

EURAM - PARIS 2016 – CALL FOR TOPIC

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE, POWER, RESISTANCE AND CRITICAL MANAGEMENT

CORRESPONDING PROPONENTS:

Edoardo Mollona, University of Bologna, edoardo.mollona@unibo.it

Luigi Maria Sicca, University of Naples - Federico II, luigimaria.sicca@unina.it

CHAIR

Ilaria Boncori, University of Essex, iboncori@essex.ac.uk

Jean-Francois Chanlat, Paris Dauphine, Jean-Francois.CHANLAT@dauphine.fr

Stewart Clegg, University of Technology, Sydney, Stewart.Clegg@uts.edu.au

Alessia Contu, UMass Boston, alessia.contu@umb.edu

Xavier Deroy, NEOMA Business School Reims Campus, xavierderoy@gmail.com

Andrea Fumagalli, University of Pavia, afuma@eco.unipv.it

David Levy, UMass Boston, David.Levy@umb.edu

Mariella Pandolfi, Université du Québec à Montréal, mariella.pandolfi@gmail.com

Luca Solari, University of Milan, solari@unimi.it

FOREWARD

This track addresses the paradox of institutional change, the resistance that the change faces and the contradictions that it incites or reveals. Given the scope of the issue, we articulate our call for papers in two segments:

- the first specifically addresses issues of institutional change whereas
- the second tackles the contradictions that institutional change both faces and generates.

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Institutionalist and management theories are more concerned with regularities rather than events, crises involving uncertainty. Paradoxically enough, institutions defined through their persistence, seem increasingly to be dominated by multi factorial causes of change. The track explores this apparent paradox and the two sides of organizations understood as persisting institutions and changing social systems.

Our purpose is to understand why institutions and organizations change (or why they do not), despite their inertia and their domination over individual members through the routines and regularities. We look for papers that contribute to the advance of institutional theory by coupling persistence and change.

How do individual actors or coalitions of actors (traders, entrepreneurs, managers, ordinary employees) and actants (such as Eurozone crises) contribute to institutional dynamics? To what extent are managers effectively monitoring institutional change? What is the role of democracy and cooperation to initiate and explain change?

Empirically we welcome papers about non mimetic behaviors within cultural contexts of order. We also welcome papers that support the domination of rules, norms and mimetic processes to explain change.

Theoretically, this track strives to investigate:

- The components of interpretive contexts dealing with institutional change.
- The role of deliberate and non deliberate changes in social innovation.
- The conflict between democracy and institutional isomorphism in the making of change.

POWER, RESISTANCE AND CRITICAL MANAGEMENT

When addressing institutional change, literature emphasizes the role of power. In this perspective, institutional agency is understood as both the power to change institutions and the power to resist change.

The track investigates the connected issues of institutional change, power and resistance. This latter both interpreted as the institutional work of elites that try to maintain their hegemony and exploitative power and the one enacted by dominated actors that resist and counteract exploitation and the establishing of hegemony.

We invite papers that:

- theoretically engage with the concepts of power, exploitation and resistance;
- empirically analyze how resistance, exploitation and power materialize in organizational life and in institutional fields;
- offer a critical discussion of managerial and economic mainstream analysis and, for this very reason, is in itself an act of resistance to west-centric and colonial rhetorics.

More specifically, we call papers that investigate:

- Critical approach to management.
- Art as a form of resistance.
- Resistance in academia
- Power asymmetries in and around organizations.
- Dialectical tension between inclusion of, and resistance to, diversity in organizations through an historical approach.
- Neo-Gramscian approach in management and organization studies.
- Neo-Marxism and the evolution of forms of exploitation and its impact on life.
- Resistance as preservation of vocabularies and categories.
- Corporate political action and lobbying influence on institutional change.
- The issues of control and domination through the comparison with another, alternative critical option oriented towards the model of spontaneous order (Self-Organization).

REFERENCES

- Bohm, S., Spicer, A. and P. Fleming. 2008. Infra-political dimensions of resistance to international business: A neo-Gramscian approach. *Scandinavian Management Journal*, 24(3): 169-182.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. The forms of capital. In J. C. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 2005. The Political Field, The social Science Field and the Journalistic Field. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field: 29–47*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Deleuze, G. 1990. Post-scriptum sur le societies de controle. In *Pourparlers 1972-1990*. Editions de Minuit, Paris.
- Fleming, P. 2006. Sexuality, Power and Resistance in the Workplace. *Organizational Studies*, 28(2): 239-256.
- Fleming, P. and A. Spicer. 2014. Power in Management and Organization Science. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1): 237-298.
- Fumagalli, A. 2007. *Bioeconomia e capitalismo cognitivo. Verso un nuovo paradigma di accumulazione*, Roma: Carocci Editore.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: international Publishers.
- Lawrence, T. B., Mauws, M. K., Dyck, B. and R. F. Kleysen. 2005. The politics of organizational learning: Integrating power into the 4I framework. *Academy of Management review*, 30(1): 180-191.
- Lawrence, T. B. 2008. Power, Institutions and Organizations. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: Sage.
- Lawrence, T. B., Malhotra, N. and T. Morris. 2012. Episodic and systemic power in the transformation of professional service firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1): 102-143.
- Levy, D. and M. Scully. 2007. The institutional entrepreneur as modern prince: The strategic face of power in contested. *Organization Studies*, 28(7): 971-991.
- Martí, I. and P. Fernández. 2013. The Institutional Work of Oppression and Resistance: Learning from the Holocaust. *Organization Studies*, 34(8): 1195-1223.
- Oliverio, S. 2012. The Most Beautiful Harmony and Education as a Moral Equivalent of War: A Deweyan-Heraclitean Perspective. *Civitas Educationis. Education, Politics and Culture*, 1(1): 113-132.
- Pandolfi, M. and L. McFalls. *Global Bureaucracy. Indifferent but not irresponsible*. 2010. In Da Lago, A. and S. Palidda. *Conflict, Security and the Reshaping of Society. The Civilization of War*. Routledge, UK.
- Sicca, L.M. 2000. Chamber Music and Organization Theory. Some typical organizational phenomena seen under the microscope. *Culture and Organization*, 6(2): 145-168.
- Sicca, L. M. and L. Zan. 2005. Much ado about management. *Managerial Rhetoric in the Transformation of Italian Opera Houses*, *International Journal of Arts Management*, Spring (3): 46-64.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communication of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.