisation, a network of interconnecting parts, comprising smaller, cross-functional business units and inter-organisational partnerships and alliances (Ghoshal and Bartlett 1995; Blumenthal and Haspeslagh 1994; Dunphy and Stace 1993; Limerick and Cunningham 1993; Ulrich and Wiersema 1989). In short, if organisations are to succeed in the new world order, it is argued, they must shrug off the bureaucracy-laden shackles of the traditional command and control system and experiment with more flexible and agile organisational forms which support and encourage innovation, exploration and learning (Bahrami 1992; Jonsson 2000).

The calls for more flexible and agile forms of organising are based on the premise that environmental hyper-turbulence demands a certain type of response for which traditional organisational forms are ill-equipped. More recent studies, however, question the displacement of bureaucracy (O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Pettigrew, Whittington, Melin, Sanchez-Runde, Van Den Bosch, Ruigrok and Numagami 2003; Palmer and Dunford 2002; Raynor and Bower 2001; Volberda 1998). These studies suggest that high performing organisations are adopting dual forms of organising in which the controllability advantages associated with traditional forms work to complement and support the responsiveness attributes of new forms (O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Pettigrew et al 2003).

A number of key themes emerge from the new forms literature. These include the simultaneous quest for effectiveness and responsiveness in a largely uncertain and complex environment. This is allied to the notion of a dualities approach in which the synergistic benefits of managing contradictory organising poles such as freedom and control, hierarchy and networks, global operating control and local responsiveness, centralised vision and decentralised autonomy, are recognised (Pettigrew et al 2003; Child and McGrath 2001). A dualities aware approach recognises that paradox and contradiction are a natural and legitimate part of organisational behaviour. According to Lewin, Long and Carroll (1999: 541), those organisations most likely to explore and experiment with new forms of organising have, over many years, established a *dual* adaptation strategy: one arm aimed at *exploration* and the other at *exploitation*. The salient question is no longer how to replace traditional with new forms of organising, but how to manage dual forms of organising.

It is therefore important to recognise the composition and context of traditional and new forms of organising in order to appreciate the complementarities in the relationship. This review of the organising forms literature points to a necessary, creative tension between traditional and new forms of organising to ensure a balance between organisational design factors reflected in the meta-duality of continuity and change, which Evans (1992: 260) regards as central to building healthy organisations. The paper first explores the contextual forces that shaped the evolution of traditional organising forms as well as their perceived obsolescence. It then charts the birth of new forms of organising and explores attempts to balance the old and the new. The final discussion section proposes five duality

characteristics and considers the role that duality thinking plays in mediating the continuity-change relationship by encouraging, rather than trying to resolve, a constructive tension between seemingly contradictory organising forms.

Understanding Traditional Forms of Organising

The application of hierarchy and structure to create order, provide a chain of command, and set direction is found in the pages of history on both Eastern and Western religions, in military organisations and governments (Ashkenas, Ulrich, Jick and Kerr 2002: 38-39). However, the technological advances of the industrial revolution gave rise to a new, classical management perspective that led to the emergence of bureaucratic structures in which standardisation and mass production were the cornerstones (Volberda 1998: 19).

Four literatures provide the foundation for the classical management perspective: scientific management, classical organisation theory, classical economics, and bureaucratic theory (Volberda 1998: 19; Fenton and Pettigrew 2000). Frederick Winslow Taylor championed the principles of scientific management, articulating a systematic approach to the management of organisational activity based largely on the efficiencies of specialisation. The scientific management perspective focused on the activities of individual workers instead of the whole group, and stressed economic incentives as the chief source of motivation (Volberda 1998: 19). In contrast, classical organisation theory took a broader view, focussing on organisation design (Volberda 1998: 20). According to Henri Fayol, management was a process of planning, organising, coordinating and controlling (Morgan 1997: 18) which encompassed the principles of rational organisation: unity of command, span of control, division of work, equity and stability of tenure (Volberda 1998: 20; Morgan 1997: 19). While scientific management and classical organisational theory have played a pivotal and lasting part in the structure and design of organisations, it was classical economic theory, and Weber's (1947) theory of bureaucracy in particular, that provided intellectual legitimacy for the classical management perspective (Volberda 1998: 20). Weber developed the classic composition of bureaucracy which emphasised the importance of applying transparent, calculable rules that were understood by everyone (DiMaggio 2001: 8).

To appreciate the magnitude of the current transformation in forms of organising, it is important to look at the classical management paradigm that prevailed for a large part of the twentieth century. The defining feature was a sharp division in activities and rewards between management and labour (DiMaggio 2001: 37). This management-worker divide served to isolate the brain of the organisation from the producing body in order to create a management cadre that served as a repository and processor of knowledge expropriated from lesser members of the organisation (Nohria and Berkley 1994: 117): ‘The overall picture of the firm was one of order, predictability, and hierarchy; in short, a well-coordinated machine with a fixed repertoire of routines’ (DiMaggio 2001: 37-38).

Critics of the bureaucratic approach attacked it as dehumanising, impersonal and autocratic (Etzioni 1964; Whyte 1956). As criticism gained momentum, the focus shifted from organisational design to work groups (Limerick and Cunnington 1993: 23). Elton Mayo’s famous Hawthorne Studies reconceptualised assumptions about human nature and the impact of the working context, ultimately setting the scene for the shift in focus from the economic to the social worker (Limerick and Cunnington 1993: 23). The human relations movement and subsequent behavioural humanist studies (eg. the Tavistock group) rejected technological determinism and focussed on improving social systems processes as a means of achieving organisational effectiveness (Volberda 1998: 23). The focus now was on understanding the needs of the individual in the group context, and providing a supportive environment that would help build self-esteem and realise individual growth needs.

The graduation from simple, functional forms to more complex divisional and matrix structures was driven initially in the mid-1960s by firm growth and maturity. Increasing complexity necessitated more sophisticated coordinating and control mechanisms for organising work which inexorably encompassed both the structural and humanist dimensions of organisation design. Organisations began experimenting with more open and fluid channels of communication, greater cross-functional collaboration and multiple reporting relationships as in the matrix structure. However, while finetuning was underway at the core of corporate bureaucracy, it was ‘certainly not graying or under challenge’ and ‘the basic tenets of stability still held fast’ (DiMaggio 2001: 38).

The nexus between structure, environment, technology and the relational dimensions of organisation intensified with the work of the contingency theorists during the late 1950s and 1960s. While classical management theory saw the organisation as a machine operating in a hermetically sealed environment, proponents of contingency theory viewed organisations as open systems interacting with, and responding to, changes in their environments. For example, Lawrence and Lorsch's (1967) pioneering research on differentiation and integration in complex organisations proposed that the rate of environmental change should determine the degree of structural differentiation and integration within an organisation. Burns and Stalker (1961) were among the first to dispute the validity and applicability of a universal, closed system, arguing that organisational form was contingent on the degree of stability or change in the environment. They distinguished between two polar systems of organising: mechanistic and organic. In a relatively stable and predictable environment using routine technology, the mechanistic system (geared for efficiency through uniformity), specialisation, high formalisation and clear lines of authority, would function most successfully. However, in more turbulent and uncertain environments, superior performance would be gained from a more flexible and organic form (Fenton and Pettigrew 2000: 13; Morgan 1997: 44-45; Limerick and Cunnington 1993: 30-31).

Waldersee, Griffiths and Lai (2000: 4), on the other hand, suggested that organisational types may be identified by two distinct sets of change capabilities (2000: 10): dynamic capabilities, such as flexibility and adaptability encapsulated in the organic form of organising; and operational or resource capabilities that reflect the mechanistic form. The ability to perform both was central to success in contemporary organisations. Waldersee et al's conclusions emphasise the paradox that is central to the dynamics of organising forms particularly if, as Groth (1999: 369) argued, coordination represents the linchpin of organisation. While the tenets of bureaucracy technically remain allied with efficiency, the popular notion of bureaucracy has come to stand for the opposite. The positive legacy of bureaucracy—civil liberty, neutrality, impartiality, reduction in nepotism and corruption—tends to be overlooked in the criticism of its weaknesses—lack of responsiveness, rigidity, excessive red tape and muzzling of creativity and individuality (Clegg 2005: 530; Asch and Salaman 2002: 134; Ashkenas et al 2002: 398).

Towards New Forms of Organising

While efficiency, achieved through standardisation and specialisation, was the catch-cry of the 1950s and 1960s, quality and a customer-first approach became the mantra of the 1970s and 1980s. By the mid-1980s, the changing business dynamics spawned by globalisation, deregulation and advances in technology demanded greater flexibility and responsiveness. In an attempt to relax the rigid formalities of the functional structure, organisations graduated to a divisional structure. However, each business division in itself remained complex, hierarchical, and procedural, a replication of the central organisation with its own functionally specialised departments (Groth 1999: 160).

In response, the matrix configuration was an attempt to combine the efficiencies of the functional structure with the responsiveness of the divisional structure. However, it was also vulnerable to a number of shortcomings. These included conflicting lines of responsibility and authority, and possible friction between central headquarters and divisions (Limerick and Cunnington 1993: 43). To overcome these deficiencies and improve synergies, many organisations began establishing smaller, *networking* business units.

Meanwhile, the burgeoning Japanese economy stimulated a Western interest in total quality management (TQM) (Imai 1986). Like the matrix fad, TQM married the order and progressiveness of a centralised bureaucracy with the process-driven innovation of teams (Scholtes 1989). Reengineering was probably the management buzzword of the nineties. Hammer and Champy (1993) defined reengineering as the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures, such as cost, quality, service and speed. Similar to the impact of TQM, and of relevance to the evolution of new forms of organising, were the use of nimble project teams and the rejection of bureaucratic structures for process-analysis.

The 1980s and early 1990s provided the theoretical foundations for new forms of organising. In addition to appropriating earlier notions about the importance of social interactions and teamwork, the period demonstrated that the ideals of new forms could be introduced within conventional bureaucracies. Its legacy was also a reinterpretation of the relationship between organisational structure and processes. As the technological drive, rampant globalisation and economic recession of

the 1990s took hold, an additional dimension—that of organisational boundaries— was increasingly considered as a variable in determining organising form (Pettigrew and Fenton 2000).

Balancing Traditional and New Forms of Organising

The changing boundaries of the globalising firm, the growth of the knowledge firm in the new economy, and the emergence of ‘network’ organisations reflected the need to connect structure, systems, people and processes within the dynamics of organisational design. A growing body of studies (for example the INNFORM project; Palmer and Dunford’s Australian-based research data; and O’Reilly and Tushman’s research on the rise of ambidextrous organisations) indicate that high performing, innovating organisations were adopting dual forms of organising as they simultaneously developed networks alongside hierarchies, pursued centralisation and decentralisation, differentiation and integration, and empowerment and control (Pettigrew et al, 2003).

Healthy organisations therefore represent dualistic entities (Pettigrew & Fenton, 2000), a juxtaposition of opposing forces such as short and long term imperatives, differentiation and integration, external and internal orientation, flexibility and efficiency, and dependence and independence, that operate by ‘mutual specification’ rather than mutual exclusivity (Ford & Backoff, 1988, 100). The resulting tensions which arise represent a natural, legitimate and invigorating part of organisational behaviour (Evans, 1999).

Continuity and change in forms of organising

The essential philosophies of both traditional and new forms of organising, as illustrated in Table 1, reflect the ongoing tension between continuity and change. The old forms paradigm, characterised by stability, hierarchy, specialisation, formalisation and centralisation, remains an enduring and valuable form of organising. However, the hardwired operational capabilities of the traditional form of organising are not enough to deal with the vagaries of a complex, often volatile, external environment. Operational capabilities represent only one half of the organisation design equation. They need to be coupled with dynamic capabilities, associated with the new forms paradigm. Dynamic capabilities provide the springboard to innovation and change, while operational capabilities represent the resources and support mechanisms that facilitate experimentation and exploration, essential for

developing dynamic capabilities. Change and continuity come together when old and new forms of organising operate in a two-way, bi-directional partnership. The partnership between old and new forms of organising (or continuity and change) is mediated through the planning, organising, coordinating and controlling functions that form the metaphorical engine room of the organisation. Its functions are non-negotiable and intrinsic to managing the dynamic balance between the traditional and new forms paradigms. Here the operational capabilities that underpin the values of traditional forms of organising and the dynamic capabilities that underscore the essence of new organising forms coalesce as complementary, not contradictory, forces.

Table 1: Linking continuity and change in the organisation's engine room

'Old' forms paradigm	<i>Operational capabilities</i>	The engine room of organisational form & function Planning Organising Coordinating Controlling	<i>Dynamic capabilities</i>	'New' forms paradigm Uncertainty, turbulence Adaptability, responsiveness Cooperative networks & alliances Loosely coupled, boundaryless
Stability Hierarchy Specialisation Formalisation Centralisation				

Synthesising old and new

These observations suggest that an evolutionary synthesis has occurred between traditional (mechanistic and bureaucratic with a structural orientation) and new (organic and flexible with a process orientation) forms of organising. Paradigmatically, this synthesis incorporates both preservation and change. Bureaucracy, and the human relations antidote that catapulted the social dimension of organisation design to the fore, are each evident in the components of mechanistic (coordination and control through structure and hierarchy), and organic (flexibility and responsiveness through cross-functional cooperation and collaboration) forms of organising. These coalesce in the dual concern for structure and process issues found in recent empirical data concerning the organisational forms being used by large companies (Pettigrew et al 2003; Palmer and Dunford 2002; Pettigrew and Fenton 2000).

Unsurprisingly, therefore, flexibility, associated with speed, agility and adaptability, has emerged as the underpinning imperative in the quest for more effective and responsive forms of organisation (Jonsson 2000; Dijksterhuis, Van den Bosch and Volberda 1999; Ulrich and Wiersema 1989; Kanter

1996; Hamel and Prahalad 1994; Goss, Pascale and Athos 1993; Kanter, Stein and Jick 1992). Organisational form has moved from an emphasis on order, stability, and control to changeability, variability, instability and agility (Volberda 1998: 26). However, while flexibility is intuitively understood to encompass mobility, responsiveness, suppleness, liveness and adaptability (Volberda 1998: 2), this represents only one side of the flexibility equation. This is certainly the case if we accept that flexibility needs to be anchored in stability to avoid spiralling out of control.

Bahrami (1992: 35-36), for example, defined organisational flexibility as polymorphous combining: firstly agility, the ability to move or change course quickly to take advantage of an opportunity or side-step a threat; secondly versatility, the ability to undertake different activities and apply different capabilities depending on the needs of a particular situation; thirdly robustness, the ability to absorb shocks and adversity; and fourthly resilience, the ability to recover from the brink of disaster without suffering permanent scars or disabilities. Once flexibility is regarded as a multidimensional concept (Volberda 1998: 81; Bahrami 1992: 48), the two sides of the flexibility equation come into focus: agility and versatility provide the springboard to innovation and change, while robustness and resilience provide the stable platform from which exploration and experimentation can be safely and expeditiously pursued. The problem is that change and preservation are generally treated as dichotomous rather than complementary elements of the organisational design equation. By favouring only one side of the change-preservation paradox, organisations risk either paralysis through inaction or chaos through overreaction.

Organising Form Dualities

In contemporary organisations, the relationship between new and old forms of organising might be better understood in terms of complementary, rather than contradictory, tensions. These tensions or opposites have been variously labelled paradoxes (Quinn & Cameron, 1988), dilemmas (Stace & Dunphy, 2001; Hampden-Turner, 1990; McLaren, 1982), dialectics (Mittroff & Linstead, 1993), competing goals and values (Cyert & March, 1992) and dualities (Sanchez-Runde & Pettigrew, 2003; Pettigrew & Fenton, 2000; Evans & Doz, 1989). The implication is that to survive and succeed in the

knowledge economy, organisations need to harness the power of paradox by encouraging a constructive tension between the opposing forces that are embodied in continuity and change.

The dilemma for organisations is learning to understand and master the interplay between continuity and change. If continuity and change are the basis of organisational learning and development, duality thinking becomes the conceptual platform for mediation in the organisation's engine room. It is critical therefore that organisations understand what constitute the characteristics of duality thinking that they must embrace. These are difficult to isolate and describe because despite the wealth of literature on forms of organising and dualities, there has yet to emerge an overarching dualities framework that synthesises the concepts and terms that have been applied to duality thinking. An instructive first step therefore was to map the evolving discussion in the literature on forms of organising and the role of duality thinking. The duality characteristics identified and described in the following section reflect the recurring themes which emerged from this literature analysis.

Duality Characteristics

In the pursuit of coherence, most theories of change have tended to treat structure and action, stability and change, and external and internal causality as independent, unrelated variables, typically privileging one at the expense of the other (Van de Ven & Poole, 1988). However, accepting ambiguity as an essential dynamic within the organisational design equation demands a dualities-sensitive approach, requiring a more reflexive, multi-layered mode of thinking. Unlike theories based on linear assumptions, a dualities framework captures the contextual nature of paradox which is embedded in organisations (Cameron & Quinn, 1988; Clarke-Hill, Li & Davies, 2003). Yet, as Sanchez-Runde and Pettigrew (2003) observed, we know very little about dualities, their antecedents and how they should be managed.

In contrast to traditional scientific enquiry which tends to polarise phenomena into either/or concepts, duality thinking encompasses the notion of both/and, which 'entails building constructs that accommodate contradictions' (Lewis, 2000: 773). Lewis (2000), for example, observed that as organisations become more complex, diverse and dynamic, traditional either/or thinking tends to oversimplify management practice and its demands. Similarly, Evans and Doz (1992) argued that in a

world characterised by complexity and turbulence, current management paradigms are inadequate, and the concept of duality offers an emerging paradigm for managing and organising.

If we are to explore an emerging paradigm that will provide direction in managing dualities by ‘mutual specification’, defining the nature of duality characteristics becomes a critical step. Lewis (2000) confirms the value of understanding duality characteristics when she suggests that a paradox framework could be a vehicle for exploring *what* sorts of tensions exist, *why* they might trigger reinforcing cycles, and *how* actors might manage paradoxes (dualities) as a catalyst for change and understanding. Thus, duality characteristics work toward the translation of the dualities concept into operational reality.

In one seminal attempt to classify organisational dualities, Evans and Doz (1992) present four principles of dualistic organisation. They argue firstly that the attributes of a social system are generally complementary, and taken together represent a duality; secondly, the relationship between complementary dualities is dynamic not static; thirdly, minimal thresholds are critical to managing dualities; and fourthly, unitary focus on a polarity results in organisational instability and disintegration. These provide a benchmark to examine further the nature and composition of duality characteristics. The following discussion identifies and describes five duality characteristics: 1) Simultaneity; 2) Relational; 3) Minimal thresholds; 4) Dynamism; and 5) Improvisation.

Simultaneity

The foundation duality characteristic is simultaneity. Dualities represent the simultaneous presence of what have conventionally been considered contradictory if not mutually exclusive elements (Van de Ven & Poole, 1988; Cameron & Quinn, 1988). Thus, simultaneity in organising forms refers to the presence of traditional and new forms of organising within a single structural reference frame. Thus, simultaneity and contradiction underline the push-pull tension of organisational dualities, such as efficiency and innovation, integration and differentiation, control and freedom, centralisation and decentralisation, and competition and cooperation (Pettigrew et al., 2003; Evans et al, 2002; Child & McGrath, 2001). When these competing tensions are pursued in concert, they can be a powerful force

for creativity and adaptation (Galunic & Eisenhardt, 2001; Mastenbroek, 1996). Of course, the concept of simultaneity is a relative rather than an absolute property, as the next characteristic illustrates.

Relational

The complementary nature of dualities, which is integral to the duality characteristic of simultaneity, is also apparent in its relational, interdependent nature. Palmer and Dunford (2002), for example, argue that old and new organisational practices are compatible and represent complementary rather than opposing forces. In their view, the incompatibility between traditional and new organisational practices is founded on the flawed assumption that new practices are designed for flexibility, while traditional practices are designed for stability. They instead advocate that new organisational practices have evolved in response to the dynamics of the business environment, and serve to strengthen traditional practices. Jackson and Harris (2003) also recognise the synergistic relationship between old and new work practices by cautioning organisations against eschewing established business principles. They recommend a mix and match approach as customer needs and market conditions dictated. As relational interdependence suggests, a change to one can affect all of the others as well.

Minimal thresholds

Dualities are characterised by the need for a minimal threshold. Hedberg, Nystrom and Starbuck (1976), for example, advocate that organisations should maintain a minimal threshold of desirable attributes: minimal consensus; minimal contentment and minimal affluence; and minimal consistency and minimal rationality. In their view, a degree of ambiguity, contradiction, and incoherence provides the catalyst for organisational learning, diversity and renewal.

Dynamism

In discussing the relational, interdependent nature of dualities, the dynamic and flexible quality of dualities has already been observed. The duality characteristic of dynamism underlines the bi-modal, interactive nature of dualities relationships. Here, energy and feedback are pivotal to the acceptance of competing but simultaneous criteria (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). In this way, dynamism demonstrates how duality thinking invokes a complementary force that encourages a dynamic interaction between duality poles such as integration and differentiation, freedom and control. Other writers provide further empirical illustration of the connectivity between the dynamic characteristic of dualities and

their relational properties. Volberda (1998), for example, contends that specialised, programmatic routines common to traditional forms of organising are unsustainable when competing in complex and uncertain environments. What are needed in these conditions are dynamic capabilities.

Improvisation

The dynamic, symbiotic and mutualistic properties of dualities suggest that it is also characterised by improvisation. Weick (1998) described improvisation as a fusion of intended and emergent action which manifests as a mix of control with innovation, exploitation with exploration, and routine with non-routine. In this sense, improvisation is a dynamic but central component of dualities (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002), intrinsically embedded as a consequence of its emergent potential. Similarly, Clegg da Cunha and e Cunha. (2002) observed that paradox and contradiction are part of the fabric of organisational life and need to be recognised and managed appropriately. They draw on the notion of improvisation to illustrate the value of a bi-directional relationship between the two opposing poles. Improvisation, therefore, serves as the linchpin between the two duality poles of plans and action (representing continuity and change), with plans amended through improvisation as the result of changing circumstances before being enacted (Clegg et al., 2002).

Forms of Organising: Concluding Comments

This review of the theoretical and conceptual foundation of new forms of organising has served firstly to reveal that new forms of organising are not necessarily all that new. Radical change has been an implicit assumption in every period of management history. Nevertheless, it is difficult to ignore the experiential evidence that the rate of change is increasing, driven at least partly by technological advances, globalisation, and the ascendance of the knowledge worker in the industrialised world.

Notwithstanding the evidence that some bureaucracies have grown beyond the strictures of their role, the implication is that calls for the introduction of new forms of organising should recognise the importance of finding a balance between two necessary and complementary, rather than contradictory, paradigms. As Evans (1999: 328) posited, organisational effectiveness is a multi-dimensional concept and these dimensions involve opposites. Consequently, organisational effectiveness can only be achieved through the management of inherently paradoxical, even contradictory elements (328). The

challenge for organisation leaders is not to favour one extreme over the other, but to develop and manage a constructive tension between the two opposing poles.

We believe the debate on old versus new forms of organising needs to move beyond the conventional prescriptions and frameworks that would have us believe the dilemmas and paradoxes surrounding issues of organising can be resolved with a simple, either/or choice. When a both/and lens is applied, the conforming strictures of operational efficiency are loosened and enabled through dynamic capabilities. The planning, organising, coordinating and controlling functions located in the engine room of organisation facilitate bi-directional feedback between conforming and enabling dualities, the latter guiding the innovative, responsive, dynamic process and the former providing the supporting mechanisms to ensure efficiency, timely planning, and controllability. As Sanchez-Runde and Pettigrew (2003) argued, dualities should not be viewed 'as threats to consistency and coherence, but as opportunities for creative organisation development, learning and renewal' (246).

References

- Asch, David and Salaman, Graeme 2002 'The challenge of change', *European Business Journal*, 14(3): 133-143.
- Ashkenas, R. Ulrich, D. Jick, T. and Kerr, S. 2002 *The boundaryless organisation: Breaking the chains of organisational structure*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bahrami, H. (1992) 'The Emerging Flexible Organisation: Perspectives from Silicon Valley'. *California Management Review*, 34(4), 33-52.
- Blumenthal, B. and Haspeslagh, P. 1994 'Toward a definition of corporate transformation', *Sloan Management Review*, Spring: 101-106.
- Burns, T., and Stalker, G.M. 1961 *The management of innovation*, London: Tavistock.
- Child, J. and McGrath, R.G. 2001 'Organisations unfettered: Organisational form in an information-intensive economy', *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6): 1135-1148.
- Clarke-Hill, C., Li, H. and Davies, B. 2003 'The Paradox of Co-operation and competition in strategic alliances: Towards a multi-paradigm approach', *Management Research News*, 1-20.
- Clegg, S.R. 2005 'Puritans, Visionaries and Survivors', *Organisation Studies*, 26(4): 527-545.
- Clegg, S.R., da Cunha, J.V., and e Cunha, M.P. 2002 'Management paradoxes: A relational view', *Human Relations*, 55(3): 483-503.
- Dijksterhuis, M.S., Van den Bosch, F.A.J. and Volberda, H.W. 1999 'Where do new organisational forms come from? Management logics as a source of coevolution', *Organisation Science*, 10(5): 569-582.
- DiMaggio, P. (ed) 2001 *The twenty-first century firm*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Dunphy, D. and Stace, D. 1993 *Under new management: Australian organisations in transition*, Sydney: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Etzioni, A. 1964 *Modern organisations*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Evans, P. 1992 'Balancing continuity and change: The constructive tension in individual and organizational development', in W. Bennis, R.O. Mason and I.I. Mitroff (eds) *Executive and Organizational Continuity: Managing the paradoxes of stability an change*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 253-283.
- Evans, P. 1999 'HRM on the Edge: A duality perspective', *Organisation*, 6(2): 325-338.
- Evans, P. 1992 'Balancing continuity and change: The constructive tension in individual and organizational development', in W. Bennis, R.O. Mason and I.I. Mitroff (eds) *Executive and Organizational Continuity: Managing the paradoxes of stability an change*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 253-283.
- Evans, P. and Doz, Y. 1992 'Dualities: A paradigm for human resource and organisational development in complex multinationals', in V. Pucik, N. Tichy and C. Barnett (eds) *Globalising management: Creating and leading the competitive organisation*, New York: Wiley, 85-106.
- Evans, P. and Doz, Y. 1989 'The dualistic organisation' in P. Evans, Y. Doz and A. Laurent (eds) *Human resource management in international firms: Change, globalisation, innovation*, London: Macmillan, 219-242.
- Evans, P., Pucik, V. & Barsoux, J.L. 2002 *The global challenge: Frameworks for international human resource management*, New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

- Fenton, E.M. and Pettigrew, A.M. 2000 'Theoretical perspectives on new forms of organising', in A.M. Pettigrew, and E.M. Fenton (eds) *The innovating organisation*, London: Sage Publications, chapter 1, 1-46.
- Ford, Jeffrey D. and Backoff, Robert W. 1988 'Organizational change in and out of dualities and paradox', in R.E. Quinn and K.S. Cameron (eds.) *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, Chapter 3, 81-121.
- Galunic, D.C and Eisenhardt, K.M. 2001 'Architectural innovation and modular corporate forms', *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6): 1229-1249.
- Ghoshal S. and Bartlett C.A. 1995 'Building the entrepreneurial corporation: New organisational processes, new managerial tasks', *European Management Journal*, 13(2): 139-155.
- Goss, T., Pascale, R. and Athos, A. 1993 'The reinvention roller coaster: Risking the present for a powerful future', *Harvard Business Review*, November–December, 97–108.
- Groth, L. 1999 *Future organisational design: The scope for the IT-based enterprise*, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C.K. 1994 *Competing for the future*, Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hammer, M. and Champy, J. 1993 *Reengineering the corporation*, London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Hampden-Turner, C.M. 1990 *Charting the corporate mind: From dilemma to strategy*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hedberg, B., Nystrom, P., and Starbuck, W.H. 1976 'Camping on seesaws: Prescriptions for a self designing organisation', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 41-65.
- Imai, M. 1986 *Kaisen, the key to Japan's competitive success*, New York: Random House Business Division.
- Jackson, P. and Harris, L. 2003 'E-business and organisational change: Reconciling traditional values with business transformation', *Journal of Change Management* 16(5): 497-511.
- Jonsson, S. 2000 'Innovation in the networked firm: the need to develop new types of interface competence', in J. Birkinshaw, and P. Hagström, (eds) *The flexible firm: Capability management in network organisations*, New York: Oxford University Press, chapter 6, 106–25.
- Kanter, R.M. 1996, 'Beyond the cowboy and the corpocrat', in K. Starkey, (ed) *How organisations learn*, London: International Thomson Business Press, 43–59.
- Kanter, R.M., Stein, B.A., and Jick, T.D. 1992 *The challenge of organisational change*, New York: The Free Press.
- Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. 1967 'Differentiation and integration in complex organisations', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-47.
- Lewin, A.Y., Long, C. and Carroll, T. 1999 'The coevolution of new organisational forms', *Organisation Science*, 10(5): 535-550.
- Lewis, M.W. 2000 'Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide', *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4): 760-776.
- Limerick, D. and Cunnington, B. 1993 *Managing the new organisation*, Sydney: Business and Professional Publishing.
- Mastenbroek, W.F.G. 1996 'Organisational innovation in historical perspective: Change as duality management', *Business Horizons*, July-August, 5-14.
- McLaren, R.I. 1982 *Organisational dilemmas*, Chichester, UK: Wiley.

- Mitroff, I.I. and Linstead, H.A. 1993 *The unbounded mind: Breaking the chains of traditional business thinking*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, G. 1997 *Images of organisation*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Nohria, N. and Berkley J.D. 1994 'The virtual organisation: Bureaucracy, technology, and the implosion of control', in C. Heckscher, and A. Donnellon, (eds.) *The post-bureaucratic organisation: New perspectives on organisational change*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Chapter 5, 108-128.
- O'Reilly, C.A. and Tushman, M.L. 2004 'The ambidextrous organisation', *Harvard Business Review*, April, 74-81.
- Palmer, I. and Dunford, R. 2002 'Out with the old and in with the new? The relationship between traditional and new organisational practices', *International Journal of Organisational Analysis*, 10(3): 209-226.
- Pettigrew, A. M. and Fenton, E. M. (eds) 2000 *The innovating organisation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Pettigrew, A.M. and Fenton, E.M. 2000 'Complexities and dualities in innovative forms of organising', in A.M. Pettigrew and E.M. Fenton (eds) *The innovating organisation*. London: Sage Publications, 279-300.
- Pettigrew, A.M., Whittington, R., Melin, L., Sanchez-Runde, C., Van Den Bosch, F.A.J., Ruigrok, W. and Numagami, T. 2003 *Innovative forms of organising*, London: Sage Publications.
- Quinn, R.E. and Cameron, K.S. (eds) 1988 *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organisation and management*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Raynor, M.E. and Bower, J.L. 2001 'Lead from the center: How to manage divisions dynamically', *Harvard Business Review*, May, 93-100.
- Sanchez-Runde, C.J. and Pettigrew, A.M. 2003 'Managing dualities', in A.M. Pettigrew, R. Whittington, L. Melin, C. Sanchez-Runde, F.A.J. Van Den Bosch, W. Ruigrok and T. Numagami (eds) *Innovative forms of organising*, London: Sage Publications, 243-250.
- Scholtes, P.R. 1989 *The team handbook*, USA: Joiner.
- Stace, D. and Dunphy, D. 2001 *Beyond the boundaries: Leading and recreating the successful enterprise*. 2nd edn, Sydney: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Tsoukas, H. and Chia R. 2002 'On organisational becoming: Rethinking organisational change', *Organisation Science*, 13(5): 567-582.
- Ulrich, D. and Wiersema, M.F. 1989 'Gaining strategic and organisational capability in a turbulent business environment', *The Academy of Management Executive* 3(2): 115-22.
- Van de Ven, A.H. and Poole, M.S. 1988 'Paradoxical requirements for a theory of organisational change', in R.E. Quinn and K.S. Cameron (eds.) *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a theory of change in organisation and management*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, Chapter 2, 19-61.
- Volberda, H.W. 1998 *Building the flexible firm*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Volberda, H.W. 2004 'Crisis in strategy: Fragmentation, integration or synthesis', *European Management Review*, 1: 35-42.
- Waldersee, R., Griffiths, A. and Lai, J. 2000 'Managing Change Success: Matching Change to Organisational Type', Australian Centre in Strategic Management and the School of Management Joint Working Paper Series, Queensland University of Technology, Working Paper No 42, pp. 1-30.
- Weber, M. 1947 *The theory of social and economic organisation*, Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

- Weick, K.E. 1998 'Improvisation as a mindset for organisational analysis', *Organisation Science*, 9(5): 543-555.
- Whyte, W.H. 1956 *Organisation man*, New York: Simon Schuster.