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Organisational Theory

Introduction to the Workshop

This workshop is not primarily about management of organisations, but about organisations and people. There is actually no such thing as ‘management theory’ in terms of a separable area of study, and what normally goes under that rubric is really an ideological stance vis-à-vis more general consideration of organizational and human phenomena. Most of the main elements are taken from the field called ‘Organisation Theory’, which, despite its name, is not a single unified body of knowledge, but a ‘secondary’ subject area built on material taken from other more distinct disciplines. This is both its strength and its weakness - conferring considerable breadth to the subject, but in general not a lot of depth. It is, by its nature, a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary subject area, and this allows for a broad analysis of organisational phenomena, but unfortunately in-depth analysis is more difficult, because it is subject to considerable influence from local conditions and knowledge that nearly always modify the force of generalised prediction. Furthermore, many of its key ideas are simply borrowed from other areas and applied to organisations.

Nevertheless, Organisation Theory has its main roots in the social sciences - specifically psychology and sociology, with some elements taken more broadly from areas such as anthropology and ethnography, as well as occasional incursions from economics, political ‘science’, and industrial relations. There are also some elements taken from the arts and humanities such as philosophy, history and (very controversially) literary and art criticism.

It is, then, a broad field which, to add to the confusion, also goes under several different names, some of which you will encounter when reading texts on the subject. The two main areas are generally called Human Resource Management (HRM) and Organisational Behaviour (OB), but the field is also sometimes called Organisational Analysis (OA), Behaviour in Organisations (BinO), Organisation Studies (OS), and a host of other names, including the practitioner area called Organisational Development (OD). There are, in fact, subtle nuances and variations in emphasis denoted by the different labels. OB and HRM, for example, are both concerned generally with "people at work", although they focus on different levels of analysis. Roughly speaking, HRM is mostly concerned with individual and group issues, drawing principally, but not exclusively, from psychology, whereas OB tends to focus on organisational factors such as structure, design and culture, having its main theoretical base in

---

1 A recent example is Chaos Theory, taken from mathematics and physics and simply grafted into organizational theory, often uncritically and frequently without any real understanding of what the theory is about.
sociology and social psychology. A further distinction is that HRM on the whole deals with ‘techniques’ - for recruitment, evaluation, negotiation etc - whereas OB tends to be more concerned with a broad understanding of organisations as complex systems or constructions. Nevertheless, there is a substantial overlap between the two areas, and in practice it is impossible to maintain a clear distinction between them. And the same is true for the other areas mentioned as well. Theoretically, and in terms of the issues raised and examined by the different areas, there is considerable complementarity; OB and HRM in particular complement one another, and should therefore be regarded as examining interrelated themes. This workshop is mainly focussed on OB, but some material specifically related to HRM is also considered where this seems to illuminate specific issues, especially those related to individuals and groups. For your purposes you simply need to be aware that these differences in terminology exist so that they don’t confuse you when you come across them. In practice, in the context of this workshop, the differences between HRM and OB (and OA, BinO, and the rest) will largely be ignored.

The aim of this workshop is to generate understanding about organisations and the part that people play in them, by building bridges between theory and practice. The session(s) will take the form of an interactive ‘lecture’; that is participants will be encouraged to enter into debate and comment as the session(s) proceed. An important component throughout is that you will be encouraged wherever possible to consider the material covered during the sessions in the light of your own experiences to ground the theory in practice. There will be considerable, although not exclusive, emphasis on the practical implications of theory.

**Topics And Themes**

As the workshop progresses it will cover a number of themes which link and relate to different topics. The difference between themes and topics is important, and is best understood through an example. Leadership is a topic covered in the workshop. But in considering different theories of leadership, several themes are implicit. These include, for example, issues of structure, culture, influence, power, trust, politics, and so on. There are other themes as well, which you should try to identify for yourself. To get the most out of the workshop you should realise that you really need to try from the outset to link across topics by identifying the underlying themes. This will give you a good basis to understand the complexity of organisation theory and how the different topics complement, contribute to and modify each other.

You should also appreciate that while Organisation Theory is, broadly speaking, a social science, it does not have the advantages of (some of) the natural sciences because its objects of study are complex, ‘living’, self aware, and legally and morally protected. One is seldom able to conduct experiments with all the dependent and independent variables neatly controlled for repeat measures. Apart from fundamental epistemic considerations there are also ethical restrictions on what social scientists can and cannot do (and for this you
should be extremely grateful!)

Below is a broad outline of the main themes underlying the workshop. It does not represent a any kind of timetable but is intended purely as a guide to help direct your thinking and reading. On page 48 there are also some ‘structured readings’ related to the broad topic areas of the workshop which should help you to identify those areas to which you need, or want, to direct more concentrated effort.

**The Nature and Scope of Organisation Theory**
This is the background to the entire workshop covering *inter alia* the tensions between Prediction and Control versus Understanding; the Nature and Status of 'Facts'; the importance of Analytical Frameworks for developing systematic approaches to organisational phenomena; the Problem of Knowledge in the Social Sciences; the Nature of Social Processes, their relation to Emergent Properties and the implications these have for prediction and control.

**Levels of Analysis**
The most fundamental of the frameworks used in the workshop shows the four major levels at which organisational analysis operates, and how they interrelate. By identifying distinct themes relevant to Society, Organisations, Groups and Individuals (SOGI) this model highlights the importance of recognising the distinct contributions of Psychology, Social Psychology and Sociology, and how these different approaches complement one another. Furthermore, by considering how the different levels interact in practice, the SOGI model can be used to illustrate and categorise complexity within organisations. This links directly to the next topic area.

**The Metaphorical Approach**
This approach, derived from the work of Gareth Morgan, highlights the metaphorical nature of knowledge about people and organisations, and the implications of adopting different metaphors about people, organisations and organisational change. This relates to the importance of understanding the nature of diversity within organisations, how this impacts on expectations, and therefore on individual, group and organisational performance. In particular this theme highlights the important practical impact of assumptions which are largely taken for granted and therefore seldom questioned.

Below, on page 7, there are some notes explaining how the SOGI model

---

2 The same is also true of some areas of the biological sciences, but, rightly or wrongly, society has deemed it acceptable to do things to, say, rats, that it does not condone when done to people. For example, unless you work for a very shadowy government organisation you will not be allowed to wire someone up to the mains and throw the switch ‘just to see what happens’.
coupled with the metaphorical approach of Morgan underlie, and can help systematise, our understandings about organisations.

**Organising Processes**

This is a central theme of the workshop, contrasting the kind of knowledge developed through sensitivity to social and social psychological processes with static structurally focussed organisational analyses. It highlights the importance of cognitive, social, political and emotional processes, in conjunction with insights developed through phenomenological approaches to human interactions, and contrasts the ‘organisation-of-production’ with the ‘production-of-organisation’, emphasising the importance of understanding how organisations are created and maintained through organising processes which are fundamentally related to the expectations, values and interests of all organisation members. Related to this, as a major theme of the workshop, is a consideration of the importance of understanding organisational politics and its role in maintaining organisations.

**Understanding Change**

Change and change processes are fundamental to many aspects of organisations, and, indeed, life itself. We will consider the appearance of change; social psychological approaches to change; macro models of change processes; strategies of change; and associated Models of the Human Actor.

**Conflict, Negotiation, and the Politics of Change**

Conflict is an important topic and theme in organisational analysis. Some argue, from a ‘rationalist’ perspective, that it is a pathological condition that must be ‘cured’. But viewed through the perspective of organisational dynamics and political process, which highlight the diversity of aims and objectives, values and interests, within organisations conflict is seen to be not only structurally and socially endemic and inevitable, and therefore a necessary concomitant of organisational life, but also as an important aspect of other processes such as creativity and development. Here we address the question by considering the importance of the analysis of points-of-view; actor-issue analysis; contextual factors; social power analysis; and the processes underlying mutiny, dissent and resistance to change.

**Group and Team Working**

Groups are an important aspect of all organisations, and whether as formal aspects of structure or as part of the processes within organisations, group processes are implicit and explicit in almost all organisational dynamics. This aspect of the workshop will consider analyses of psychological and social psychological dimensions of groups, including role analysis, and factors
affecting 'effective' team performance such as **skills development** and sensitivity to **structural emergence**.

'Cultures' and 'Leaders' as Cultural Agents

Culture was identified in the 1980s as an important feature of organisations, and a developed theme was the attempt to ‘manage’ culture as an aspect of management prerogative. This is best known through the work of those that Thompson & McHugh (1990) called ‘the culture merchants’ such as Tom Peters and Rosabeth Moss Kanter. Although the work of these so-called ‘gurus’ will not be examined directly, their continuing influence will be addressed critically through consideration of this and the other themes. For example, the enduring temptation of the culture management approach, with its promise of easy answers, continues today with a renewed interest in leadership, as well as infamous (and ill-conceived) systems such as ‘business process re-engineering’. These issues will be examined through the following themes: Cultures and their appreciation; cultural emergence; cultural 'management' and the role of 'leaders'; static versus dynamic views of leadership; leadership contrasted with formal position; emergent leadership; leadership and motivation, and trust.

Trust

Trust is not addressed directly as a single topic in the workshop, but as a fundamental theme uniting many of the other topics. When considering change processes, for example, or leadership, trust is implicit, although seldom examined directly in the literatures. If you are looking for a good handle to unite the whole workshop this theme is probably one of the best. Consideration of what generates or undermines trust can help you to generate your own critiques of the literatures and theories of organisation. If taken seriously, an understanding of trust, what underlies it, its nature, and, most importantly, what undermines it, can help generate important insights and understanding of other topics, and the limitations of their conceptualisation in the literatures, especially change, motivation, power, leadership, and control.

Linking the Themes

Although for practical reasons many of the themes identified above will be considered as separate topics, or as implicit aspects of other topics, it is important for you to realise that they interrelate and interact in many, often complex and unpredictable, ways. To get the most out of the subject matter you really need to engage **actively** with the material, developing your *own* analyses and critiques, and, above all, making **links** between the topics as they appear to you. For example, although ‘motivation’ will be treated as a topic, it will really make very little sense in real-world terms unless you are able to link it with other topics such as ‘leadership’, ‘organisational politics’ or ‘organisational culture’. Some of these links will be identified for you, but you will also need to do a lot of this work for yourself. This is not the kind of subject in which
understanding can be achieved simply by learning ‘facts’ and ‘figures’ parrot fashion. You will be expected to provide evidence of having thought about the material, of which cross-linking is the most obvious.

The rationale for this is that to understand organisational phenomena fully, it is necessary to appreciate that separate topics cannot be considered in isolation, but need to be seen as integrated elements in a broad pattern - an approach sometimes referred to as ‘holism’. Considerable emphasis, therefore, will be placed on the integration of material, both in the workshop itself and (if appropriate) for assessment.

While this might imply considerable extra effort on your part, in practice it will have the ironic effect of making the subject easier to assimilate. It is important to realise that OB is a subject which is, or ought to be, directed towards real practice, and we do not, generally, experience the world as discrete bits and pieces.

It is my hope that as you progress through the material, you will see ways in which it relates to your own experiences, and that you will begin to see ways of exploring it that will allow you to investigate issues and topics of particular interest to you. To this end I have tried to build in sufficient flexibility to give you ample scope for personal exploration and development of the material into topics that interest you personally.

The subject matter is not easy, but it can be interesting, it can be useful, and it can even (sometimes) be fun. I also believe that it is fundamentally useful if approached in the right way and used with sensitivity and imagination. As the programme develops I hope you can discover this for yourself.

Dr. Lesley Prince
University of Birmingham
12 November 2007
Introductory Notes on Organisational Analysis

Dr. Lesley Prince

Organisational analysis is about organisations and people. This covers issues of structure and formality. But it also encompasses issues of process and, in a very fundamental way, change. The subject matter can be very abstract, and is drawn from literatures concerned with organisations in general rather than any specific sector. That said, much of the material is based on a private sector model, although at its most general the issues it covers, especially those underlying change and organisational dynamics, are common, to a great degree, to all organisations whatever sector they occupy.

Local government has been fond, in recent years, of complaining that the nature and context of their work is changing, creating, so it is claimed, specific difficulties. But the same is true for all organisations, whatever sector they are located in. More generally the nature of work and working life is also changing. All organisations have been subject to fundamental pressures over the past 20 or so years, and the situation is unlikely to alter for the foreseeable future. Much of this, of course, has been stimulated by continuing developments in information technology, and the increasing globalization that has resulted. These developments are challenging ‘traditional’ ways of working and organising. Indeed, pressures from this quarter affect every aspect of life both at work and home, and the jury is still out on the eventual direction that this will take us all. But information technology is only one aspect of the changes we all face. Changes in legislation and political priorities, whilst obviously important in public sector organisations, also impact on the private sector. Changing social values and priorities, perhaps best exemplified in the West by concerns about the roles of men and women and environmental issues, affect everyone fundamentally, and have certainly changed the shape of work, and, importantly, expectations.

At another level, it has been argued that all of organisational life, indeed all of life, can, in one way or another, be characterised in terms of perpetual change - that it is endemic, whether recognised or not. As the Presocratic philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (circa 480 BCE) observed, everything is in a state of flux - ‘even the unchanging hills change, but more slowly than most other things’ (Speake, 1979: 135. See also Honderich, 1995; Hussey, 1982; Kahn, 1979; Kirk, 1962).

Thus, large scale social and political changes are affecting all organisations without exception. Within organisations this has resulted in changes in the ways
Keegan (1993) gives a useful, although controversial, discussion of the nature of warfare, drawing attention to the sometimes ironic co-operative aspects. Clausewitz is the classic Western source on the subject (Rapoport, 1968; Howard & Paret, 1993), but it is also illuminating to read what Machiavelli has to say (Wood, 1965). It is currently somewhat fashionable to talk about Sun Tsu, who wrote the

Figure 1: A cavalry corset carried by Captaine Brown’s Parliamentarian Troop of Horse during the English Civil War, 1642 - 49. The sentiments expressed by the images are possibly appropriate for a military unit engaged in active combat, but are they really appropriate for civilian organisations in peacetime?

Source: Turmile MS, f 54.

First it is based on a false and shallow understanding of warfare, indeed of competition in general\(^3\), ignoring, inter alia, the indisputable co-operative basis of

\(^3\) Keegan (1993) gives a useful, although controversial, discussion of the nature of warfare, drawing attention to the sometimes ironic co-operative aspects. Clausewitz is the classic Western source on the subject (Rapoport, 1968; Howard & Paret, 1993), but it is also illuminating to read what Machiavelli has to say (Wood, 1965). It is currently somewhat fashionable to talk about Sun Tsu, who wrote the
social endeavours. It is also based on a false, and somewhat envious, belief that within the military whatever those in command order to happen does happen, without question (see Ereira, 1981, for at least one dramatic example showing the latter to be mistaken).

The focus on management prerogative, to the exclusion of other issues, has led to the characterisation of resistance to change, and other impediments to achieving the ‘objective’, as something that necessarily must be overcome. Resistance to change, in other words, becomes simply another technical problem to be solved rationally. Yet it requires no formal research or expertise to realise that changes at work pose a threat, real or imagined, to everyone involved. At the very least change increases uncertainty, and therefore generates as well as highlighting fundamental insecurity.

The threat of change, obviously, undermines the status quo, and people’s sense of place. It also generates fears for the future (Toffler, 1971; 1981; 1991), threatening power bases, established expertise, and so on. In other words, far from being simply a technical matter, amenable to simple solutions, the threat of change is also a social and political issue, with considerable emotional undertones. It is in this arena that so-called ‘wounds of change’ are inflicted, and these ‘wounds’ have a corrosive tendency to undermine trust. It is for this reason that there has been a growing cynicism about change - ‘jokes’ about ‘delayering’, ‘alternative career opportunities’, ‘restructuring’, etc - and some reluctance to take proposals for change at their face value (see, for examples, Mangham, 1979, 1985; Moore, 1997; Thomson & McHugh, 1990).

At the heart of many problems associated with change is the precisely the insistence on regarding the matter as a purely technical one, to the exclusion of important emotional factors. This relates to ideas about what organisations are, and what can or cannot be said about them, particularly in relation to concepts of

classic Eastern texts on warfare, and there are some interesting editions of his major work (Cleary, 1996; Griffith, 1963; Wing, 1988). It is also worthwhile having a look at the work of the Japanese writers Miyamoto Musashi and Yagyu Munerori (Cleary, 1993). Lao Tsu’s classic the Tao Te Ching, sometimes called a ‘manual of leadership’ (although this description rather misses the point) is worth a look, although don’t expect a ‘how to do it’ manual (Feng & English, 1973; Le Guin, 1997; Wu, 1990). On competition, Burnstein (1969), Deutsch (1968), and Gibb (1969, a, & b), although quite old are all worth looking at for their comments. Handy (1985) is also worth a look, although he does get his conceptual knickers in a bit of a twist in places. Recent work on trust also covers important ground in the discussion of competition and co-operation (Coulson, 1997, 1998; Gambetta, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Misztal, 1996), as does the work on co-operation itself (Axelrod, 1984; Baker, 1996; Nowak, May & Sigmund, 1995).

Although intended to be funny, Scott Adams (1996) The Dilbert Principle is also worth a look for its acute observations about the experience of change at low levels in an organisational hierarchy.
prediction and control, and, by implication, the ability of social science to deliver simple messages about complex issues.

In other words, when change is viewed as a technical problem, there is an expectation that, like all technical problems, it can be brought into a framework in which prediction and control is possible. Because organisations fall within the remit of social science, this therefore translates into the expectation that social science can supply the necessary tools. Unfortunately it is a false expectation - although one perhaps encouraged by the ‘Heathrow Airport’ School of Management texts.

**Understanding Organisations**

It is conventional to regard organisations as ‘things’, as given objects much like any other object, such as a table. That is, as independent, morally and politically neutral, objects in the social environment, that can be treated apart from the people within it, and, to some extent, apart from the environment without. Objects with their own dynamics, goals, and so on. This is, of course, very convenient for those running organisations, because it lets them off the ethical hook. Such a view, called an ‘entitative model’ (because it treats organisations as ‘things’) tends to foster the rationalistic approach mentioned above and discussed below - an approach that leaves little room for the messier aspects of organisational life. But it is not a view that is sustainable. Organisations are social and political phenomena of extreme complexity. They are the products of human action, which in turn also help shape human action. When viewed dispassionately, they can appear to be complex, paradoxical, and frequently contradictory (Morgan, 1997). When experienced from within, they can appear to be messy, disorganised, directionless, and frustrating, and managing them can seem at times to be mere ‘muddling through’ (Lindblom, 1959). In short, organisations are not easy to understand.

One response to such situations is to simplify. But the problem is to simplify without making simplistic. To this end it is essential to use models which can help describe without hijacking the process of understanding. One such model, describing the levels or ‘layers’ of organisations is the SOGI model (see figure 1 below). But before considering this model in some detail, it is important to explain why rationalistic models can be misleading.

**The Limits of Rationalism**

Rationality is seldom defined by those who write or talk about organisations. It tends to be used in the vaguest possible sense to mean something like ‘sensible’, or ‘scientific’ or ‘reasonable’ or ‘grown up’ or ‘objective’ or ‘systematic’. In fact there are at least three different models of rationality alluded to, but often muddled and confused with one another: logical rationality; statistical rationality and, very controversially, economic rationality. Logical rationality is based on the

---

5 The ‘quick fix’ summarised in five bullet points.

6 Or Soggy Model, if you prefer. The name itself should alert you to the dangers of taking it as the final word on organisations.
application of ‘rules of inference’ and is intended to allow valid inference from assumptions to conclusions. Statistical rationality is based on the premise that (speaking crudely) with accurate information and probability estimates one can draw valid inferences from empirical data. Economic rationality is based on the incorrect (and quite risible) suggestion that all people operate at all times to maximise their ‘utilities’ (usually conceived in terms of money or advantage). At least in the first two the aim is to arrive at a set of rules and procedures which allow for the exclusion of avoidable bias in decision making (crudely speaking). That is to say they are attempts at ‘pure’ objectivity (a project for which there is considerable well founded scepticism as to its eventual achievement).

The ideal rational model is one that is simple, complete and internally consistent. As a rule such models aspire to be both descriptive (explaining the world as it is) and prescriptive (detailing how the world ought to be). The latter aspect is, however, frequently disguised, although it is important to emphasise that this is not really as a result of dishonesty - it is actually rather difficult sometimes to distinguish the two. Nevertheless the distinction is fundamentally important - whether models are viewed one way or the other can have a major impact on events and people, both positive and negative.

It should be noted that rationalism per se is not being criticised here. On the contrary, rational thought is as fundamental to the social scientific enterprise as other programmes for understanding our world. The problem is, however, that rational models are both very seductive - and ultimately misleading. They are seductive because of their simplicity. In general if it is possible to view a complex phenomenon through the lens of a rationally constructed model, it gives the impression that the complexity is merely an illusion. It also encourages the expectation that all complex issues can be resolved into simple technical matters. Both responses are mistaken - complexity is sometimes precisely what we are faced with.

The real problem is that ‘rational’ models all assume perfect or perfectible knowledge, information and understanding. But as psychologists and others have demonstrated, human cognitive ability is severely limited, what Simon calls ‘bounded rationality’ (Newall & Simon, 1972). More seriously, by their very nature rational models exclude important, but non-rational, aspects of life, such as emotional factors. That this is an important omission has been argued by, amongst others, neurologist Antonio Damasio (1994, 1995). Damasio, who might have been expected to argue otherwise, asserted that, in his view emotionality, although itself non-rational (or even, by some views, irrational) contributes importantly to what we recognise as human rationality:

*Emotion may well be the support system without which the edifice of reason cannot function properly and may even collapse.*

In general, however, ‘rational’ models applied to organisational analysis leave no room whatsoever for the irrational and non-rational - emotionality is never considered except as an impediment (Burrell, 1997; Burrell & Hearn, 1989). Unfortunately, the success of the ultimate rational model - mathematics - continues to fuel the belief that such models are possible for all phenomena, and that once they are established prediction and control will be possible for all complex social
situations. In some ways this, coupled with the limitations on human information processing ability, is what has fuelled the growth of information technology based systems for decision-making - expert systems and the like.

Consideration of mathematics itself, however, undermines these expectations. For those who are interested, the mathematician Kurt Gödel demonstrated that even mathematics does not completely fulfill the expectations of a rational system - while being internally consistent it is not complete (Nagel & Newman, 1958; Sokal & Bricmont, 1997; Speake, 1979). In other words, there are problems that can be posed within a particular system of mathematics but cannot be solved within that system.

A similar problem attends that other model of rationality - formal logic. Indeed in this case it has been shown that the basis for logic is not itself logical but intuitive - quite the antithesis of logic, in fact (Haack, 1978).

More recently the advent of ‘Chaos Theory’ has lent weight to arguments about the difficulties of prediction and control, even in simple rational systems (Cohen & Stewart, 1994; Gleik, 1987; Stewart, 1990; Stewart & Golubitsky, 1992).

Many people are now aware of the so-called ‘butterfly effect’ in which a small event becomes amplified through a series of intervening effects until the outcome is catastrophic. This is a bit of a parody, but it is a useful thought experiment. Imagine that the beat of a butterfly’s wing, in creating a very slight disturbance in air currents, begins a chain of events, each increasing the effects of the preceding one until it results in a hurricane somewhere else in the world. This has two primary features, for our purposes: the unpredictability of systems once minute changes are introduced into the starting parameters; and a different, but clearly related, phenomenon, of amplifying systems. Such amplifying systems are well known, and have received extensive discussion (e.g. Waddington, 1977). In terms of organisational analysis, the implications of an amplifying system are clear - small changes in one aspect of an organisation (such as changing the technology) can have far reaching and unpredictable results elsewhere (e.g. staff turnover). In addition, each change will interact with other features of the organisation, or system, whether already existing or brought about by the change itself. These interactions can cancel out effects - much like the interference caused by out of phase radio waves; additive, which means that the separate effects simply accumulate; or synergistic - effects joined together out of which emergent properties, not inherent in the parts, begin to appear (Cadbury, 1997). This last type of interaction is very important because consideration of the parts does not give any basis for predicting what will emerge from the interaction. More significant for present purposes, however, is what Chaos Theory has shown in relation to the unpredictability of simple systems.

Mathematicians have studied what happens when a system based on very simple rules is run through many thousands of iterations (Poundstone, 1985; Stewart, 1990). They conclude that even very simple systems behave unpredictably - that the outcome of the iterations cannot be predicted in advance.

---

And that social scientists are merely being evasive, or lazy, or both, in denying the possibility.
unless the system has been run through previously. Furthermore, if the system is
rerun with even tiny variations in the initial values, the resultant behaviour may be
completely different from previous runs.

Of course Chaos Theory is a formal mathematical model of deterministic
chaos. No-one really knows if organisations are truly chaotic systems in this sense,
because no-one has ever derived the necessary equations. It is not even clear if
such equations are possible, even in principle, but what has emerged from Chaos
Theory is certainly very suggestive, and the implications for very complex
systems, such as organisations, are quite profound - demolishing the expectation
that prediction and control is easily achievable. This conclusion is reinforced when
one considers the different (interactive) levels of analysis involved in
organisational theory - the SOGI Model.

Levels of Analysis: The SOGI Model
This SOGI model is perhaps one of the simplest descriptions of what is involved in
trying to understand organisations. In essence all it does is describe the different
levels which need to be taken into account to get a detailed picture of an
organisation: Society; Organisation; Group; Individual. But, simple though it is,
the model summarises some of the complexity of organisations, and can also be
used analytically to conceptualise organisational issues.

At the individual level, organisational analysis encompasses psychology;
the societal level is clearly sociological. But, for completeness, it would be
necessary to draw from all the social sciences, including anthropology and
political science. The problem for anyone trying to understand organisations is to
try and integrate these levels, which is clearly impossible in any definitive way
because there is simply too much to take into account. Furthermore, each of the
levels presents its own complexity, and each is the subject of specialist
understanding. Before discussing these, however, some consideration of the
limitations of the model is necessary.

Limitations of the SOGI Model
The SOGI Model only deals with the political and social world - the world of
human interactions. What it does not include is the physical world, which
nevertheless might be important. The weather, for example, can have a major
impact on people and their activities - Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD);
temperatures that are too high or too low; levels of ozone; light levels; wind. If one
is to believe some of the theories being propounded, a supernova in the remotest
corner of the galaxy will, sooner or, probably, later have an effect on people living
on Earth (I suppose you could call this the cosmic level of analysis). Closer to
home, it has often been claimed that the phases of the Moon can have an impact on
people’s behaviour, and it is well known that Sunspot activity plays havoc with
electronic equipment.

A more obvious limitation, from the point of view of social science, is that
the SOGI Model begins arbitrarily with whole individual human beings, and ends
with a vague catch-all category called ‘Society’. The latter is discussed below, but
the former is worth considering here.
Figure 1 The SOGI Model: This simple model details the different levels of analysis used within Organisation Theory, and also their interrelations.

Starting with whole human beings is very convenient, and the model has to stop somewhere simply for practicality, but for some purposes it might be important to take into account factors below this level. Physiological and even genetic processes, for example, are often implicated in cases of stress and depression (see, for example, Nemeroff, 1998) - both issues of concern for some organisations, not least because of their relation to human motivation. These can be affected by the physical conditions in which people work, both positively and negatively (light levels, for example), and, medically at least, interventions might be made at this level (the ‘happy pill’, Prozac, is a good example).

Issues at this level are already becoming important for some organisations, and are likely to become more so. For example, the defence industry in the United States is currently facing a crisis because of a shortage of experienced and skilled software engineers. Unfortunately for the organisations concerned these people tend, for some reason, to be ‘acid heads’ - a category of people specifically banned from working on defence projects, and who, in general, are not very sympathetic to defence work anyway (Rushkoff, 1994). Their creativity and LSD habits, however, seem to be inextricably linked (see for example Schaeff & Fassel, 1988).

Another aspect which is likely to generate further interest in the near future is the advent of ‘smart drugs’. These substances are said to enhance cognitive abilities, such as memory and mental performance. They work by introducing into the body precursors for various brain chemicals such as endorphin. At the moment their use is restricted to the fringes (allegedly), and they are not yet illegal. But, it has been confidently predicted that in the next few years if the pace of change keeps up, they will become a necessity for anyone wanting to survive in the workplace (Dean & Morgenthaler, 1991; Pelton, 1998; Rushkoff, 1994).

Of course one could move the levels of analysis further down, until perhaps we are forced to examine the behaviour of subatomic particles in order to understand organisations, but that would be silly. For most purposes starting with whole individuals is both convenient and sufficient, but it is important to note that some issues cannot be fully understood at this level.

The Individual Level

That organisations are composed of people is obvious, although perhaps too often overlooked. Therefore, at a very fundamental level to understand organisations we need to understand people - all people, not just managers - a very complex matter, as anyone who is a person will agree.

The issue of predictability is immediately thrown into high relief when it is
considered how difficult it is to predict human behaviour. Mike Harding used to say of his father that he had a problem with his legs: ‘They wouldn’t walk past pubs’, and most of us are familiar with people who say they find it difficult to resist their particular vice (such as chocolate) even when they have resolved to do so. This perhaps captures something of the issues involved.

We have, in the philosophers’ jargon, some measure of privileged access to our own mental states, motives and behaviour, but how many are in a position to predict even their own behaviour with any accuracy? One suspects very few, if any. This rather makes the predictability of other people’s behaviour seem a little unrealistic, except perhaps in the very crudest sense.

An individual’s behaviour will be the result of a complex series of processes involving emotions, knowledge, perceptions, values, interests, mood, and so on. In addition it will be affected, perhaps effected, by the circumstances surrounding that individual, including particular incidents and events, the behaviour of other people, the weather, and so forth.

The Group Level
The situation is further complicated when people form groups. There are aspects to groups which only appear as group phenomena, such as power relations, affectional ties and group norms. In addition, people change their behaviour in groups, sometimes very subtly, sometimes dramatically. This is an aspect of experience that is easily recognisable: the hell-raising youth, swearing and drinking in the company of peers, but very prim and proper at home; the shy retiring individual who becomes the model of urbane wit in the right company; the company accountant who is also a member of a swingers’ club.

An excellent account of this process appears in the introduction to the Science Fiction novel *Speaker for the Dead* (Orson Scott Card, 1986):

*Most novels get by with showing the relationships between two or, at the most, three characters. This is because the difficulty of creating a character increases with each new major character that is added to the tale. Characters, as most writers understand, are truly developed through their relationships with others. If there are only two then there is only one relationship to be explored. If there are three characters, ... there are four relationships: Between A and B, between B and C, between C and A, and finally the relationship when all three are together. ... So when a storyteller has to create three characters, each different relationship requires that each character in it must be transformed, however subtly, depending on how the relationship is shaping his or her present identity. Thus, in a three-character story, a storyteller who wishes to convince us of the reality of these characters really has to come up with a dozen...*
different personas, four for each of them (pp xix - xxi).

As a description of the subtleties that occur when people congregate in groups this is very good. Of course it does not cover every aspect of group life that may be important, such as group cohesiveness, conformity, the emergence of structure in interactions, and other group phenomena, but it does nevertheless show why prediction and control in a group setting is likely to be very difficult, and certainly impossible with precision. It also illustrates the principle that one can never fully know or understand another person, especially if that person’s relationships are ignored.

The Organisation Level
At the organisational level of analysis, factors such as organisational size, age, and structure need to be taken into account. So much is familiar from much of the management literature. But other, more sociological and anthropological aspects are also important - issues such as organisational culture, internal political processes, alliances, interest groups, co-operation and conflict between specialist departments, the available technology, and so on. Such factors interact in complex ways with those already highlighted under the other levels of analysis, and further reduce the likelihood of accurate prediction and control in anything other than a fairly superficial way.

The Society Level
In broad terms, ‘Society’ is a label that refers to anything and everything ‘outside’ the organisation. It is a bucket category, which perhaps is better labelled ‘environment’ (but EOGI doesn’t make the joke quite as well as SOGI).

The point is that organisations are not independent entities sitting in stately isolation from the rest of the world; to paraphrase John Donne: ‘No organisation is an island’. Quite clearly they are embedded within, and part of, society at large. In some ways this is little more than a platitude, but the activities of some large organisations in catapulting large numbers of their workforces onto the job market would suggest that it is not, perhaps, platitudeous enough. Writers such as Tom Peters blithely talk about ‘downsizing’ (or other euphemisms for sacking people), with no consideration whatsoever for the burden that this potentially causes elsewhere. Certainly one does not get the impression from authors like Peters that those who are ‘downsized’ matter in any important way to the organisation that is getting rid of them (see Moore, 1997; Peters, 1992).

Nevertheless, the societal level is important when trying to understand organisations and how they work. For the public sector in Great Britain this has been painfully obvious in recent years - changing legislation; the impact of changing social and political values, pressures to become more ‘businesslike’, and so on, not to mention the impact of unemployment on the economic and social fabric of society at large.

But the impact of ‘outside’ is further reaching than simply the influence of a domestic social context. It includes, for example, other organisations, whether competitors, suppliers, clients, or simply other organisations. Their activities can,
obviously, have an impact on the affairs of any organisation. To take an extreme example, the efforts of a terrorist group can quite clearly disrupt the smooth functioning of a merchant bank if it becomes involved, even accidentally. And, at the end of the twentieth century, the span of influence may well be global. The advent of easy worldwide communications, and the growth of supranational corporations, means that organisations, and the people who work in them, are now subject to pressures and influences from some very remote sources indeed. What happens in Europe, the United States or Far East can now have a direct and non-trivial impact on all organisations, whatever their size. And, it must be emphasised, the activities of organisations also have a major impact on the outside. What happens inside organisations impinges on others outside the organisation; there are no purely technical matters that affect the organisation internally alone.

**Interactions between the Levels**

The levels of analysis identified within the SOGI Model are not, of course, discrete and mutually exclusive. Nor are they independent of one another. On the contrary they can and do interact. For example, when considering groups of people, some of the issues are to do with the impact of individuals on the group. A particularly talkative or imaginative individual can have a pronounced effect on group dynamics. On the other hand, a group can, and usually does, have an impact on those that comprise it. Group norms, for instance, can affect people’s behaviour significantly, even to the extent of publicly denying the evidence of their own perceptions (Asch, 1951, 1958; Milgram, 1974).

Similarly, groups within organisations can and do have an impact on those organisations. For example small oligarchies - especially those Child (1984) calls the dominant coalition - can often have a direct and disproportionate effect on the activities of an organisation directed to their own ends rather than those recognised as legitimately those of the organisation. In turn, organisations can have a profound impact on the behaviour of groups within it - for example the modification of professional standards in favour of those enforced by the organisation.

Interactions of these kinds can be tracked through all the levels of analysis, and are shown in figure 1 by the arrows on the diagram. As should be apparent by now, however, predicting the direction and form of these interactions is not possible with precision, and will require considerable local detail even to allow crude predictions.

All told then, the chance of developing easy methods for precise prediction and control within organisations, and therefore for the management of change, is unlikely, to
say the least. The sheer complexity of the dynamics involved, from individuals through to the impact of society, make it a project with a high implausibility quotient.

This, of course, might not sound a particularly positive conclusion, and indeed it is not if one’s sole intention is simply to control the behaviour of other people. But it takes only a moment’s reflection to realise that the impossibility of such precise control is actually very positive - if one can learn how to manipulate others, then they can learn to manipulate you - a dystopian nightmare subverting creativity, democracy, and all the other things that we tend to value most about life. Only a thoroughgoing authoritarian despot could find any comfort in such a fantasy. Thankfully it is a very remote possibility indeed - one hopes an impossibility. But this begs the question of what social science can contribute to our knowledge about organisations. The answer is understanding of the issues involved. How this can be achieved is discussed below.

**Morgan’s Metaphors**

What we assume, what we take for granted, constrains and directs what we see, and therefore what we conclude. The answer to a problem is constrained by the questions we ask and the tools we use to derive the answer. As noted above, when confronted by complex and paradoxical phenomena, we need models to aid understanding. But whatever models we use can become a problem, rather than an aid, if we forget they are simply *models* and start regarding them as ‘The Truth’ (complete with capital letters). Unfortunately this is all too easy to do.

When considering organisations we generally have such a model in mind, but too frequently one that is taken for granted, and seldom questioned. And yet, whichever model we use has important implications for what we see, and don’t see, in an organisation. For example, if we view organisations as machines, then we tend to see the machinelike qualities and ignore other aspects. Management, when organisations are seen as machines, then becomes analogous to machine minding.

A machine minder has responsibility for turning the machine on, and off, for ensuring that it is properly lubricated, that the motive force (electricity or whatever) is available as necessary, that the parts are properly calibrated and in good working order. When things go wrong it is the machine minder’s responsibility to set them right - replacing old, worn out or damaged parts, recalibrating parts that have become misaligned, and so on.

It doesn’t take a lot of imagination to see how this model becomes translated into management practice. Indeed it is a good description of one of the most dominant and pervasive models of management practice, summarised by Koontz & O’Donnell (1955) as:

- **PLAN**
- **ORGANISE**
- **MOTIVATE**
- **CONTROL**

In other words, by this view it is management’s task to take on responsibility for all aspects of other people’s work, including their motivation. In the final analysis, if the machine breaks down and no other response works, there is always recourse
to what has been called a Birmingham Screwdriver (a hammer), which translates into human terms as the ‘Kick In The Pants’ (KITA) model of motivation (Wilson & Rosenfeld, 1990). If that doesn’t work, and the machine part is irretrievably broken, the final line of action is always replacement - the Fit In or Go Somewhere Else (FioF O) model.

There are, however, other ways of ‘seeing’ an organisation. It is possible, for example, to see it as a growing thing, perhaps a plant or tree, or even a whole garden. This is not as fatuous as it might appear. When viewed this way, management becomes analogous to gardening. Gardeners do not, of course, turn their plants on and off. Indeed a good gardener will not intervene too much with the plants at all. Instead the focus is on the environment in which the plants grow, and the gardener’s attention will be focussed on the provision of compost and manure to ensure that the soil is fertile, will make sure the plants are situated in a congenial place in the garden, without too much or too little light, and will ensure that the plants are properly fed and watered. Of course gardeners also pleach and prune upon occasion, in the right season, but essentially they are concerned with the provision of the right environment for the plants to grow.

This is a quite different model from the machine metaphor of how to view an organisation, and it generates a quite different model of management. In contrast to the controller of the machine model, this one presents more an image of a custodian.

The point here is not to argue that one of these images is correct and the other mistaken. It is to draw attention to the principle that each is a different way of ‘seeing’ organisations - and is simultaneously a way of not seeing. That is, the models we use direct our attention towards some aspects of organisations and blind us to other sometimes more important aspects.

Both of these images can be regarded as ‘correct’ to some extent. They are also both misleading. Organisations are clearly not neither machines nor gardens. But, in order to understand them at all, because they are complex, we tend to think in terms of analogy or metaphor - we think of organisations as if they were a machine or a garden. In either case we are thereby able to generate insights to help us understand what we see or experience. But the cost of this is that the metaphors we use also blind us to other, equally important, features of organisations that are not encompassed by the metaphor.

This is the basis for the approach to organisational analysis developed by Morgan (1997). He points out that if we use only limited metaphors in trying to understand organisations, then our insights are correspondingly limited, and so, therefore, is our ability to deal with problems that we may encounter. His book is an elaboration of this theme.

Morgan identifies eight different metaphors current within organisational analysis. It is unlikely that this list is exhaustive, but his analysis is nevertheless interesting, and his exploration of the different metaphors highlights the ways in which they generate different insights into organisational dynamics, thus making what he writes useful as well as interesting. Taking the list from the contents page of Images of Organization, the metaphors identified by Morgan are:

- Organizations as Machines
- Organizations as Organisms
Each of these different metaphors generates its own way of seeing, and not seeing, organisations. They draw attention to different aspects of organisational dynamics, and therefore highlight different issues, problems, and solutions. Each also highlights different ideologies of organisation and organising, and therefore immediately links organisational analysis to areas such as political theory.

One particularly important aspect of the metaphors is the way in which they generate different conceptualisations of a ‘problem’. For example, a ‘problem employee’ who regularly refuses to do overtime, would be conceptualised within a mechanistic model as a ‘broken or misaligned part’ of the machine, and therefore needing replacement or recalibration. Viewed within a political model, however, which takes into account people’s values and interests apart from those enacted (or imposed) at work, such a person may be regarded as someone who is exercising their ability to pursue life beyond the workplace - perhaps it is a parent wanting to ensure adequate time with his or her children.

The Metaphors in Brief
Taking each metaphor very briefly, they highlight the following aspects of organisations.

The Machine Metaphor, which is the dominant mode of thinking about organisations, highlights the formal, structured aspects of organisations. This is the metaphor that highlights those bureaucratic elements of an organisation, the rules, procedures, roles, hierarchies, and so on. Management initiatives, such as ‘Performance Related Pay’, ‘Management by Objectives’, and so on, are based on this way of thinking.

The Organic Metaphor, which is also very popular, highlights the organic or ‘living’ aspects of organisations, such as ‘environmental fit’ and ‘life cycle’. In some ways this last feature has generated some surprises. For example, most of us tend to think of the organisations we know about as fixed and relatively permanent features of the environment. But, viewed in terms of life cycles - birth, growth, development, decay, and death - which are natural aspects of living systems, draws attention to the similar aspects of organisations. When looked at this way, changes imposed upon organisations which might be viewed as a threat to the very rationale of the organisation (e.g. the assault on ‘public service values’), - itself a response drawn from the cultural, or political, metaphor - it might be concluded that the changes are simply part of the evolution of the organisation, its environment, or even part of the evolution of the species to which the organisation belongs.
The Brain Metaphor is a complex one, simply because the brain itself is so complex that we can only understand it metaphorically. No-one really understands how the brain works, and the general approach is to take metaphors from the dominant technology of the day (steam engine; telephone exchange; computer CPU, and so on). Thus, as a metaphor for organisations it is really a metaphor nested within a metaphor. Nevertheless, there are aspects of the metaphor which are useful and interesting. In one sense it is a reiteration of the machine metaphor (when the dominant technology is steam), and draws attention to the hierarchical relations of brain to other parts of the body (especially the peripheral nervous system). However, there are aspects of the brain which do not fit this model, such as its marvellous ability for self organisation, and this feature is beginning to find its way into organisational thought.

One other aspect which may possibly find new emphasis in organisational thought is the way in which the brain encompasses massive redundancy. Much of the brain is not used. Until recently this was a complete puzzle, but some now argue that it is the redundancy that allows the brain to function for a lifetime. Brain cells die throughout life, and they are not replaced. A ‘store’ of unused brain cells therefore allows the brain to continue functioning despite its degrading architecture. Furthermore, if the brain suffers a massive insult, particularly in youth, it is now known that the functions carried out in that part of the brain may be transferred to another part.

In organisational terms, this raises all sorts of questions about ‘appropriate staffing levels’. While an auditor may argue, for example, that a health service ought to be run ‘efficiently’ with ‘just enough staff’ for its functions, one may counter that on the contrary it ought to be ‘over’ staffed to some extent, to allow it to continue functioning in the event of crisis - as recent experiences in the National Health Service have demonstrated.

Cultural (Anthropological) Metaphor. There has been much talk since the early 1980s about organisational culture. This has generally been of the ‘we must impose a can-do culture’ kind of talk, with culture viewed simply as yet another resource at the disposal of management. But, when viewed anthropologically culture is not a tool of management, but an important aspect of social life, emerging and being shaped by those who are embedded within it. This metaphor draws attention to aspects of organisational life coded in rituals, values, norms, beliefs, and so on. Culture by this view is something of a lens through which people evaluate the world, and a ‘blueprint’ by which they guide and evaluate their own and other people’s behaviour. Viewed from the outside, cultural ‘artefacts’ can appear bizarre - such as some of the formal rituals enacted by the military - but they function importantly as part of the ‘metaphysical glue’ which binds the organisation together. Tradition, in this sense, becomes something to be understood as an aspect to organisational functioning that allows it to function at all, and not necessarily as an impediment to ‘progress’.

The Political Metaphor. This metaphor draws attention to issues surrounding
people’s values and interests. In a mechanistic model of organisation there really is no place for ‘politics’, which is viewed simply as ‘illegitimate politicking’ - an aspect of organisation which is part of the ‘irrational’, and therefore excluded from ‘rational’\textsuperscript{10} models, and generally regarded as somehow pathological - a disease to be cured. When taken seriously, however, organisational politics is really about those features of organisational life which are affected and effected by important elements of human life. For example, within a mechanistic model, ‘organisational’ goals are the only legitimate focus of attention within the organisation; within a political model, it can be countered that there are other, and perhaps more important, goals pursued by the people within the organisation. A good example is the question of why particular people do they job they do. Quite clearly they may be committed to the job as an end in itself (as, perhaps, with some doctors or lawyers or printers). They may, however, be enacting some broader values, of which the job is merely a part. Or, they may simply see the job as a means to an end - paying the mortgage and ensuring their family is well fed, well housed, and able to pay the bills.

This metaphor takes such issues seriously, and highlights aspects of organisational life such as power, competition and conflict, but not necessarily as pathological conditions to be cured - often simply as endemic features of organisational life.

\textbf{The Psychic Prison Metaphor.} One aspect of the socialisation or acculturation process is that as individuals become fully part of an organisation, they also internalise the favoured ways of doing and thinking within that organisation: ‘It’s the way we do things around here’. This metaphor draws attention to this feature of organisational life, and highlights the point that frequently the ‘favoured’ ways of doing and thinking are overly constraining and perhaps detrimental. In other words the ‘psychic prison’ which constrains and restrains what can be done within an organisation. Clearly this metaphor has something to say about the conditions for ‘creativity’ within organisations.

Beyond that, the metaphor can become a little exotic for some tastes, highlighting such issues as ‘repressed sexuality’ as enacted within organisational life, and the ways in which fears and anxieties about life and death can influence behaviour.

\textbf{Flux and Transformation.} This is a metaphor that emphasises process issues

\textsuperscript{10} Perhaps I should use the term ‘rationalistic’ here. I am not referring to rational models in any formal sense, but to the ideological use of quasi- or ‘seemingly’ rational models, using flow diagrams, statistical analysis, and so on, that imply some form of ‘objectivity’. These are ‘rationalistic’ but not rational, and form part of an overarching set of political managerialist tools that serve simply to reinforce the ascendancy of ‘those in charge’ without imparting any true rationality to organisational functioning at all.
within organisations. This is definitely a metaphor based on Heraclitus’s observation quoted earlier - an insight that everything is, to a greater or lesser extent, in a process of changing. Importantly for this metaphor is the conceptualisation of change itself, and Morgan identifies four different ‘logics of change’: self reproducing systems; flow and negative feedback (information processing systems); dialectical or cyclic change; and chaotic change.

This metaphor raises important issues about contradictions within organisational life - drawing attention to some of the paradoxes that are embedded within. It also highlights some of the processes in which, while organisations change individuals, individuals also change organisations (logic of mutual causality). This last aspect is very important. When the focus is purely on what the ‘organisation’ (or, more precisely, the management) demands, expects or does to the people within it, attention is shifted away from the interdependence at the heart of organisational life, and what the individual demands, expects, or does to the organisation. In some ways this aspect of the change metaphor links directly with the cultural and political metaphors, because it is dealing with issues also dealt with, in a different way, in those metaphors.

The Dominance Metaphor. This, Morgan’s final metaphor, draws attention to some of the nastier aspects of organisational life - exploitation, control, and manipulation. It highlights issues such as enforced overwork, stress, and the ‘workaholic’, occupational health and safety issues, and so on. The importance of this metaphor is that it also draws attention to ethical issues in organisational life - in a way it is the servant that sweeps the dirt from under the carpet, and leaves it on the floor for people to see and examine.

Using the Metaphors

Morgan did not intend his examination of organisational metaphors to be a purely academic exercise. His intention was to develop a set of intellectual tools for the examination of organisations and organisational problems, with a practical focus. In other words, the metaphors are not simply there as clever ideas, but are intended to be used for analysis, both by practitioners as well as academics.

He talks about the process of ‘Imaginization’, a diagnostic approach using the metaphors as a basis for generating insights. To reiterate a point made earlier, if we view organisations through a narrow lens of only one metaphor, then we are constrained in the scope of our understanding, and also our ability to act. Morgan’s argument is that the more metaphors we can deploy in the process of understanding, then the broader our scope for action. Thus, to emphasise an important point also made earlier, the metaphors should not be considered as competing models of organisation, in which one is correct and the others therefore incorrect, but as different ways of seeing the same thing, each providing a different set of insights, and therefore different spins on appropriate actions. In other words,
Morgan argues that the metaphors are best regarded as intellectual resources that can help in the diagnostic process.

As a corollary to this, it is necessary to cultivate a diagnostic, or analytical, turn of mind. The very basis of this approach is that the ‘quick fix summarised in five bullet points’ is unrealistic and unhelpful, and that precise prediction and control is highly unlikely to be achievable. Instead, the approach emphasises the inherent complexity and uncertainty of organisational life, recognising that it is often contradictory and paradoxical. But, although this stance could lead to various forms of panic stricken paralysis and twittering doubt, Morgan argues that skilful use of the metaphors will not only allow actions to be undertaken, but that those actions will be based on a firm foundation of reflection and knowledge interwoven with sophisticated analysis.

One other important aspect of this approach is that it places the onus on those wanting to use it to ensure that they are informed about the people they work with and the context within which they work. This requires some measure of research skill, and a willingness to value, almost for its own sake, the ‘spirit of enquiry’.

In the final analysis no-one can guarantee certainty, and no method can ensure perfect accuracy and error free decisions. But, although mistakes may still be made, decisions that are based on a relatively broad and detailed analysis are, one hopes, less likely to lead to really stupid mistakes.
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\[11\] Not to be confused with snooping, sneaking, spying, or invading people’s privacy. That’s not the same thing at all.
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Workshop Aims

- To provide participants with a body of knowledge relating to organisations and their management, giving a historical and developmental view to the way organisations are viewed, and some indication of how ideas become recycled over time.

- To give the basis for, and help develop, a critical awareness of issues surrounding organisations and their management.

- To show how different topics and themes relating to organisations are interrelated, and thus provide some basis for understanding the complexity of organisational issues.

- To highlight the contingent nature of knowledge about the social world, emphasising how assumptions about the world, and people in particular, directly effect the ways in which organisations are managed.

- To use this information and knowledge to underline the ideological nature of management theories, and encourage students to develop their own critiques.

- To enable participants to understand some important aspects of organising processes.

- To provide participants with some basis of understanding for working in their own organisations when they leave the workshop.

Workshop Objectives

As a result of attending this workshop, students should:

- Have a clear understanding of the development of organisation and management theory over time.

- Be able to outline the main theories and approaches to organisations and assess them critically.

- Have a clear understanding of, and be able to outline, some of the main problems which characterise organisations.

- Be able to develop reasoned, critical, and, so far as is possible, original arguments on organisational and management issues.
• Appreciate the complexity of organisational issues, but be able to develop reasoned and coherent accounts of organisational problems.

• Understand the importance of organisational processes for critically assessing rational models of organisation.
Reading Lists

Reading lists often cause anxiety and confusion among students, especially when they’re long. As it is often pointed out, time is limited, and no-one has time to read everything, so, some explanation is in order. You are not expected to read everything on these lists. They are provided as a resource and to offer some guidance. Like most subjects, the literatures on organisations and related areas are vast, complex and confusing, and to try and get some purchase on them without any advice is difficult and bewildering. These lists are therefore intended to help you to navigate the area; don't think of them as an outline of all the texts and papers that you must read. To try and tackle everything here would take several years. Instead, use them aid to your studies, to give some element of guidance to areas that it would be fruitful to explore if you have the need and inclination.

Core Texts

This workshop has been constructed around two core texts, within which you will find most of the arguments and themes addressed during the teaching periods. It would be in your interests to have access to both these books on a regular basis. If you can’t afford to buy your own, then consider a joint purchase with other participants.


This book covers the main themes and references to general organisation theory. It is broad rather than deep, and provides short summaries of the topics which comprise the core of OB and HRM as academic disciplines. It is most useful for getting a quick overview of a subject, and for supplementing what can be derived from lectures. It is also a useful source of references to be followed up on a given topic. It also has the undoubted advantage, from our point of view, of taking a substantially European viewpoint, and therefore goes some way towards redressing the, sometimes inappropriate, emphasis on the American experience of organisations generally found in OB texts. It is not, however, appropriate for pursuing a subject in depth, for which further reading will definitely be necessary.


Morgan is a respected writers on organisations on both sides of the Atlantic, although his reputation really rests (deservedly) on this one book. This text, while being theoretically sophisticated, is written in an accessible style, and covers one of the most useful approaches to organisational analysis. As with Wilson & Rosenfeld, this book covers most of the main themes and references used in the workshop. The difference is that Morgan concentrates on depth, rather than breadth, and provides detailed and considered expositions of his themes, integrated through his own model of organisational metaphors. The real beauty of this book is that it addresses its subject matter in a way that makes it relevant for both theoreticians and practitioners, thus making it the ideal text for this workshop.
Supplementary Texts

These are texts which cover some of the main themes addressed in the workshop, or those which, while being general, give a slightly different view of some themes. These are recommended as further reading especially when (if appropriate) preparing for essays, especially in the early stages.


This is a perennial, and venerable, text which has the undoubted advantage of being both cheap and accessible. Its strength is breadth, plus Handy's explicit attempt to integrate the material (unlike most texts which simply present a recipe list). It does have disadvantages, however. First it is now looking rather dated and some of the material is old fashioned. Second, Handy sometimes gets himself into conceptual muddles, and readers are, therefore, advised to approach it carefully and critically. Nevertheless it is still a good all round text which covers most of the major themes in organisational analysis, and also provides some useful references.


This is a more up to date text than Handy, with a new edition published relatively recently. In some ways it would have made a good core text for the workshop, and would have been selected had it been fully accessible to complete beginners. But it makes some assumptions about prior knowledge, and is, therefore better placed as a supplementary to the main texts. Its main advantage lies in the contemporary critiques it presents of some of the major, and most influential, theories of organisations, including Tom Peter's so-called Excellence approach. It is also unusual in Organisational texts in that it draws substantially from the Industrial Relations literatures. Its detailed and sustained use of the political model of organising makes it an excellent text for anyone wanting to study the topics of organisational politics and power in depth.


This is a revised edition of the authors' earlier text Organisational Behaviour: Politics at Work. It was the earliest systematic study of the 'Political Model', although in places it is rather Machiavellian, and occasionally addresses organisational politics and power simply as managerial tools for manipulation and control. Despite this blemish, the text marks the emergence of a distinctively European perspective on organisations which is critical of the rational-scientific approaches of North American theory. It is also one of the earliest sustained examinations of organisational politics as something more than mere ‘politicking’, and therefore provides essential material for understanding the issues involved.


This text also focuses on European trends in organisational thought, especially those aspects drawn from social psychology. Specifically it is an elaboration of the Political Metaphor, and presents a systematic and thorough discussion of the main themes of OB and HRM from that perspective. It is, however, rather hard going, and readers are advised that they will have to concentrate to use this text. Nevertheless, what this book has to say is very important for a thorough understanding of organisations and organisational dynamics.
Extended Reading List.

The following texts contain material which can help to extend the overall analysis of organizations, particularly the political model. They all have something of relevant interest, including elements of the philosophical background of much of the organizational literature, and from which much of the current thinking comes, albeit often obliquely. In addition there are also texts which are related to specific themes or topics which you can use for your assignments (if appropriate).

Many of these readings appear as brief references in the guided readings section below, but not all of them. It would therefore be a useful exercise for you to browse this list from time to time for useful titles.


An interesting, although journalistic, account of an important problem. This book stimulated several pieces of research, and a new field, which was long overdue given the stridency of the culture merchants rhetoric about ‘management’s right to manage’ - the right to do what they liked.


Not one of the most scholarly critiques of organisational life, but it makes some very important points nevertheless. Read it for pleasure rather than information - it won’t provide you with much help writing essays, but it will make you laugh!


This is a standard text on social psychology which is regularly updated in new editions. The importance of this text for the workshop is that it focuses a lot of attention on issues of influence between people, and covers basic theoretical and empirical work in the area. Much of this is very important for organisational analysis, although it is not very well covered in the mainstream OB literatures.


An important corrective to the dominant models which take hierarchy and stratification as necessary and inevitable features of social and political life. Although Barclay is not naive enough to suggest that status differentiation is simply an artifact of entrenched interests, he does provide some interesting and useful arguments for suspecting that they
might not be as inevitable as is sometimes suggested.


One for the dedicated leadership researcher, although less useful for the general reader. Stogdill’s text, and Bass’s update, is the primary source on leadership, providing the most extensive list of references on the topic, and some very good commentary as well.


This is an extremely important text for anyone who wants to understand the issues underlying our attempts to make sense of the social and political world. It emphasises the point that our categories for understanding are fundamentally arbitrary, in the sense that we could choose a different way of classifying the phenomena we are examining (and perhaps get different answers), while also emphasising the point that it is, nevertheless, essential to categorise in order to say anything sensible about the world at all. This book is usefully read in conjunction with Morgan (1997), and Zerubavel (1993), both of whom examine similar issues from slightly different angles. The perspective they all elaborate develops a critical theme which will be developed throughout the workshop.


Clinard is a law professor who has made his reputation examining ethical issues surrounding organisations and their activities. He concentrates on the private sector, and mainly American examples, but the issues he raises are relevant to organisations in all sectors. This book is a useful corrective to treatments of organisations that ignore their social and political impact on the environment and society at large. It is usefully read in conjunction with Punch (1997), Punchard (1989) and Moore (1997), as well as texts covering issues of power and politics.
Much of the organisational and (especially) management literature treats the workforce either as fundamentally passive, or, in some of the wilder flights of fantasy, as being happy to be exploited. Most of this derives from a more or less exclusive focus on organisations and management projects, resulting in the implicit (and ideological) characterisation of the workforce merely as a ‘resource’ for the organisation’s use. As a result management theory often flounders in the face of real people behaving like real people. This book covers some of the latter ground. It is interesting in its own right as an essay on the ways in which people try to maintain some attachment to, and control of, their own lives. When used in conjunction with a critical approach to organisations the implications of this study are quite dramatic. This is usefully read as an adjunct to studies of organisational politics. It is also interesting if you are interested in questions of human motivation - you will never look at Maslow the same way again.


This is a collection of case studies designed to stimulate critical thinking about organisations and how they are run. You might find some useful cases for assignments here, but also there are some very good references and commentaries. Martin Corbett is a specialist in the problems associated with technology.


Much of so-called critical organisational theory targets ‘rationalism’ and ‘rationalistic models’. It is not always clear what this is supposed to mean. If you want to explore the critique you will need to have some grounding in the terminology itself, and this book can help you. Note, however, that the book is written from a philosophical standpoint, and much of the content, therefore, addresses specifically philosophical questions. It is, nevertheless, very interesting.


This is a new text on an important topic. The scope of the book is broader than this workshop, covering, inter alia, formal contractual relations and regulation. Nevertheless, there is also much of relevance here as well, and you can get a frisson of pleasure from the knowledge that you have rubbed shoulders with some of the authors. There’s also a cracking chapter on leadership from page 95!


This is a classic text on bureaucracy, and one well worth exploring for that reason.


This is not an anti-military tract, but an examination of the ways in which organisational dynamics, processes and structures can subvert the effective running of organisations - in this case military organisations. It has some very important points to make, many of which are reiterated in a broader context in Dixon (1987). Some of it is a bit Freudian for my taste, but the overall thrust of the book is extremely important.


If you want to know what some of the fuss is about concerning Postmodernism, try reading this. You will also need to look at some Foucault, and, for a considered counterblast also have a look at Callinicos (1989), and parts of Sokal & Bricmont (1998).


Great study of an important mutiny. This book gives some splendid first hand material about why the mutiny happened, how the sailors regarded their officers and how the mutiny was eventually settled. This is useful material if you want to examine issues of leadership, power and politics in organisations.

This is not an organisational text, but it is important for its approach to knowledge and knowledge making. Fort was at one time unfairly called ‘the Arch Enemy of Science’ because of his unremitting application of scepticism to matters of science and epistemology. In the context of this workshop Fort’s work has some application as an example of the difficulties encountered when we try to make sense of the complexity surrounding us. Those of you with an exotic twist to your nature will enjoy the topics treated by Fort - falls of strange objects, UFOs, spontaneous human combustion, etc. You might also be interested to see where Chris Carter gets his ideas for the X-Files. This book is a compendium of the books of Charles Fort (The Book of the Damned, New Lands, Lo!, Wild Talents) which have also recently been reissued by John Brown Publishing.


Science fiction dystopia about the future and how it may be shaped by information technology. Written by the man who coined the term ‘Cyberspace’. Although fictional (and a cracking good read) this book is a useful corrective to some of the triumphalism surrounding technology. Read it in conjunction with Toffler (1971; 1981; 1991), Zerzan & Carnes (1988) and Zuboff (1989).


This text can usefully be read in conjunction with Butler & Wilson (1990)
Hemphill, J. K. (1949) Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio
Don’t expect a standard organisational studies text here - or even a standard work of scholarship. This one’s just for interest, although if you are in any way fascinated by the balance and tension between order and chaos this book does, ironically given its intention, contain some interesting stuff.
A wonderful science fiction novel addressing questions of hierarchy and power in an accessible form. It’s also a good read. As with Gibson (1993) this book raises important issues, albeit in a fictional context. In this case Le Guin examines issues of power and dependency, and some of her insights are actually quite profound.
Popular text presenting information about recent developments in the
mathematics of complexity. It is a reasonably straightforward account in non-
technical language, laying out the main features of the area. This is useful and
important material for issues of certainty and control in real world systems.
Although this is not specifically geared towards organisational theory, much of
the content of this book is highly suggestive for organisational analysis.


groups.’ *Employee Relations*, 19, 11 - 26.

Management Review*,

A well known (and very short) study of social power by a specialist in the
subject. Well worth looking at for most aspects of the workshop.


London: HMSO.

British Psychological Society and Macmillan.

Press.


Mechanic, D. (1962) "Sources of power of lower participants in complex
organisations". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 349-364

Practice*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

69, 2614 - 2618.

- 568.


groups’. In, R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (eds) *Trust in Organizations*. 


Cambridge & Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison
des Sciences de l’Homme.


Michael Moore is well known for his television productions, and his criticism of big business and its treatment of those who work for it. This book is an extended essay outlining his criticisms and the reasons for his outrage. In some places it is a bit patchy, and some of the material is not directly relevant to the workshop, but there is sufficient within it to make it an important adjunct, and corrective, to those texts which blandly talk about ‘restructuring’ or those which are frankly triumphalist about ‘downsizing’ (or whatever the current euphemism is for sacking people). This book has some significant material in it for advancing the political analysis of organisations. Written by someone who has no need (or desire) to flatter management, this book provides a lot of illumination on the reactions of the powerless to the power of organisations.


Boring but useful. This book consists of a series of separate essays each dealing with a different aspect of organizational change. You should be aware, however, that the chapters are only loosely integrated, and there is considerable disagreement amongst the authors on key aspects and issues.


Private sector version of *In Search of Excellence*. The book is complete junk, but influential nevertheless, not least with Bill Clinton and our own esteemed government.

Packard’s books are now quite old, but what they say is still relevant. For some reason issues of influence within and between people has been neglected within organisational theory, certainly since the 1970s, and as a consequence there is a kind of naivete running through some areas of the literature. Packard’s examination of issues of power and influence fills some of the gaps, and can be usefully read in conjunction with more specialised texts such as Aronson (1988).


This is a splendid examination of social power in the mould of French & Raven (1959). This is usefully read in conjunction with French & Raven’s original study, and with Mowday (1978) and Mechanic (1962).


A useful book for sources and information. Its moral stance, however, is dubious, and Peters’ analysis is, as ever, superficial, platitudinous and patronising. Since writing this Peters has moved on to other topics. Although I am no fan of Peters, this book is usefully read in conjunction with Toffler (1971, 1981, 1991), as well as Zerzan & Carnes (1988), Zuboff (1989), and Handy (1985, 1990, 1994).


Pratchett is not noted for his contribution to organisation theory, but like the other fiction authors included in this list he does, nevertheless, offer some intriguing and important insights. The three ‘nomes’ books (*Truckers*, *Diggers*, *Wings*) are actually an extended discussion of the difficulties of instituting change, although Pratchett naturally didn’t write them for the instruction of managers and would-be managers. *Lords and Ladies* is an interesting examination of power - real and imagined - recapitulating some of the more formal insights of French & Raven (1959) and Paton (1983).


Extracts from some of the more influential organisation theorists. This book provides access to some of the work of the founders of modern management theory, in their own words, without having to do extensive library work. Reading an author’s own words can be quite a surprise when compared to the commentaries offered in other text books.

This provides potted summaries of some of the main (historical) organisation theorists, and is invaluable as a guide to further reading as well as a summary of the whole field.

A relatively new book exploring aspects of organisations which, frankly, seldom appear in the mainstream texts. An important contribution to the political analysis of organisations, which develops a theme likely to become much more important in the near future - organisational ethics. This book is usefully read in conjunction with Clinard (1990).

A book about the operation of collectives and co-operatives. Useful as a corrective to the presumption that hierarchical organisations are somehow inescapably ‘natural’.

Interesting piece by a journalist on the IT underground. Rushkoff covers issues such as smart drugs, hacking, techno-shamanism, and other exotica related to the information revolution. He has some important insights into the future as well, so this book is usefully read in conjunction with the work of Toffler, Zerzan & Carnes and Zuboff.
Recent book addressing (attacking) the scientific borrowings of certain high profile French postmodernist ‘philosophers’. If ever you were in any doubt about the scholarly foundations of some of the more incomprehensible works in social science, this book should help assuage those doubts. The book is also interesting for what it has to say about the foundations of scientific knowledge, and therefore contributes to the basis of this workshop.
Taska, L. (1992) “Scientific Management: Technique or Cultural Ideology?” *Journal of Industrial Relations,*
A ‘band wagon text’, this is a particularly boring examination of an old philosophical debate set within an organisational context. The debate is about the tensions between order (hierarchy) and creative chaos (markets). Its theme still has some contemporary relevance, and is therefore worth examining, but because of the terms in which it is couched here this book will rapidly become of only minor historical interest. If you can get hold of a copy Principia Discordia (Jackson, Koke, Pearcy & Hartsock, 1994) treats a similar theme more amusingly (although perhaps less helpfully for your studies!)


It has always intrigued me how an old Marxist could become the darling of management without changing his initial stance very much. But it happened to Toffler, much to his own bemusement. Toffler is an important source on issues of information technology and the future of work. If you want to pursue these topics you will have to read at least some of his writings.


This is an interesting and important examination of the ways in which insights into human behaviour can be used for negative ends. There is much else besides, of course, and the book is therefore usefully read as a general text in its own right.


See also Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989) which reprints this paper.


The importance of abstract studies about categorisation, which this text is, is that they highlight the problems both of knowledge and, in a practical sense, also raise issues of taken for granted assumptions and their impact on, amongst other things, practice, justice, fairness, ‘common sense’, and other very practical themes related to everyday life. This text examines some of the very basic themes of the workshop, but don’t suppose that it is just to do with foundations. What Zerubavel has to say, like that of Bateson (1979), is extremely important for understanding the way organisations are run, especially in highlighting ideological aspects of ‘common sense’ and ‘truth’.


This is a collection of writings on the theme of Information Technology providing an important counter balance to the triumphalism of those who champion IT as the saviour of the future. If we were to believe some writers technology will finally bring about the democratic utopia of ancient dreams - this book gives the other side of the argument, and shows how IT also presents threats to individual liberty in society at large and at work.


This book and Zerzan & Carnes (1988) make excellent companion volumes. They examine broadly similar areas although from different perspectives. As with Zerzan & Carnes, this book raises some thought provoking questions about the role of technology and the future of work.

Dr. Lesley Prince

12 November 2007
Directed Readings

What follows is a set of directed readings for the workshop. I may supply others as the workshop progresses. This list should be used in conjunction with the reading lists immediately above. Each reading given below relates to one or more of the topics covered during the workshop, and all can be found in the reading lists above, or listed separately below. As with the reading lists, I intend the following simply as a guide not as a compulsory list of readings. It is not my intention to swamp you with too much to read, but each of the book chapters or papers listed below contains some information, whether important background, details, or both, which may help you to progress your understanding of organisations.

As a general point, remember that Morgan (1997), Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990) and Handy (1985) contain material on most of the topics listed in the workshop.

Please note that all of the brief references given here are fully referenced in the reading lists given earlier. However, not all of the references given in the extended reading list above appear here (because it would take too long to sift through all of them carefully). So in addition to using these lists to guide your reading, you should also browse the extended reading lists for titles that have a bearing on the topic. This will be especially important for preparing essays.

Frameworks of Reality: Prediction & Control, and the SOGI Model

Although the theme of this session is covered in most texts to some extent, discussion of the principal points is generally found in the more philosophical texts, and the use of the SOGI model as an analytical framework is unusual to this workshop. Nevertheless, the theme is an important one, and some expansion of the main points, with extra material drawn from other intellectual traditions, can be found in the following (incidentally, I don’t necessarily agree with everything said in all or any of these books - the importance is in the debate):

Morgan (1997): Introduction; Chapter 1; Chapter 10.
Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990): Introduction; Chapter 1.
Hosking & Morley (1991): Introduction; Chapter 1; and further elements throughout the book.
Bannister & Fransella (1986)
Bateson (1979): Introduction; Chapter 1; Chapter 2; and further material throughout the rest of the book.
Berger (1972): throughout.
Berger & Luckmann (1976)
Cacti (1991): Chapters 1, 2, 4, & 5; Summary.
Chapman & Jones (1980)
Child (1984)
Cohen & Stewart (1994)
Cottingham (1984)  
Daft & Steers (1986), throughout  
Dawson (1992), throughout  
Hall (1992): Chapters 7, 12, 14, 17, & 18.  
Hughes (1998)  
March & Simon (1993), throughout  
Selznick (1943), throughout  
Sims, et al. (1994)  
Sokal & Bricmont (1998) Chapters 4, 7 and 11 contains some interesting material on general epistemic questions.  
Stewart (1989): Prologue; Chapters 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, &14; Epilogue.  
Stewart & Golubitsky (1992)  
Zerubavel (1993)  

See also the notes in this book on page 7, above.

**Making Sense of Organisations: Metaphorical knowledge.**

The readings for this topic are more or less identical to those for the last one, although, being based on Morgan’s work, his is the most important of the references given. But see also the following:

Grant & Oswick (1996), throughout  
Tinker (1986), throughout

**Traditional Management: Mechanism, Rationality and Bureaucracy.**

Abrahamson (1993)  
Abrahamson (1997)  
Beetham (1987)  
Blau & Meyer (1987)  
Blauner (1964)  
Boyne (1998)  
Clegg (1990)  
Cottingham (1984)  
Crozier (1964)  
Dale (1970): Chapter 6, sections by Taylor; Chapter 9 by Fayol.  
Damasio (1994)
Dixon (1987)
Dolgoff (1971)
Downs (1967)
Fayol (1949, 1984)
Gilbreth (1911)
Gulick, & Urwick (1937)
Hales (1993)
Hughes (1998)
Jacques (1976, 1993)
Johnson & Gill (1993)
March & Simon (1958, 1993)
Merton (1940)
Mullins (1999)
Rollinson et. al. (1998)
Sofer (1972)
Taylor (1903)
Thompson et al. (1991): Chapters on hierarchy.
Tullock (1965)
Weber (1947)

Modified Bureaucracy: The Human Relations Movement and Job Design.

Dale (1970): Chapter 7 and Chapter 8, by and on Mayo, and on Mayo versus Taylor.
Dubin (1961) This has chapters by Mayo and Roethlisberger.
Dubin (1974)
Hughes (1998)
Sofer (1972): Chapter 4

Many of the references given above for traditional management theory also cover this topic as well.
Contingency Theory: Horses for courses and organisational structure.

Pugh & Hickson (1983): Sections on Woodward, the Aston Group, Burns, Lawrence & Lorsch.
Pugh (1971): Chapters by Burns; and Woodward.
Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990): Chapters 12, 16, 17, 18, & 19; Case studies 8, 9 & 10; Readings, 10 & 11.

Most of the general text books listed in the extended reading list will have a section on this topic.

Organisational Culture: Real and imagined.


See also:

Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989) - Section 10 (pp 606 - 663) contains some very interesting and useful readings.
Organization Studies had a special issue on Organisational Symbolism in 1985.
The Journal of Management Studies had a special issue on Organisational Culture in 1986.
Anthony (1994)
Clegg, S. (1990)
Cohen, S., & Taylor, L. (1992) Again, although not a direct examination of organisational culture, Cohen & Taylor present an extended discussion of the tactics employed by people to escape what they find to be relatively intolerable circumstances in everyday life, including work. Their concepts of ‘Paramount Reality’ and ‘Consensual Reality’ are particularly pertinent to ideas about organisations and their cultures.
Friedman (1977)
Goffman, I. (1959)
Handy, C. (1989)
Harrison (1987)
Hofstede (1994)
Hughes (1998)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
Moore, M. (1997) Although not a conventional examination of organisational culture, Moore has much to say on the subject which is both interesting and important.

Pheysey (1993)
Schein (1985)
Tropenaars (1993)

To extend your analyses of organisational culture you will find discussions of power and politics in organisations particularly useful.

**Rationality revisited: Decision-making in organisations**

Lee & Lawrence (1991): Chapter 9
Newall & Simon (1972): throughout.
Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990): Chapter 10; Reading 7; Case Studies 3, 4, 5.
Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989) some useful readings, including the original paper by Lindblom (pp117 - 131).
March & Simon (1958) especially chapter 6.
Churchman (1995)
Mulholland (1991)
Newall & Simon (1978)
Newman (1978)
Pettigrew (1973)
Pettigrew (1973)
Quinn (1984)
Simon (1977)

**Why Work?: The motivation to get out of bed in the morning.**

Most general textbooks on organisations and management have sections or chapters on motivation. You might also find it useful to try and relate motivation to leadership at some point.

Morgan (1997): Morgan doesn’t cover motivation as a specific topic, but does discuss related themes. The best chapters to read for this are probably chapters 2, 3 and 4, which relate directly to the lectures so far, and chapters 5, 6, 7 and 9, which anticipate themes to be covered later, especially in Semester 2.
Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990): Chapter 4 gives some useful and important background material. Motivation is specifically covered in chapter 5, and chapters 6 and 7 expand the theme to include Job Design and Learning. You might also find Case Study 2 useful for stimulating your thinking on the topic.

Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989) This has some excellent readings on motivation by Nadler & Lawler (pp 3 - 19), Maslow (pp 20 - 35), Staw (on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, pp 36 - 71), and Kerr (‘On the folly of rewarding A while hoping for B’, pp72 - 87).
Corbett (1994) This is a collection of case studies designed to stimulate critical thinking about organisations and how they are run. Specific to motivation, you might find cases 2, 3, 10, 11, 12 & 13 useful to look at.
Armstrong (1996), sections on motivation.
Campbell & Pritchard (1983)
Chmiel (2000), elements throughout, but mainly section II.
Friedman (1977)
Goodman & Friedman (1971)
Heery & Salmon (2000), especially the chapter by Nolan, Wichert & Burchell.
Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959)
Herzberg (1968)
Holloway (1991), sections on motivation.
Katzell & Thompson (1990)
Mowday (1987)
Steers & Mowday (1987)
Varey (1995)
Vernon (1983)
Vonk (1998)

The Politics of Organising: Goals? Whose Goals?

Lee & Lawrence (1985): Chapters 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
Lee & Lawrence (1991): Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9.
Thompson & McHugh (1990): Chapter 4, plus other material throughout the book.
Adams (1992)
Dixon (1987)
Fricker (1998)
Friedman (1977)
Heery & Salmon (2000)
Hewitt (1984)
Hughes (1998)
Janis & Mann (1977) has some useful material in chapter 3.
Kakabadse & Parker (1984)
Kramer (1996)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
Lawthom (2000)
Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989): Section 6 (pp 345 - 407)
Le Guin (1975)
Patchen (1974)
Punchard (1989)
Salancik & Pfeffer (1977)
Sims, et. al. (1994)

**Power and Conflict in Organisations: Pathology or Normality?**

Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989): Sections 6, 7, & 8, and the Chapter by Dafna Izraeli & Todd Jick (pp 253 - 275).
Adams (1992)
Bachrach & Baratz (1962)
Bacharach & Lawler (1980)
Barclay (1982)
Brown (1963)
Cartwright (1959)
Clinard (1990)
Cohen & Taylor (1992)
Copeman (1975)
Dixon (1987)
Dolgoff (1971)
Emerson (1962)
Eyerman & Jamison (1991)
French (1956)
French & Raven (1959)
Fricker (1998)
Friedman (1977)
Friedman (1977)
Heery & Salmon (2000)
Herzog (1989)
Hickson et. al., (1971)
Kakabadse & Parker (1984)
Kipnis et. al., (1976, 1980)
Korda (1975)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
Le Guin (1975)
Lukes (1974, 1986)
Mechanic (1962)
Mintzberg (1983)
Moore (1997)
Mowday (1987)
Groups and Group Dynamics

Most organisational texts have something to say about groups, but mostly they are not very good. Meanwhile, the following will be useful.

Aronson (1988). Note, this book is updated regularly. The reference is to the fifth edition, but it is likely that more recent editions are available.
Bales (1958)
Belbin (2000)
Codol (1984)
Deschamps (1984)
Fraser & Foster (1984)
Hare (1976)
Hollander (1958, 1964)
Hollander & Webb (1955)
Knippenburg (1984)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapter 9
Meyerson et. al., (1996)
Robinson (1996)
Tajfel (1981)
Tajfel (1984)
Turner (1984)
Unsworth & West (2000)
Vonk (1998)

Conformity and Obedience to Authority

Almost all general texts on Social Psychology will have details of this theme. Conformity in particular is a standard social psychological subject, which is often also linked to power, stereotyping, and internal group dynamics.

Eiser & van der Pligt (1988)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
Milgram (1974)
Vonk (1998)

Diversity: Vive la Differance?

Aronson (1988)
Arrighi (2001)
Bennett (1998)
Chambers & Horton (1990)
Clement & Spinks (2000)
Codol (1984)
Colwill (1982)
Cross et. al., (1991)
Davidson & Cooper (1992)
Deschamps (1984)
Frese (2000)
Hughes (1998)
Hunt & Palmer (1999)
Jewson & Mason (1994)
Johnson & Redmond (2000)
Kandola & Fullerton (1998)
Knippenburg (1984)
Kelly (1991)
Kirton & Greene (2000)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapter 11
Latham (1999)
Lawthom (2000)
Liff (1996)
Macpherson (1999)
Meyerson & Fletcher (2000)
Milner (1984)
Morgan (2003)
Prasad & Mills (1997)
Prasad, Mills, Elmes, & Prasad (1997)
Robinson (1996)
Ross & Schneider (1992)
Somerville, Steele, & Sodhi (2002)
Tajfel (1981)
Tajfel (1984)
Thomas & Ely (1996)
Thomas (1990)
Thompson (1998)
Turner (1984)
Turner (1987)
Vince (1996)
Warr (2000)
Watts & Evans (1999)
Webb (1997)
Wilson & Illes (1999)
Leadership and Management: The gentle art of being in charge?

For this topic there is an embarrassment of riches. The literatures on leadership are vast, complex, frequently confusing and deeply frustrating. The readings below are the merest scratch on the merest scratch on the surface. There are further relevant references listed in the reading lists above, and, just to make you feel even more comforted, you could, and probably should, also read around the related topics power, influence, politics, motivation and trust.

Leavitt, Pondy & Boje (1989): Sections 5, 6, & 9, especially chapters by Pondy (Leadership as a Language Game) and Zaleznick (Managers and Leaders: Are they the same?).
Barclay (1982)
Barnard (1938)
Bass (1981)
Bennis (1959)
Bernard (1927)
Bies & Tripp (1996)
Brown (1963)
Bryman (1986)
Cartwright & Zander (1968)
Cockerton & Whyatt (1986)
Conger & Kanungo (1988)
Copeman (1975)
Fiedler (1964, 1967, 1978)
Gemmill & Oakley (1992)
Graumann & Moscovici (1986)
Grint (1997, 2000)
Hemphill (1949)
Hewitt (1984)
Hollander (1958, 1964)
Hollander & Webb (1955)
Hunt (1991)
Kellerman (1984)
Kipnis et. al., (1980)
Kramer (1996)
Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
Le Guin (1975)
Lewicki & Bunker (1996)
Merton (1969)
Pfeffer (1983)
Prince (1998) (a splendid examination of the subject!).
Quarter & Melnyk (1989)
Check out the reading lists above as well. There are lots of references to works on leadership in there.

**Negotiation and Influence: What does it take to work together?**

- Janis & Mann (1977), throughout.
- Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
- Fisher & Ury (1987) a pot boiler useful for a practitioner’s viewpoint
- Mulholland (1991), throughout
- Newall & Simon (1978)
- Newman (1978)
- Pettigrew (1973)
- Strauss (1978), throughout.
- Vonk (1998)

**Organisational Change: How to manage it and how to screw it up.**

- Morgan (1997): Mainly chapter 8, but also look at chapters 6, 7, & 9 as well.
- Thompson & McHugh (1990): Chapters 4, 5, 6, 9, & 10.
- French & Bell (19)
- Kramer & Tyler (1996): Chapters 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 16
- Mangham (1979)
- Mohrman et. al., (1989)
- Plant (1987)
- Pratchett (1989, 1990 a, b)
- Vonk (1998)
Technological Imperatives: IT, the politics of transformation and futures.


Corbett (1994) has some very good case studies of technology and organisations, and some excellent references (Corbett is a specialist in the human machine interface).
Brown (1997) is also an interesting examination of the impact of technology on life and society.
Frese (2000)
Gibson (93)
Hafner & Markoff (1993)
Heery & Salmon (2000)
Kipnis (1996)
Rushkoff (1994)
Vonk (1998)
Wilson & Rosenfeld (1990) also has a very good section on the future of work.
Notes on Writing a Case Analysis

Dr. Lesley Prince

The case study is one of the most versatile tools used in the social sciences, with a variety of different forms and a range of purposes. For example case studies are used extensively as a research method, alongside better known methods such as experimentation, surveys, participant observation, and so on. They are also used widely as teaching tools in, for example, psychology, sociology, political science, history, law and management studies (Yin, 1989).

The content of a case study, the analysis, similarly takes many forms, depending on the purpose of the study and its projected audience. Broadly speaking, however, there are three types relating to three distinct purposes: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory (see Yin, 1989: 15-16, et. seq.). The case studies for which you will be asked to prepare an analysis fall fairly neatly into the descriptive and explanatory models.

By and large, as a teaching exercise, the purpose of case analysis is to encourage you to make explicit links between a set of situations and incidents described in a case study and the organisational literatures, both theoretical and empirical. The focus of the exercise will depend on whether the case describes a set of problems for which you must propose some solutions, or whether you are simply presented with a description to which you are invited to supply a theoretical commentary. Nevertheless the process is very similar: make explicit links with the literature in relation to an embedded argument or series of arguments from which clear conclusions are drawn. To this extent case analysis has much in common with the kind of formal reports that are very common in contemporary organisations.

Structuring a Case Analysis

Like so much in the social sciences there are many different ways to structure a case analysis. Unlike formal laboratory reports, for which it is possible to outline a specific and uniform set of stages covering well recognised items of key information, a case study can take a variety of forms depending, again, on the purposes for which it was produced and the proposed audience. Furthermore, case analyses are frequently presented in narrative form, rather than the more restricted formal language of 'scientific' reportage, and consequently it is difficult to prescribe specific stages through which they must pass. Nevertheless some sort of framework is essential if an analysis is not to descend into an amorphous welter of disconnected observations with neither direction nor point. What follows, then, is a series of notes on one such framework, which I call a medical model.
It should be emphasised that this model is being offered as an aid to those who are unfamiliar with case analysis. It is not the only framework that exists for writing up cases, and neither is it necessarily the best for all purposes. Furthermore it is not a compulsory model, and if you already have a model for case analysis which you are happy with, then please use that.

General notes on the Medical Model

This framework is called a medical model for several reasons, the most obvious one being that it is focussed on organisational problems, and is therefore focussed on the attempt to find solutions of some sort. The focus on problem solving is largely historical in that most cases used for teaching in organisational analysis courses have an explicit orientation towards problems. And it should be remarked that by and large such a focus has several distinct advantages, not least of which is the way in which such cases generate the understanding that organisations are "complex, contradictory and frequently paradoxical" (Morgan, 1997).

So, the Medical Model of case analysis has a distinct problem solving orientation. In other words this approach views case analysis as a practical tool designed to derive practical solutions to practical problems. But here it must be stressed that the purpose is emphatically not to derive the one proper or correct solution to a set of problems. Some organisational problems are practically insoluble. Others can only be resolved (not solved) over time. And even when it is possible to suggest a simple solution, there are no known criteria by which the solution can be evaluated as 'correct', let alone the one best solution, simply because the complexity of the world generates, in practical terms, infinitely many solutions to one problem. Given that most problems within organisations are themselves complex, made up of many different smaller problems, all interlinked, the possibility of identifying the correct solution are remote to say the least. There are good solutions, and there are bad ones, but ultimately this evaluation must take into account the specific features of the case, including context, environment, dominant issues, persons, personalities and so on. A solution is 'good' if the positive implications of implementation outweigh the negative ones, and this naturally raises questions about what criteria are used and how they are justified.

The Organisation is not well

At the heart of the medical model is a metaphor: that the organisation is not well, and needs some treatment. As you proceed with your analysis it is, therefore, your job to prescribe what the medicine should be. It is, sometimes, useful to bear in mind the image of a doctor's surgery, with you as the doctor, while conducting your analysis.

Another useful metaphor is the funnel. Initially you will be presented with a relatively unstructured set of descriptions about an organisation. It is your job as the analyst to give these notes some structure, and meaning, by use of the organisational literatures. At each stage of the analysis, however, you will also reduce the amount of material in the case to those aspects which form the core of your analysis, until what you are left with is a simple series of statements which present your overall conclusions. In a sense this process involves the distillation of the important features of the case until you have only the necessary and sufficient details for making recommendations about action.
Structure of the Medical Model
There are five main headings (sections) in the framework forming the case analysis proper, plus two others that are required in academic work. These are, respectively:

1. DESCRIPTION
2. ANALYSIS/DIAGNOSIS
3. OPTIONS
4. PRESCRIPTION/RECOMMENDATION
5. ACTION

Plus:

ABSTRACT
REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Description
The starting point for any case analysis is a basic description of the situation presented in the case notes. If the purpose of the case is theoretical commentary then the description will be a fairly straightforward repetition of the main points of the case as you, the analyst, see them. Obviously this process in some ways a matter of arbitrary choice on your part, a factor which cannot be avoided (although see Miles & Huberman (1984) for an attempt to systematise the process). When the purpose of the case is problem solving the process is similar, but with somewhat more focus. The aim then should be to derive a description of all the main symptoms of difficulty that are presented in the case notes. This is directly analogous to the process of consultation that takes place in the doctor's surgery.

When you enter the doctor's presence the first question you are likely to be asked is: "What seems to be the problem?". You are not being invited to give a complete diagnosis. On the contrary, you are being asked for the immediate reason for your visit. Let us say, for example, that you were experiencing severe stomach cramps, and thus your reply might be "It's my stomach doctor, it's causing me a bit of pain". As far as you are concerned this pain is precisely what the problem is; it is this that you experience and which you want the doctor to cure. It is sufficient as a starting point, but as a medical diagnosis it obviously doesn't go far enough. From your point of view the pain is the problem; from the doctor's point of view it is merely the symptom of a problem, and it is his or her job to discover what underlies this, and possibly other symptoms.

The initial job of a case analysis is to do the same thing. The case notes will describe some elements of the presenting problem or problems, but these should be treated as symptoms, and recorded as such.

This is only the first part of the job of this section, however, because you also need to identify significant features of the case which, while not obviously problematic, might have an important bearing on the case. Back to the doctor's surgery and your "stomach pain". After the initial question, you may very well be asked something like "Have you been eating any strong curries recently?" or "Have you been abroad recently?" or "Have you been eating a lot of fruit recently?" and so on. These factors are not problems in themselves, but, quite obviously, if you have been eating too much fruit, for example, then the underlying problem, that which has caused your discomfort, can be easily identified.

In sum, the job of the first section of a case analysis is to:
Give a description of what seems to be the problem
Identify the main symptoms
Describe other relevant factors

It should be noted that all the information required for this section will be found in the case notes. At this stage it is neither necessary nor desirable to try and make explicit links with the literature. Nor is it necessary to import any other kind of information from outside the case at this stage. Undoubtedly you will feel that there is insufficient information available on particular aspects, but this is usual. Most of the time we have to make decisions on the basis of incomplete information, and this is, therefore, one of the constraints within which you have to work. Do not invent details to cover awkward gaps. Stick to the details presented in the case notes. The appropriate slogan here is stick close to the data. Just think how uncomfortable you would feel if the doctor started to invent spurious details about your medical complaint.

Analysis/Diagnosis
The second section is the place where you bring the literatures to bear. If section 1 has been completed properly you should have described a set of factors which require explanation. The literature, therefore, becomes the principle tool by which you derive this explanation or explanations. At bottom this is a process of giving meaning to the features you have identified, possibly in relation to causes. This principle applies equally to theoretical commentaries and problem solving cases. In the latter, however, like the doctor in the running example, you are trying to discover what the underlying "illness" is, and, if possible what has caused it.

Don't be surprised or alarmed if while you are bringing the literature to bear there appear to be conflicting views about what is going on in the case, or contradictory predictions. This sometimes happens, and if it does then it is the job of the case analyst, you, to arbitrate between rival accounts through comparison with the details presented in the case.

One principle is very important here. Too many students assume that this section is a test of their ability to cite as much of the literature as possible, in the mistaken belief that they are marked according to the number of names they can quote (and by implication according to the number of books and papers they can pretend to have read). The result is often an unsatisfactory mishmash of unrelated citations - unrelated to each other and to the case under consideration. The result is inevitably total and inescapable confusion. Far better to cite only one or two pieces of work from the literature, but in such a way that they contribute something substantial to the analysis or, in other words, your understanding of the case. As an acid test ask yourself, before you include any theory or report of empirical enquiry "Does this add anything materially to my understanding of this case? Does this help me to draw sensible conclusions?" If the answer is no then don't include it.

One final point worth stressing is that you are likely to find that the details of the case relate to one or more Levels of Analysis (SOGI). You should be alive to this, and aware that theories are often only appropriate to specific levels. In other words, the level of analysis is going to have a considerable impact on which theories and empirical data sets are appropriate.
Options
When identifying possible courses of action, you are presenting for consideration only what kind of options there are in general. These should follow directly and obviously from your diagnosis in the previous section. When the diagnosis has been done thoroughly, and systematically, this section should almost write itself.

As an arbitrary number you should identify at least four different options. To make the job easier, however, remember that Doing Nothing is always an option, so in effect you have to identify only three.

Each option should be evaluated. Identify good aspects and bad aspects, including implications for other aspects of the organisation and the people that comprise it. For example, many organisational problems can be solved very simply by sacking the entire workforce. Problem solved; we can all go home. Well, not quite. In most circumstances such a solution would create problems more severe than the original one. So perhaps it's not the best solution after all. Let's go back to the interview with your GP. Having decided that the cause of your discomfort is to be found in the excessively spicy diet that you have been indulging in recently, your doctor announces the following options: a course of antacid tablets; the complete surgical removal of your gastro-intestinal tract; a complete change of diet; regular doses of Milk of Magnesia; a holiday in the Algarve. He or she then decides, for quite inscrutable reasons, that surgery is the one to go for. You would most certainly be entitled to ask what possible advantages could be derived from such a course of action and if the negative implications had been properly assessed. Most likely you would be anxious to point out the severe implications of this option, preferring, no doubt, any of the other options - no doubt the last one especially.

The point is serious. Options which on the face of it will solve the immediate problems faced by an organisation may have such difficult and undesirable consequences that they are best put aside. But you can only know this if you evaluate all aspects of the option in question, that is, identify its advantages and disadvantages. And this requires the engagement of your experience, your intelligence, your emotions, your imagination, and above all your humanity.

Prescription/Recommendation
Once again the material in this section should follow obviously and clearly from the results of the last section. Here you are stating very clearly what should be done in the case under consideration. Your final recommendation may take the form of one of the options described and evaluated earlier, and in this section you should repeat some of the more serious implications highlighted there, both positive and negative. Your recommendation need not be so restricted, however. You might, for example, choose to recommend several of the options, perhaps related to short, medium and long term time spans. Or, in the light of your evaluations you might feel that one option should be implemented in a modified form, perhaps modified by one of the other options. The choices are quite wide, with only this restriction - you should not at this stage introduce a completely new option. First it's cheating, and second your reader is entitled to ask "Where did that come from?" In other words don't spring surprises.

Having made your recommendation, you should evaluate this as well, because there might be additional implications following from the decision to implement. It is also good practice at this stage to make some suggestions about how you might head off some of the more negative implications. Remember also that are nearly always some negative consequences of implementing any strategy to tackle organisational
problems, so don't try to duck the issue by ignoring the problem.

**Action**

This, ultimately, is the most important section of a case study when it is presented to a real organisation who might be expected to act on your suggestions. In a case analysis produced for educational purposes, however, it tends to be the least important, for the following reasons.

When done properly this section can take considerable time. It needs to be based on a detailed knowledge of the organisation; the way it works; what resources it has at its disposal; how much time and resourcing it is prepared to commit, and so on. In a case analysis conducted for educational purposes you are unlikely to have this information, particularly if the case has been set from a text book or similar source, remembering that your only source of information is likely to be the case notes, and the instruction that you should stick close to the data. Assumptions can play a part, of course, as they can at any point in the analysis, but they should be clearly labelled as such. Under no circumstances, however, should you simply invent details to get you out of a tight spot. That would be *too* easy. Consider an extreme, and perhaps ludicrous, example. In any case that you are likely to encounter, if you were allowed to invent details, there would be nothing to stop you from simply saying "*But at the last minute everyone realised that they were behaving badly. So they had a meeting, resolved all their differences and lived happily ever after. So the fact that Fiedler's theory didn't seem to make any sense at all in relation to this case doesn't matter any more. The End.*"

In relation to this section of a case analysis, then, you cannot write about what you have few details of. Nevertheless it is important to try and sketch in some features of how, in practical terms, you would see your recommendation turned into a programme of action. The difference between this section and the last, which sometimes confuses people new to case analysis, is actually straightforward. Here is an example:

**Recommendation:** I recommend that our best course of action is for us all to go into town for a meal.

**Action:** We book a table for 8pm at *Marios Famous Pizza Parlour and Drinking Emporium*; leave the house at 7pm; catch the 7.30pm bus (avoiding the problem of drinking and driving, and, being cheaper than the taxi, leaving more money for indulgence), etc.

**Concluding theoretical commentaries**

As noted earlier, the theoretical commentary case analysis departs from the problem-solving case at the point of identifying, describing and evaluating the different options for action. Obviously, however, a theoretical commentary doesn't stop there, and in point of fact there is a section relevant to such analyses which has a functional equivalence to the last three sections of the problem-solving case. This is the **Conclusions** section. Here the many interim conclusions drawn throughout the case analysis itself are restated and brought together. In some ways they are also brought side by side where they can be directly compared. Out of this comparison, and in relation to the main strands of argument set up in the analysis, the overall conclusions of the analysis should emerge. This is not the same as the restatement of the interim conclusions, but should be an overall synthesis for the case as a whole, rather like the last section in a good essay.
Abstract
For academic purposes each case analysis should have an abstract of roughly 100 words. There is no mystery to this, and indeed it is a good discipline to follow. Equivalent terms, from different contexts include: synopsis; precis; and executive briefing. Like all of these the abstract is a potted account of the entire piece, and its purpose, obviously enough, is to enable prospective readers to evaluate the contents without having to read the whole document.

The abstract should always be placed at the front of your report, just after the title page.

References
This section is extremely important, and should appear at the end of the case analysis. In this section you should include the full details of all the work to which you referred, even if only in passing, in your text. Every time you refer to someone's work, they are entitled to a full listing in your reference section. This is distinct to a bibliography, which is a list of all the sources you actually used (the two obviously not the same thing). My preference is to use the double heading References & Bibliography to avoid complications.

The form which you choose to adopt for referencing is irrelevant, providing that (i) it is a recognised system of some sort, and (ii) you follow it consistently. There is, however, a general preference in social science for the Harvard system, the form of which you will find at the back of most social science texts and below.

Presenting a Case Report
When you have completed the text of your case report, remember that presentation is as important as content. At the very least you should prepare a cover page with the following information: The title of the report; your name; your course; the date. Next, enclose the Abstract of your report, on its own page, and also bearing the title of the report. Then include a contents page, followed by the main text of the report, and finally your references and bibliography. In sum your report should have the following, in this order:

- Title Page: Title; your name; your course; date
- Abstract: Title; abstract
- Contents: Contents page listing all your main headings
- Main Text: The text of your report
- References and Bibliography: A complete list of all the texts you refer to in the text, and which you have used to prepare your report.

It is worth commenting that you should also use a similar presentation for essays.

References and Bibliography

Important Notes for Writing Your Own Case Study

If you want to write a case study based on your own organisation, or another organisation which you know well, you will need to observe some simple, but extremely important, rules about the ethics of research. What these boil down to is the straightforward prescription that you must protect the identities of the individuals who comprise the main actors in your case. Accordingly, please make sure that the names of individuals, departments and organisations are sufficiently disguised to prevent a casual reader of your assignment from identifying who you are talking about.

This is not a trivial matter, and should, therefore, not be taken lightly, even in an undergraduate piece.

As compensation you can always have fun making up names for people and places. Indicate obliquely what you think of your subject matter, if you like, by adopting names such as Grindem Down, or Dire Place. Old favourites (cliches), such as Letsby Avenue, for a case about the Police Force can also be adapted. Or, try running the original name through a spell checker or thesaurus to see what comes out the other end. Some examples that I have found include Touchier for Thatcher and Meagre for Major; Morally or Motley for Morley, Fiddler, or Fiddlier for Fiedler, Facile or Foul for Fayol, and Measly, Mislay, Muesli or Moistly for Maslow.
Space for Doodles, Marginal Notes, Aimless Scribblings, Love Letters and Shopping Lists