
Review

Author(s): Lisa R. Berlinger and Sim B. Sitkin

Review by: Lisa R. Berlinger and Sim B. Sitkin

Source: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Dec., 1990), pp. 740-744

Published by: [Sage Publications, Inc.](#) on behalf of the [Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393523>

Accessed: 05-03-2015 19:30 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Inc. and Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

the use of ESOPs in leveraged buyouts (LBOs). Although the use of ESOPs to fund LBOs became extensive after the book was published, several notorious examples, such as the Blue Bell and Dan River cases, had already become public and merited review.

Notwithstanding these weaknesses, *Employee Ownership in America* is still a very important book. It is well worth reading and was a landmark piece of research in the EO movement when it was first published. It has had a profound impact on attitudes toward EO among public policymakers, trade unionists, corporate managers, and entrepreneurs. Certainly it is worthwhile reading for administrative scientists, too, but they will have to establish for themselves the relevance of its findings to organizational science.

Christopher B. Meek

Associate Professor
Department of Organizational Behavior
Marriott School of Management
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84651

REFERENCES

- Blasi, Joseph**
1989 *Employee Ownership: Revolution or Ripoff?* New York: Ballinger.
- Grob, Gerald N.**
1961 *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- McKinsey and Company**
1983 *The Winning Performance of America's Mid-Size Companies.* Washington, DC: McKinsey and Company.
- Marsh, Thomas, and Dale McAllister**
1981 "ESOPs tables." *Journal of Corporation Law*, 6: 613–617.
- Meek, Christopher B., Warner P. Woodworth, and W. Gibb Dyer, Jr.**
1988 *Managing by the Numbers: Absentee Owners and the Decline of American Industry.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Montgomery, David**
1967 *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1862–1872.* New York: Knopf.
- Rayback, Joseph G.**
1966 *A History of American Labor.* New York: Macmillan.
- Rogers, Daniel T.**
1974 *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850–1920.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold, Harold Cook, and Jack Lohmann**
1984 "Research report: The relationship of employee ownership to technological adaptiveness and performance of companies." Unpublished manuscript, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Whyte, William F., Tove H. Hammer, Christopher Meek, Robert Stern, and Reed Nelson**
1983 *Worker Participation and Ownership.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell ILR Press.
- Woodworth, Warren P., Christopher Meek, and William F. Whyte**
1985 *Industrial Democracy. Strategies for Community Economic Revitalization.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management.

Robert E. Quinn and Kim S. Cameron, eds. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1988. 334 pp. \$29.95.

Paradoxes can be frustrating, amusing, attention-grabbing, insight-producing, and ultimately hard to package neatly. So it is with *Paradox and Transformation*, a collection of nine papers and seven rejoinders that brings together a variety of perspectives and applications of recent organizational research, using a paradox framework to "introduce and explore the im-

Book Reviews

plications of paradox in organizations" (xiii). The point of this book is that considering organizational behavior to be paradoxical gives us insights that we could not get by restricting attention to the more readily understood aspects of organizational life.

Paradox is a difficult and slippery concept, but Quinn and Cameron have structured this book in a way that facilitates understanding. With the exception of the introductory and concluding chapters, each chapter is followed by a rejoinder, many of which make a substantive contribution by supplementing and summarizing the chapter. Quinn and Cameron note that the "chapters are more thoughtful explorations than well-developed or refined expositions" (xv). Therefore, it seems appropriate that they have chosen to include rejoinders to the chapters, even though such a format is more often used for conference papers.

The first three chapters provide a set of theoretical lenses through which the paradox perspective can be understood. In the introductory chapter, Cameron and Quinn describe the history and definitions of the concept of paradox and list six characteristics of effective organizations that are contradictory or paradoxical: simultaneous loose-tight coupling, specialization and differentiation, continuity and turnover among leaders, deviation-amplifying and deviation-reducing processes, expanded search in decision making that occurs concurrently with the creation of inhibitors to information overload, and disengagement and dis-identification with past strategies as well as reintegration and reinforcement of roots. They then describe some research examples in which approaching the phenomena under study as paradoxical has proven fruitful.

The chapter by Van de Ven and Poole provides a thoughtful and imposing analysis of how social structure and individual action interrelate in seemingly paradoxical ways. If you become frustrated while reading this chapter, look at Starbuck's rejoinder before proceeding. The chapter makes tough reading because it has few examples and uses esoteric jargon. However, it is well worth it for the serious student of paradox, even though, as Starbuck notes, not all that Van de Ven and Poole deal with is paradoxical.

The chapter by Ford and Backoff is difficult to read, for similar reasons. The chapter addresses how to use the perspective of paradox to frame thinking about behavior in organizations. More specifically, the authors emphasize paradox as a purely human construction that can be most usefully thought of in terms of interdependence and complementarity, which they contrast with formal logic or conflict-oriented dialectical conceptions of paradox. As Michael Thompson notes in his excellent rejoinder, the authors summarize a complex and highly relevant literature that might not otherwise be accessible to organizational scholars.

Chapters 4–8 examine more concrete areas of study; however, it was disappointing to discover that most of these chapters do not really deal with paradox at all. Instead, they examine reframing, conflict, ambiguity, and change, without really joining these constructs with paradox itself.

741/ASQ, December 1990

Bartunek's chapter focuses on organizational and individual reframing as tools for transformations in organizations. While the chapter is an interesting explanation of reframing, it seems to have been written outside of the context of the book: the connection to paradox is mentioned only parenthetically, and Bartunek does not actually address paradoxical phenomena. However, the chapter is broadly relevant in that one implication of the whole book is that examining phenomena in organizations as though they were paradoxical involves a reframing of researchers' and managers' perspectives. In his rejoinder, Kimberly notes that an explicit discussion of this link would have connected the chapter to the rest of the book and could have resulted in more exploration of the potential importance of reframing as part of the paradox process.

Eisenhardt and Westcott's chapter addresses the creation of excellence, using just-in-time (JIT) manufacturing systems as an example. In the rejoinder to this chapter, Buenger and Daft point out that, although the chapter is a well-written and informative discussion of JIT systems, it does not fulfill "its stated purpose to explore the role of paradox in creating innovation and excellence through the example of just-in-time manufacturing" (p. 195). Like Bartunek's chapter, this chapter uses the definition of paradox very loosely and possibly inappropriately. However, this chapter provides very useful and interesting reading for those who wish to learn more about JIT systems—as long as the reader keeps in mind that conflict, ambiguity, and multiple demands are not synonymous with paradox. Siporin and Gummer discuss the history and development of paradoxical interventions as used in family therapy. Their discussion of applications to behavior in organizations will be disappointing to organizational behavior researchers who will wish for more of substance in this area and less historical background. Kilmann's rejoinder addresses the potential difficulty of using paradoxical interventions in organizational situations that differ on key characteristics from the family-therapy situation (e.g., the rewards, structure, and culture of the organization could sabotage efforts to get individuals to change even when they might otherwise want to). We had hoped for a chapter that would provide a more substantial and specific discussion of the characteristics of paradox in family therapy that could be applied to organizations, but perhaps this was asking too much.

Morgan's chapter, "Teaching MBAs Transformational Thinking" and Torbert's rejoinder raise issues that should be seriously considered by everyone who teaches management. Morgan's chapter may make you want to restructure the courses you teach. But, before you do, read Torbert's rejoinder. Torbert, using a developmental perspective, questions whether transformational thinking is a skill that can be taught. The debate that is initiated here is quite enlightening and should be continued, with its competing claims tested empirically.

Argyris's chapter, "Crafting a Theory of Practice," builds on his familiar theory of learning, change, and intervention to examine how our beliefs, behaviors, and defensive routines

Book Reviews

create a series of nested paradoxes that can dysfunctionally constrain constructive interactions. As Mirvis notes in his rejoinder, the literature on paradox typically emphasizes logical or linguistic paradox but may be much less informative for organizational scholars than a clear focus on the intrapersonal paradoxes such as those Argyris addresses. While Argyris's chapter does not revisit his work over the previous fifteen years, its framing of this work in terms of a paradox provides an illuminating link to the general thrust of this book.

In the last chapter, Quinn and Cameron summarize their view of the dynamics of paradox and transformation. They point out that some theorists see paradoxes as problems to resolve, while others see them as the essence of the process of change. This chapter further integrates the book by outlining the competing and complementary themes and perspectives.

This book urges us as researchers to adopt a paradoxical perspective and look for examples in which paradoxical phenomena are present. This book suggests that it is during periods of transition that stable and dynamic processes are most likely to be simultaneously visible. Thus, it is during times of transition that paradox will become salient, because most organizational paradoxes reflect the simultaneous presence of characteristics associated with stability and characteristics associated with change. This is the major point of the book and merits further study.

Paradox and Transformation is something of an unfinished patchwork, with repeating patterns and a dominant color scheme. Thus, it will be engaging for careful readers who are struggling to grapple with the complexities of studying organizational phenomena from a paradoxical perspective. But for the reader seeking a tightly woven, finished product, the book will be disappointing. If the book is approached with a willingness to enter the complexity involved in examining paradox in process, the reader will be rewarded with a rich and varied set of insights, intellectual leads, and challenging perspectives. However, this volume exhibits a number of limitations and leads to frustrations that often characterize edited collections. For example, the book contains many unacknowledged contradictions, as though the authors did not all read and learn from each other's chapters before the book was finished.

The reader leaves this book with an enhanced—if incomplete—understanding of the complexities of the topic and a very useful array of frameworks and illustrations for scholars interested in studying organizational paradox. To put it in the terms of the book, we expected to get less than we expected, and that's what we got. But that is indeed a valuable contribution on a difficult and important theme.

Lisa R. Berlinger

Department of Organizational Behavior
The Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106
and

743/ASQ, December 1990

Sim B. Sitkin
Assistant Professor
Department of Management
Graduate School of Business
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712

The Invisible Bureaucracy: The Unconscious in Organizational Problem Solving.

Howell S. Baum. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. 214 pp. \$24.95.

People in the company, for example, do their best to minimize friction (we are encouraged to revolve around each other eight hours a day like self-lubricating ball bearings, careful not to jar or scrape) and to avoid quarreling with each other openly. It is considered much better form to wage our battles sneakily behind each other's back than to confront each other directly with any semblance of complaint.

Joseph Heller

The ramblings of Bob Slocum, the organization man in Joseph Heller's funny but depressive novel, *Something Happened*, become much clearer reading Howell Baum's important new book, *The Invisible Bureaucracy*, on the workings of the bureaucratic mind. The traditional scholar of organizational processes may, however, find this book quite disturbing. The author, like Dante's Beatrice, takes us on a tour into the bureaucratic underworld—a domain that, as he shows us, is rife with anxiety and defensive reactions. As he guides us around all these obstacles, Baum helps us to become better interpreters of the "deep structure" of bureaucracy.

It can be said that the psychoanalytically oriented approach to organizational studies has tended to be on the periphery of organizational science. The average textbook of organizational behavior or management is usually characterized by extremely simplistic theories of what makes people in organizations "tick." Frequently, the human being in all its complexity is conspicuously absent. It is unfortunate that very few scholars of organizations interested in the essence of human motivation and change have really made the effort to familiarize themselves with the seminal contributions of dynamic psychiatry, developmental psychology, psychoanalysis, and individual and group psychotherapy. All too often, "Freudian" psychology is associated with a bearded, cigar-smoking man with a funny Viennese accent, obsessed with sexuality.

Those for whom this sketch rings a bell do not realize that Freud's true contributions derive from his observations that unconscious mental life plays an important part in determining behavior and action, that the present is very much influenced by the past, and that there is such a thing as an "internal world," an "inner theater" consisting of cognitive and affective "maps" that, with great precision, re-enact tragedies and comedies having their source in the formative years.

Organizational theorists should also realize that there has been life after Freud. We can name, for example, the work done by British object relations theorists such as Fairbairn,

744/ASQ, December 1990