INFLUENCING THE ORGANIZATION'S PRIORITIES – A THEORRETICAL RATIONALE FOR AN INDEPENDENT INTERVENTION

Dr Ashfaq Ahmad Khan[1]
Lecturer in Accounting, UNE Business School,
University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia
Ph: (+61 2) 67732711, E-mail: akhan27@une.edu.au

Dr Dessalegn Mihret
Lecturer in Accounting, UNE Business School,
University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia
Ph: (+61 2) 67733057, E-mail: dmihret@une.edu.au

---

[1] Corresponding author

INFLUENCING THE ORGANIZATION'S PRIORITIES – A THEORRETICAL RATIONALE FOR AN INDEPENDENT INTERVENTION

ABSTRACT

Current literature on organizational change advocates the significance of 'strategy facilitation' on the part of the parent organization in the process of change imposed on the subordinate organization. Through this conceptual paper, resorting to the recent strategic changes Australian tertiary sector's constituents underwent in response to the Australian government's funding-specific policy changes for the sector, we argue that while 'strategy facilitation' by a 'power source' works to the advantage of subordinate organizations, 'strategy imposition' may work the opposite way. Externally dictated conditions for a change that leave an organization with no option but to submit passively to the pressure and adapt its core organizational elements for the sake of its survival, may result in the organization's demise in its real essence, as the organization sacrifices its true identity in an attempt to placate the external demand. Accountability dictates that such a change needs to be scrupulously checked and subjected to an independent enquiry before considered for implementation. We aim to develop theory- and logic-deduced propositions to help guide future empirical research into the area.

Key words: Accountability, power, governmentality, organizational change.

INTRODUCTION

Using the platform *Accounting, Organizations and Society* has provided to disseminate 'alternative' management accounting practices (Baxter and Chua, 2003), this conceptual paper seeks to portray the discipline as vulnerable to external manipulation. Accounting in general and management accounting in particular has been highly debated to have great influence in shaping social phenomena, even using it for safeguarding vested interests of 'political' groups, inside organizations (Baxter and Chua, 2003). The discipline, with its "constitutive power" and adaptable and flexible nature, has the capacity to shape and be shaped by shared norms and understandings (see, for instance, Ahrens and Chapman, 2006; Baxter and Chua, 2003; Burns and Scapens, 2000). In his book Hopwood (1972), linking the management use of accounting data to their performance evaluation, greatly admires the role of accounting in facilitating the coordination of individual efforts for the achievement of collective organizational goals. Renowned theorist, Henry Mintzberg (cited in Aquinas, 2008) lists adapting their organization's strategy to changing environment for ensuring the organization's survival and efficient functioning as among management's primary responsibilities. Wherever it has worked to the contrary, it is largely because of managers' attempts to manipulate accounting data and/or systems to enhance their individual performance (Hopwood, 1972; Dillard, Rogers, Yuthas, 2011), and to serve politicized networks of organizational members, under the surreptitious 'politics in action' and in creating 'power zones' inside the organization (Baxter and Chua, 2003, p. 104; also see Dillard, Rogers, Yuthas, 2011).

What stems from Hopwood's arguments that is of particular relevance to this study, is that managers' willingness, whether responding to external pressures to adapt their organization's setting to the external force's demands or acting as per their strategic planning, to tailor their organization's strategy is primarily driven by their desire to enhance their own performance. Organizational objectives and accounting practices inside the organization chase each other (see, Ahrens and Chapman, 2006). As the discipline is not regulated and the numbers it deals with are mundane and organization-specific, its techniques are often adaptable to suit certain group's requirements and goals. Busco, Quattrone, and Riccaboni (2007, p. 146) posit:

> Management accounting change is a theoretical space which, possibly more than many others in management and organizational studies, intersects and interacts with the broader knowledge area of the social sciences, sociology and philosophy of knowledge and science and technology studies.

The actual change management accounting and the organization undergo may be good or bad for the organization in the long run, depending on the organization's set objectives, which if unbiased or uninfluenced by an external entity, would yield 'objective outcomes' for the organization, and vice versa. The disciplinary powers of an authority vested in it through the knowledge resource (see Law, 1986), actual or perceived, captured in the concept of 'governmentality' (see Gordon, 1991, p. 1), may cause a change for an organization that may drastically shift its objectives. Borrowing from Mouritsen's (1999) 'flexible firm' concept, while being flexible may be good for the organization, outcomes for the organization are different if it employs 'flexible being driven internally' approach than if it employs 'flexible being driven externally' approach (For a detailed account of management accounting's response to 'internally' driven structural changes in the case of some Australian hospitals, see Chua, 1995).

Organizational members do make use of accounting to pursue organizational goals, at least sub-goals, if not the major ones (Ahrens and Chapman, 2006). The very nature of management accounting, being flexible to its proponents' contextualised objectives, lends it to many forms of uses, all rationalised in different practice contexts (Baxter and Chua, 2003). We argue here that management accounting works towards the attainment of the overall organizational goals, in their original form, unless wilfully manipulated in a politicized manner, in which case its focus shifts to a new set of goals. Given this interconnectedness of management accounting and the organizational goals, and the discipline's socially embedded nature (Baxter and Chua, 2003), a change in goals understandably would trigger a change in the accounting systems the organization employs. Also, given the discipline's ability to affect and be affected by an organization's practices different spheres and the governing institutions and norms (Mouritsen, 1999; Vaivio, 1999; Burns and Scapens, 2000), and the institutional theory's (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) position on the development and subsequent proliferation of certain practices approved as legitimate, through institutional isomorphism, the need for the discipline to experience and then develop only good practices is highlighted.

Having accepted the positive role of management accounting, being equipped with some highly powerful control tools (see Baxter and Chua, 2003), in facilitating achievement of organizational objectives, and its highly vulnerable and ordinary nature in that it is not regulated and governed as financial accounting is, we argue for the 'protection' of management accounting from external power sources trying to exert influence on it, through influencing the organization's objectives and other elements, which chase and are chased by management accounting, from an 'unavoidable' adaptation to placate the external force's peculiar demands/objectives/vested agenda, and thereby bring policy-makers and practitioners' attention to the influence forces external to an organization may have on management accounting practices within organizations. The effect, we argue, on management accounting in general is not limited to the institution on paper but, as institutional theory predicts, the newly acquired practices soon spread across other constituents sharing the same business field and become institutionalised as legitimate practices. These may eventually spread to other unrelated business fields through social and business interactions among staff of different businesses and staff changing jobs.

THE SITE OF THE

Organizations are 'turbulent arenas' and competing notions of knowledge/understandings collide and gave rise to different practices. External force may cause these competing knowledge to surprise organizations by introducing 'new realities/requirements' of existence (Vaivio, 1999). Schatzki's (2002, p. 59) asserts:

> [...] social orders are not self-standing or self-propagating configurations, but that they instead exist and evolve only in some context encompassing them.

Borrowing from the Schatzki's (2002, p. xi) 'the site of the social', theoretical concept/construct, management accounting adapts, develops or deteriorates, on the 'site' of the organization through the social interaction of the members of the organization. We consciously used the term 'deteriorates' as a recognized part of the development of the stock of social knowledge, as the concepts of 'organization' and 'the opposite of organization' Schatzki elaborates on (p. 8). Thus, if an external force 'imposes' certain changes on the organization through its top management would improve or deteriorate the existing management practices, depending on the external's force's strategic motives, and not primarily influenced, as per Mintzberg's theory, by the management's inherent desires/responsibilities to ensure the organization's wellbeing.

For objective results, constituents of certain industries should not be amenable to external intervention due primarily to their peculiar agenda of existence. The Australian tertiary education sector underwent some drastic strategic changes in recent times, as the sector's constituents (i.e. universities) had to adapt and reorient to meet the changed federal government funding requirements in the post-2011 era. Federal government funding policies for universities around Australia have undergone a notable change over the past year or so. Universities are now more demand-driven as Federal government funding will be based on the number of students enrolled in the post-2011 era. Universities are now concerned about their efficient functioning, in the light of their core objectives of learning, teaching, research, and even survival, under the changed circumstances. The issue has been fiercely debated in universities circles and the media, but no serious attempt has so far been made to empirically investigate universities' performance in key areas of learning, teaching, research, governance and management, staff and students' satisfaction, financials, and learning and growth. Several universities, including the University of New England (UNE), have already taken steps to embrace the new era, with 'effective' strategies in place.

With this change we see an impact on universities' overall objectives and missions. Before this change universities' primary emphasis was on learning, teaching and research, with 'federal funding' concerns in the backseat, while after the above impact, we may witness a 'sub-optimal' trade-off between these objectives and the universities' new set of objectives – self-sustainability, survival and profitability. The high emphasis on and attachment of government funding for universities to student numbers and uncapping of students enrolment would have a bearing on universities' core objectives and values – learning, teaching, and research, as the universities primary focus would now shift to attracting/recruiting more and more students with a possible sub-optimal trade off between the quality of their core objectives and values and their enrolments strength. Logically, strategies shift and policy planning at universities would be guided primarily by the above 'state-imposed' changes introduced to the sector. Thus, it is high time to empirically investigate these aspects of the change and ascertain the pros and cons of such policy changes on the core organizational elements of Australian universities. The study's outcomes could potentially be replicated for other 'public-good' enterprises, and have implications for and guide similar future policy changes at the government/state level.

This study extends existing literature by investigating how management accounting systems influenced by external changed circumstances make organizations structurally adapt in a way that produce major shifts in an organization's priorities. The paper is the first phase of the intended two phases[2] and presents theoretical ontological arguments with deductive reasoning and puts forward some propositions for further theoretical and empirical investigation. Desktop research method was employed to review relevant literature and view the research issue at hand with the theoretical lenses of institutional theory, Laughlin's organizational change model, and Foucault's conceptualization of the interplay between power and the construction of social phenomena.

LITERATURE REVIEW – DEDUCING PROPOSITTIONS

Institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), Laughlin's (1991) model of organizational change, and Foucault's strands of discussions on the various capacities of power and its role in the construction of knowledge, and the interplay between these theoretical frameworks provides researchers with a unique vision for contemplating various types of organizational changes caused by various types of triggers and the resulting consequences for the affected organizations' overall structure and functioning. Given the peculiar nature of the management accounting discipline, unregulated and ordinary, dealing in mundane numbers, qualitative research into it, whether done purely qualitatively or under a combination with the still dominant quantitative positivist approach, mostly reveals some valuable insights into the discipline (Parker, 2012).

From the standpoint of institutional theory, 'coercive' influences compel organizations not only to follow rules and regulations from authoritative entities but also conform to what is generally expected of them as business enterprises (Oliver, 1997). We argue that 'coercive' influences (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) instigated by a parent organization (or any organization with a capacity/authority to influence another organization) to trigger a change in a dependent organization's (or industry's) constituting elements (structure, routines, practices, policies, etc.), once gotten across successfully, would cause it to incorporate some additional changes under the resulting 'mimetic' influence (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) effect, obviously so because a successful 'reorganization' attempt triggered under the institutional theory's 'coercive' influences umbrella would then spread across other industry

[2] Under phase II, resorting to the 'comparative case study' approach, we intend to analyse the tangible and intangible changes University of New England – a regional university – and University of Sydney – a metropolitan university - have gone/will go through to effectively embrace the new post-2012 era, and compare and contrast the outcomes with an objective to see the impact the 'externally dictated' change conditions have had on their overall performance across various organizational elements, as described above, and whether the impact has been positive or negative from the perspective of the universities' core operating objectives – learning, teaching and research. We are deliberately taking on universities with a different background as the objective of the study is not to compare outcomes across universities with 'similar' circumstantial background, but to see the impact of the change on two different universities that could be considered representative of other Australian universities in the two broad groups of 'regional' and 'metropolitan' universities.

players under its ‘mimetic’ influences umbrella, which explain an organization’s willingness to adopt particular changes so it could win the status of legitimate player of other industry players (Bartram, 2011). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) identify a mimetic institutional influence (Scott (1995) name these ‘cognitive’ influences) as a force that tends to influence an organization and tailor its policies and practices in accordance with the circumstances currently prevailing in the industry of which it is a part. Mimetic pressures work best in situations where organizations function in a state of uncertainty. Because in such a situation most organizations are already inclined to portray themselves as an integral part of the group instead of trying to stand alone and be deemed isolated (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

Organizations in the same field will perceive their policies to be deleterious for their own survival and wellbeing in the long run if they would opt out from the mainstream organizations in the same field by trying to neglect these influences (Covaleski and Dirsmith, 1988; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The extent of change the affected organization may embrace would vary across industries (see, for instance, Lowrey and Woo, 2010). Erakovic and Wilson (2005) found in their study that response to external pressures for change is different both in magnitude and speed among different organizations. They concluded that the scale and pace of change among different organizations will depend on a variety of factors - social or economic - such as their relative sizes, ages, relationships with external environment, and strength of the surrounding institutional field (see also Oliver, 1991). Their response will also depend largely on the nature of organizations which exert pressures, and the environment (level of uncertainty) surrounding them. For instance, organizations will respond differently to pressures from, say, the government, parent organizations, different interest groups, professions, or the general public. Similarly, response will also vary substantially among different organizations depending on factors, such as the extent and content of the pressure and the means of control by which pressures are exerted, such as coercive or voluntary (see, Campanale, Cinquini, and Tenucci, 2010, for details on the dynamics of organizational response to changed external conditions).

Accounting’s nature as the “discipline of the social” (Baxter and Chua, 2003) dictates that organizational priorities if caused to undergo a change will impact on its accounting practices. Schatzki’s (2002) “the site of the social” dictates that every organization is a ‘playing field’ for management accounting, where its team members, particularly the upper management, could cause to instigate a change in management accounting practices, which eventually become ‘norms’ and ‘institutions’ of that particular industry and may be transmitted across to other organizations through staff changing jobs. Management accounting, thus, has the capacity to develop (and/or deteriorate) routines, practices, and institutions through the interaction of organizational member and play of power and politics between themselves as well as with outside entities. The management accounting’s ‘playing field’ change frequently; the discipline both affects and is affected by it (Mouritsen, 1999; Vaivio, 1999). The literature concedes that management accounting adapts to serve different interest groups within and outside the organization, including policy-makers, who affect management accounting to serve their peculiar goals (see, Baxter and Chua, 2003). The organization’s ‘institutions’, established organizational activities and routines that are passed on, as accepted, legitimate, and approved, to new members, may undergo changes as a result of a variety of stimuli (Burns and Scapens, 2000). Similarly organizational objectives and other elements may change when new pieces of information and figures surprise organizations (see Ahrens and Chapman, 2006), but if these come to the organization in a routine fashion, the organization's response would understandably to different in adapting or reorienting its set of objectives than if these are 'unavoidable', expressed by organizational members implicitly or explicitly, and enforced by an outside entity.

Hopwood (1972) values accounting numbers as indicative of management performance, however, acknowledges the problems management could face in tailoring the accounting system to ensure realisation of this objective. Management accounting's influence go beyond financial numbers and associate itself with management's 'problem solving' concerns (Vaivio, 1999). Thus, it's capacity to exert influence on how the organization functions at a more micro level (Vaivio, 1999), and the concept of the 'organization' as being socially constructed and susceptible to people's interest and ideas and management members' mutual 'power mix', both within and outside the organization (Benson, 1977), necessitates that any external attempts to tailor it to suit their own peculiar agenda would be tantamount to altering the organization's 'constitution' of being what its existence rests on.

Management accounting affects and is affected by organizational functioning (Burns and Scapens, 2000). Strategic changes are commonplace in organizations and often work for the betterment of the organization if they are undertaken by the management, without 'undue' influence from the outside, under their core responsibilities as Mintzberg theorizes. As a result of an external or internal trigger Management accounting adapts or reorients itself in the form of changed organizational routines and practices but the magnitude and extent of change it reveals depends on the level of coherence and similarities between the new and the old routines and practices (Burns and Scapens, 2000, p. 12; also see Chua, 1995).

> [...] In the process of enactment and reproduction of the emerging routines, the intended rules may become modified as acceptable modes of behaviour are negotiated. What is deemed acceptable will be influenced by the meanings and norms embedded in the ongoing routines and also the powers of the individual actors; all of which will be shaped by the existing institutions.

Burns and Scapens (2000), while acknowledge the rational and efficient changes in the organization's routines and practices as a result of externally or internally triggered change, assert that the level and extent of change in the organization's management accounting practices will depend also on the capacity, position, relation to the organization, and authority of the person/entity triggering the change.

> [...] a new management team imposed by the corporate headquarters which has just acquired the business will be influenced by the institutions of the acquiring company. They may also be influenced by broader professional institutions (including recommendations of professional bodies and even currently 'fashionable' ways of managing)

The new acquired or imposed routines and practices do eventually become the norm of the organization and become institutionalised, if not reversed by any means such as the strong bonding between the organizational tangible and intangible elements that confront and eventually fail the weaker external force (Burns and Scanpens, 2000; see also, Laughlin, 1991). However, there certainly arise a question regarding the effect of an externally imposed change on the organization's constitution or founding values and on all the stakeholders, particular in the case of a 'public-good' organization, and that needs to be investigated. Will the organization remain *constitutionally* the same in terms of its core values, norms, and objectives as it was when it was purpose-created? Due to the effect of the 1990s paradigm shift in the microfinance sector, several microfinance institutions drastically transformed into different organizations that were substantially, we argue *constitutionally,* different to their original being (see Khan, 2011). Enron's collapse demonstrated organizational and accounting changes, due to power play of different stakeholders within the firm as well as the firm with the outside world, with extremes of both good and bad market capitalism. Whosoever gets the blame for the over $70 billion firm's total collapse from a giant business enterprise to a bankrupt one within time span of few months (see Dillard, *et al*., 2011), we argue accounting, in particular its management accounting counterpart, is vulnerable to selfish manipulation. Our first set of propositions that we would like be considered for empirical investigation is:

P1. If the magnitude of pressure exerted by an external power source is very high which the dependent organization cannot avoid, this will affect the organization's basic constitution of existence.

P1a. If the magnitude of pressure exerted by an external power source is very high which the dependent organization cannot avoid, this will change the primary focus of the dependent organization's core activities.

The literature on accountability in the context of forced changes 'imposed' on a sector's constituents, where parent-dependent relationship between the power source dictating the change and the passive recipient of the terms of the dictated change is evident, and the later operates in a general public-good sector, has a strong bearing on such organizational changes in terms of the final outcomes for the dependent organization and its direct and indirect beneficiaries. Accountability, a vague and elusive term, refers to "a relationship in which people are required to explain and take responsibility for their actions' (Sinclair, 1995, p. 220-221), where "the giving and demanding of reasons for conduct" (Roberts and Scapens, 1985, p. 447) and/or provision of "an account or reckoning of those actions for which one is held responsible" (Gray *et al*., 1996, p. 39) are considered obligatory and accountable. We argue for an effective intervention from an independent authority under situations of forced changes where a power source, in pursuit of its own peculiar agenda, causes its 'dependent' organization(s) to undergo a less than optimal organizational change that would potentially negatively affect not only the organization(s)' founding principles but also other close stakeholders. We group this type of accountability under the "structural discourse", as opposed to managers' "personal discourse" (Sinclair, 1995, p. 224), that management carries out under the normal course of his/her work commitments, except that we categorise it as ‘imported structural discourse’ in the context of this study, as the management’s capacity here is more like an intermediary between the external power source and the organization it is part of. In the context of modern capitalist enterprises, Weber’s (2012, p. 424) ‘class status’ phenomenon applies to the contextual value of accountability we bring to the attention of policy makers through this theoretical situational analysis of the Australian tertiary sector’s adaptation and reorientation to the Australian government’s ‘imposed’ policy changes. With appropriate policy interventions, under such situations of organizational change, the power source must ‘feel accountable’ and the proposed changes need to be scrupulously peeped into and thoroughly analysed for prospects and constraints before been allowed to affect the dependent organizations. This is particularly true under circumstances of forced organizational change where improvement in financial gains is the primary driving force and the power source’s agenda includes ensuring such gains at the expense of other qualitative and quantitative non-financial factors (see Kaplan and Norton, 2001).

The accountability framework, as it stands today, takes into account the influence of management over employees in a typical business enterprise due to the former’s capacity to control and monitor the later through the control of the ‘means of production’ (see Burowoy, 1979, p. 24). Also, while the mainstream accounting is believed not to sufficiently address contemporary accountability issues (Neimark, 1994), management accounting through its sophisticated control tools is, in the context of value creation, ensuring accountability (Bryer, 1999a, 2006a). Similarly the current accountability framework also covers Bryer’s notions of social controls through results controls – achieved through holding management accountable for a desired rate of return on the capital employed (2006a) and staging of a collective mutual action among shareholders to establish lines of accountability hierarchy inside the firm (1999a), and actions controls (2005) – achieved through deducing and implementing effective policies and prudently and efficiently responding to external intervening factors. We posit, nonetheless, that the framework does provide a room for a change to accommodate the accountability situation we are endeavouring to cover in this conceptual paper as described above. In the context of this study, we argue for a ‘control of control’ (Power, 1994, p. 300) phenomenon, where a power source’s capacity to control and manipulate a dependent entity is controlled and held accountable for the legitimacy and accuracy of its actions, particularly those that could potentially harm, explicitly or implicitly, the later and its objectives and missions, and thus made part of the accountability terrain. We forward the following proposition to be considered for further elaboration and analysis.

P2. In the case of a public-good industry or not-for-profit sector, an externally dictated pressure for change by a power sources should be subjected to an independent authority’s intervention and approval before been implemented.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Power produces social realities/truths and social truth in turn enables the exercise of power. Foucault (1980, p. 93) asserts:

> [...] Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of truth: it institutionalises, professionalises and rewards its pursuit.

Power's capacity to institutionalise particular norm, in situations where parent-dependent relationship exists between the entity exercising the power and the recipient of the directives, highlights the significance of intervention of a 'stronger power' - an independent authority, to 'guide' and appropriate the 'weaker' power's level of thrust, to save the 'dependent' organization from 'less than optimal' internal adaptation. Kassim, Tahajuddin, Hassan, Shamsuddin, and Sulaiman (2011, p. 99), while describing Handel's (2001, cited in Kassim *et al*., 2011) stand on the two main approaches to organizational change – rational and natural – argued that:

> [...] natural approach views organization as full of complexity where people will interact to each other to satisfy their needs, to gain social recognition and prestige, to gain and exercise power, and to have their own interest and objectives which are possible to differ from the organizational itself.

The organizational change that the Australian Tertiary sector went through fits more or less Kassim *et al*.,'s (2011) 'natural approach' to organizational change. Power networks permeate every organization's social body that shapes organizational routines and establish long standing institutions. The literature talks about this extensively. Through this study we present a case of the exercise of power by the 'power network' of an external body, with an accepted level of 'coercive' powers (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), on the organization's routines, practices, and institutions, and the resulting changes in the accounting systems the organization may have to go through to placate the external power's peculiar demands/requirements. Dialectical theoretical base' 'social construction' principle (Benson, 1977) helps us discern and understand the impact of externally caused internal influences on Australian universities' structural adaptation to Australian government's changed funding policies that came into effect from 2012.

Benson (1977) asserts that social construction is a continuous process and that new patterns of knowledge and institutional arrangements replace, improve, deteriorate, or contradict current patterns through the social interaction and power play, which may not be a rational selection in its entire, thus contradicting the neoclassical economic theories, as the dialectical Marxism advocates (see Habermas, 1974). This is what we observe has happened in the case of the Australian tertiary education sector, which underwent strategic changes in response to the Australian government's amended funding policies that affected the sector's constituents immensely, which we argue warrants a thorough academic enquiry and rigorous debate. The altering of organizational priorities, rules, and routines could be achieved through altering its management accounting practices (Burns and Scapens, 2000; Chua, 1995). Dillard, Rogers, Yuthas (2011), giving an account of the Enron's sudden collapse, assert several factors, both internal and external, could cause an organization to undergo a drastic change. The major cause these authors pinpoint that led to the demise of the giant is the change in the organization's ethical structures caused by management's wilful acts of greed coupled with pressure from "societal economic values" (p. 6). This depicts the vulnerability of organizations' structure and, per Laughlin's (1991) typology of organizational change, constitutive elements, to externally caused disturbance. When truth and power are interrelated and mutually dependent, with power doing the continuous shaping of norms and routines, and institutionalising them through rewards, then how "[...] is the discourse of truth...able to fix limits to the rights of power?" (Foucault, 1980, p. 93).

There are two peculiar aspects to this study that are expected to augment readers' understanding in relation to the external shock absorbed by the management accounting in the Australian universities through its management control systems and apportioned internally through organizational adaptation: first, passive submission on the part of universities to the changed external circumstances, and second, universities' internal adaptation or reorientation to effectively embrace the changed situation and thus ensure their competitive and efficient functioning and survival in the new era. The study will draw on two theoretical frameworks for conceptualising the management accounting and the resulting organizational change processes – Institutional Theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) and Laughlin's model of organizational change (1991) respectively to analyse the empirical data that will be collected under phase II of the study and shed light on these two distinct aspects of the study.

As referred to earlier, any organization, depending on its strength, size, and the nature of its relationship with other organizations, has to adapt, reorient, and transform, when 'kicked', 'jolted', or 'disturbed' by turbulent environmental conditions, especially if the environmental turbulence is initiated/caused by an organization on which it dependent for resources: capital, customers, expertise, technology, etc. Kassim *et al*., (2011) categorise organizational change as one the two approaches: Mainstream (positivist), where a set of independent variables bring about a change in the 'organizational change' dependent variable; and, alternative (interpretive), where organizational change instigate as a result of interaction among social actors and the wider environment. The change process Australian tertiary sector has embraced in response to the Australian government's changed funding policies for the sector resonate more with the later view. As with any qualitative study, in order to achieve enhanced 'internal' and 'external' validity, we argue it is best to resort to a combination of two or more theoretical frameworks so all aspects are best aligned with the relevant theoretical frameworks. With the recent shift of the organizational change literature focus to neoinstitutionalism that has necessitated a re-visit of the theory of isomorphism (Lounsbury, 2008), organizational change processes can be viewed from an entirely different angle. As with continuously developments in the case of institutional theory, Laughlin's organizational change model is also not without flaws (see, Fraser, 2012). Therefore, we resort to a combination of two theoretical frameworks to study and analyse organizational change in the context of this study, and thus avoid compromising quality.

A study's findings are further authenticated and validated under the 'investigator triangulation' approach (see, Yin, 1994; Rice and Ezzy, 1999; Modell, 2010; Guion, Diehl, and McDonald, 2011; Ostlund, Kidd, Wengstromc, and Rowa-Dewar, 2011; Molina-Azorın, 2011), where different researchers in a particular field of research evaluate the same phenomenon using the same data collection technique, and then compare their individual research outcomes. 'Theory triangulation', where researchers from different disciplines are involved in the study of a single phenomenon, has also been cited for enhancing a study's validity (see, Guion *et al*., 2011). Modell (2010, p. 127) calls this approach where multiple paradigms are mobilised 'meta-triangulation'. The later approach (theory triangulation) holds true in the case of this study where researchers teach and research in the areas of management accounting and auditing respectively.

The use of institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), a specific way of looking at organizations (Scott, 1995), as a conceptual framework, gained momentum in the 1990s in the realm of social sciences research (Scott, 1995; Burns and Scapens, 2000). Routines, practices, and institutions adopted by even one organization in an industry, if not 'stopped', condemned, or ridiculed by the society, rather accepted as logical or legitimate, soon find their way into the organizational structures of other players in the industry, so much so that they are 'forced' to adapt their structures and other organizational elements to adopt these new routines and institutions. Instigation of particular routines and practices tends to establish 'trends' and eventually we encounter "inexorable push towards homogenization" across all players in the industry (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p. 148). Institutional theory asserts that organizations in order to ensure their legitimate existence and access to society's scarce resources must conform to societal expectations and industry prevalent norms and values that are endorsed by the society as 'true' and 'legitimate'. Three main institutional elements, with varying degrees of importance in different contexts, have so far been identified in the literature. These are 'coercive', 'mimetic', and 'normative' influences (DiMaggio and Powel, 1983, p. 150; also, see Bartram, 2011). Scott (1995), adopts different names[3] for the influences, and explains the way they penetrate into the organizational setting. He asserts:

> [...] institutions consist of cognitive, normative, and regulative structures and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behaviour. Institutions are transported by various carriers − cultures, structures, and routines. As these institutions shape social behaviour, they are inevitably incorporated into organizations, and are such powerful forces that they appear as objective reality, even though they are socially constructed (Scott, 1995, pp. 33-34).

The following propositions seem to be a natural outcome that is worth investigating in this context:

P3. Organizational and/or management accounting change that is dictated by an external power source, whether objective or not, will be institutionalized and spread across most industry constituents.

P3a. If the organizational/management accounting change that is dictated by an external power source is not objective and driven by the power source's own peculiar agenda, the

[3] He has used the same name for 'Normative' influences, but re-named coercive influences 'regulative' and mimetic 'cognitive'.

outcome for the dependent organization would be negative in terms of its tangible and non-tangible organizational elements.

Laughlin's model of organizational change (1991) maintains that all organizations function under a 'balanced' state, with all organizational elements – 'Interpretative Schemes' (Values/norms/beliefs/culture, Objectives/mission), 'Design Archetypes' (organizational structure, communication systems, decision processes), and/or 'sub-systems' (tangible organizational elements, such as premises, staff, machinery, location, finances, etc.), in harmony and coherence with one another, until the organization's this 'balanced' state is 'disturbed', 'kicked' or 'jolted' by some external or internal pressure for a change. The model elaborates on various levels of change an organization can go through under various circumstances depending on the severity of the external or internal 'force' that 'disturbs' the organization's 'balanced' state of its elements (Erakovic and Wilson, 2005; Oliver, 1991). Laughlin (1991) argues that externally dictated change shifts these organization's elements to a 'new' position, where it achieves a 'new balance'.

The extent of change in response to external pressures is shown in Table below:

i. No Change	Inertia
ii. First order change (Morphostatic)	'Rebuttal' / 'Reorientation'
iii. Second order change (Morphogenetic)	'Colonization' / 'Evolution'/ Transformation

Source: Adapted from Gray *et al*., (1995).

Out of the three elements that hold an organization together in a coherent form, most studies on organizational change (for example Wilmott, 2000; Kikulis *et al*., 1995) suggest that 'interpretative schemes' are the hardest to disintegrate, when disturbed by external forces. Depending on the respective strength of the pressure for change and the bond among the organization's structural elements, the literature identifies following different levels of organizational responses:

Inertia - Successful resistance to change (see, for instance, Miller and Friesen, 1984; Gray *et al*., 1995; Laughlin, 1991)

Rebuttal - No widespread changes in all organizational elements; only limited changes in some or all organizational elements (see, for instance, Larrinaga-Gonzalez *et al*., 2001; Laughlin, 1991)

Reorientation - Little change, mostly in the organization's 'sub-systems' and 'design archetypes'. The organization is able to 'defend' its main coherence – the 'interpretative schemes' (see, for instance, Laughlin, 1991; Gray *et al*., 1995; and Greenwood and Hinings, 1993)

Colonization - Some changes in the organization's design archetypes, sub-systems, as well as the 'interpretative schemes' (Laughlin, 1991). Larrinaga-Gonzalez *et al*., (2001) have referred to such types of changes as 'non-elected' – implemented without some organizational members' consent.

Evolution or Transformation - Major changes occur in all organizational elements, where the organization transforms into a new different setup (see, for instance, Burns and Scapens, 2000; Tushman, Newman and Romanelli, 1986; Tushman and O'Reilly III, 1996; Miller, 1982; Miller and Friesen, 1984). Organizational members' consent to the change is a peculiar characteristic of this type of change (Nadler and Tushman, 1989; Greenwood and Hinings, 1993).

The literature suggests that the 'interpretative schemes' (Laughlin, 1991) organizational element is the most intangible of all others; they are the strongest of all with a strong coupling with the organization's overall setting and remaining elements (Wilmott, 2000; Kikulis *et al*., 1995), and shape the organization's overall identity. They represent the basic themes and the driving forces behind an organization's overall business endeavour, and comprise of the explicit and implicit shared values of all organizational members (Tyrrall and Parker, 2005). External disturbances of an extremely severe nature instigate major changes of an evolutionary nature in organizations. The simple adaptation of existing processes and systems would fail to placate these types of disturbances. They will leave these organizations in a halcyon state only if changes incorporated by them are quite apparent and visible in *all* aspects of their operations (Tushman, Newman and Romanelli, 1986).

What level of changes would Australian universities need to undergo (and/or have undergone) and what implications would they entail for their overall performance and other organizational elements, are a sort of questions that remain to be empirically investigated and answered, and that is what this study aims to achieve – find answers to these questions and thus help policy-makers make better informed decisions in similar situations of change in a 'public-good' sector. Our proposition in this context is below.

P4. If the external power source exerts a high magnitude pressure for change on its dependent organization, the outcomes for the dependent organization in terms of its core values and objectives will be of 'evolution/transformational' level where its true identity will run a risk of change.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Most aspects of management accounting change have been debated and discussed extensively in the literature. The discipline has undergone substantial change over a period of over 40 years, mostly through qualitative empirical research (Parker, 2012) both in terms of routines and practices as well as the playing field in which it functions (Burns and Scapens, 2000). Also, several contextual aspects of management accounting change have been explored and analysed in the literature (see, Busco, *et al*., 2007). What makes this study different and therefore significant is its stand that the effect on the organizational functioning of external pressure for change 'imposed on' and penetrated into the organizational setting through members of the management team and translated into and reflected through the organization's management control systems need to be viewed differently than if the organization instigates the change process internally, or if the change is wholeheartedly welcomes even though initiated by an outside entity. Schatzki (2002, p. 63) denotes these phenomena as ‘contexture’ and ‘texture’ respectively. Situations where ‘parent-dependent’ relationship, formal or informal, exists between the ‘power source’ dictating a change and the ‘dependent’ organization, a change dictated, if not stopped, contradicted, or corrected in magnitude by a ‘suitable’ intervention from an independent authority, can potentially alter the ‘dependent’ organization’s constitution of existence, not only for that organization but for the entire industry that organization is part of. Free and Macintosh (2008, p. 8) group these phenomena under “symbolic violence”, though elaborating on control situations internal to an organization, where some organizational members command greater “stores of capital”, understandably comparable to the role of Australian government in the case of our study, while others are passive knowing they have lesser capital stakes in the organization. The later group, the authors argue tend to make their mind up, willingly or otherwise, that what’s dictated by the former group is legitimate, inevitable, and natural.

Management accounting as it stands now has been the result of various triggers, including social interaction among organizational members, innovative practices and routines, competition among employees for different personal objectives, transfer and institutionalization of various practices across players in different industries through various means, and so on. As with most management accounting research studies’ qualitative ‘hypothetico-deductive positivist focus’ (Parker, 2012, p. 54), we present a hypothetical framework that borrows from logic and that needs to be tested empirically. We argue some triggers of change would work better than others for the discipline as well as the affected organization, depending on who triggers the change (an internal or an external entity), the nature of the industry (a purely commercial undertaking or a public-good enterprise), and most importantly the relationship between the entity that triggers the change and the affected organization and the entity’s objectives for the change. If, in a public-good industry, trigger for a change in a ‘dependent’ organization’s management accounting practices comes from an outside entity (the power source) pursuing its own peculiar agenda, the pressure for change should be intervened into and moderated if there is a danger of ‘undue influence’ on the dependent organization’s constitution of existence and negative consequences for the sector’s beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The notions of ‘unintended consequences’ and ‘changing and fragile nature’ of management accounting (Ahrens and Chapman, 2006; Baxter and Chua, 2003) dictate that external pressures for organizational change need to be scrutinized by an independent body before implementation. This paper also shares Baxter and Chua’s (2003) concern about long term sustainability of research on management accounting’s peculiar contribution to the advancement of organizational control and management in the light of external influences on organizations’ functioning, particularly given the discipline’s flexible and ‘tailor-able’ nature. While the literature portrays managements accounting to shape the organization’s planning and control under the well grounded notion of rationalism in making choices (Burns and Scapens, 2000), little attention has so far been given to the externally triggered management accounting change and its repercussions for the organization’s function, and this conceptual study fills this gap by drawing practitioners and policy-makers attention to this relatively unexplored aspect of organizational change[4].

The study is expected to influence the way an external entity exerts pressure on its 'dependents' for a change to its management accounting systems, through providing a framework to guide implementation of such changes. Also from the perspective of accountability and auditing, the study would recommend intervention from an independent authority to first investigate and evaluate possible outcomes for the 'dependent' organization/sector in terms of the effects such externally dictated changes might have on its core values and objectives all the stakeholders. The study's outcomes, as evident, could be replicated to any 'public-good' sector, such as hospitals, where there is an evident 'parent-dependent' sort of relationship [see, for instance, Khan (2011) in the case of microfinance sector]. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) assert that once the power source, competition, the profession, or the state, tailors dependent organizations' into a particular routine, institutional forces drive all players to strive to adopt homogeneity, or be ready to be isolated. Thus, we argue Australian universities, mimicking the instigators' routines and practices, and institutions, sooner or later, will adopt these industry 'norms' and the practices and routines would eventually be institutionalized, the point of concern being the inherent motives of the external power source and 'quality' and resulting outcome of the imposed change conditions on these dependent organizations' accounting practices as well as other tangible and intangible organizational elements, some of which qualify as peculiar 'identity marks' for these organizations the alteration of which may compromise their constitution of existence.

The empirical data that we intend to collect for the study's second stage would reveal as to which level of change, as per Laughlin's model of organizational change, did these universities undergo and what implications did the change have on their overall performance across the four perspectives described under the Balanced Scorecard' technique. The study is expected to provide a deep insight into the change processes and performance outcomes these universities have/had to experience, in particular, and the greater impact the externally dictated change conditions had on the Australian tertiary education sector in general, and aims to come up with some policy recommendations for the sector's governance and control. The study is also expected to help policy makers make more informed decisions at both the state and national level under similar situations of change regarding a 'public-good' business enterprise.

In addition to policy implications, the study is expected to advance knowledge in the area of management accounting, corporate performance, leadership, and governance.

[4] Authors intend to carry out an empirical study on this in the Australian tertiary education sector in the near future.

REFERENCES

Ahrens, T., & Chapman, C.S., Management accounting as practice, Accounting, Organizations and Society (2006), doi:10.1016/j.aos.2006.09.013.

Aquinas, P. G. (2008), 'Organization Structure and Design: Applications and Challenges', Excel Books, Delhi.

Bartram, T. (2011), "Employee management systems and organizational contexts: a population ecology approach", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pages 663 – 677.

Baxter, J., and W.F. Chua (2003), "Alternative management accounting research— whence and whither", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 28, pages 97-126.

Benson, J.K. (1977), "Organizations: A Dialectical View", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pages 1-21.

Bryer R.A. (2006a), "Accounting and Control of the Labour Process", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 17, pages 551-598.

Bryer, R.A. (1999a), "Marx and Accounting", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 10, pages 683-709.

Bryer, R.A. (2005), "A Marxist Accounting History of the British Industrial Revolution: A Review of Evidence and Suggestions for Research", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 30, pages 25-65.

Burawoy M. (1979), "Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process Under Monopoly Capitalism Chicago", University of Chicago Press.

Burns, J., and R.W. Scapens (2000), 'Conceptualizing Management Accounting Change: An Institutional Framework', *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 11, pages 3-25.

Busco, C., Quattrone, P., and A. Riccaboni (2007), "Management Accounting Change: Issues in Interpreting its Nature and Change", Management Accounting Research, Vol. 18, pages 125-149.

Campanale, C., Cinquini, L., and A. Tenucci (2010), "Do Management Accounting Systems Influence Organizational Change or Vice-Versa? Evidence from a Case of Constructive Research in the Healthcare Sector", Social Science Research Network, Online Document, Available: SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1656943 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1656943, Date Accessed: May 29, 2012.

Chua, W.F. (1995), "Experts, Networks and Inscriptions in the Fabrication of Accounting Images: A Story of the Representation of Three Public Hospitals", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2/3, pages 111-145.

Covaleski, M. A., and M. W. Dirsmith (1988), "An Institutional Perspective on the Rise, Social Transformation, and Fall of a University Budget Category", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 33, pages 562-587.

Dillard, J., R. Rogers, and K. Yuthas (2011), "Organizational Change: In Search of the Golden Mean", Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change, Vol. 7, No. 1, pages 5-32.

DiMaggio, P. J., and W. W. Powell (1983), "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48, pages 147-160.

Erakovic, L., and M. Wilson (2005), “Conditions of Radical Transformation in State-Owned Enterprises”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 16, pages 293-313.

Foucault, M. (1980), “Two Lectures”, In C. Gordon (ed.) ‘Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977’, The Harvester Press Limited, Brighton, Sussex.

Fraser, M. (2012), "“Fleshing out” an engagement with a social accounting technology", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pages 508 – 534.

Free C., and N.B. Macintosh (2008), “ Bourdieu's Logic of Practice Theory: Possibilities for Research on Management Accounting and Control”, Research Paper No. 02-09, Queen's University School of Business, Ontario, Canada.

Gordon, C. (1991), “Governmental Rationality: An Introduction”, In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (eds.) ‘The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality’, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Gray, R. Owen D. and C. Adams (1996), “Accounting & Accountability”, Prentice Hall, London.

Gray, R., D. Walters, J. Bebbington, and I. Thompson (1995), “The Greening of Enterprise: An Exploration of the (Non) Role of Environmental Accounting and Environmental Accountants in Organizational Change”, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 6, pages 211-239.

Greenwood, R., and C. R. Hinings (1993), “Understanding Strategic Change: The Contribution of Archetypes”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pages 1052-1081.

Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C., and D. McDonald (2011), “Triangulation: Establishing the Validity of Qualitative Studies”, University of Florida: IFAS Extension. Online Document, Available: http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/fy394, Date Accessed: May 29, 2012.

Habermas, J. (1974), “Theory and Practice”, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, London.

Hopwood, A.G. (1972), ‘An Empirical Study of the Role of Accounting Data in Performance Evaluation’, *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 10, Empirical Research in Accounting: Selected Studies 1972, pages 156-182.

Kaplan, R.S., and D. P. Norton (1992), “The Balanced Scorecard – Measures that Drive Performance”, Harvard Business Review, January-February.

Kaplan, R.S., and D. P. Norton (2001), “Transforming Balanced Scorecard from Performance Measurement to Strategic Measurement: Part I”, *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pages 87-104.

Kaplan, R.S., and D. P. Norton (2005), “Using the Balanced Scorecard as a Strategic Management System”, Harvard Business Review.

Kassim, A. W., Tahajuddin, S., Hassan, M. G., Shamsuddin, A. S., and Y. B. Sulaiman (2011), “Organizational Change and Pace: A Conceptual Link”, International Conference on Management Proceeding, Penang, Malaysia, June 13-14.

Khan, A. A. (2011), ‘Dictating Change, Shouting Success: Where is Accountability?’, *Australasian Accounting Business and Finance Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 85-100.

Kikulis, L., T. Slack, and C. Hinings (1995), “Sector-Specific Patterns of Organizational Design Change”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 32, pages 67-100.

Larrinaga-Gonzalez, C., F. Carrasco-Fenech, F. J. Caro-Gonzalez, C. Correa-Ruiz, and J. M. Paez-Sandubete (2001), “The Role of Environmental Accounting in Organizational Change: An Exploration of Spanish Companies”, *Accounting, Auditing, & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pages 213-239.

Laughlin, R. (1991), “Environmental Disturbances and Organizational Transitions and Transformations: Some Alternative Models”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pages, 209-232.

Law J. (1986), “Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge”, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lounsbury, M. (2008), “Institutional Rationality and Practice Variation: New Directions in the Institutional Analysis of Practice”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 33, pages 349-361.

Lowrey, W., and C. W. Woo (2010), “The News Organization in Uncertain Times: Business or Institution?”, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pages 41-61.

Meyer, J. W., and B. Rowan (1977), “Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 1, pages 340-363.

Miller, D. (1982), “Evolution and Revolution: A Quantum View of Structural Change in Organizations”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pages 131-151.

Miller, D., and P. H. Friesen (1984), “Organizations: A Quantum View”, Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Modell, S. (2010), “Bridging the paradigm divide in management accounting research: The Role of Mixed Methods Approaches”, *Social Science Research*, Vol. 21, pages 124-129.

Molina-Azorın, J. F. (2011), “The Use and Added Value of Mixed Methods in Management Research” *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pages 7-24.

Mouritsen, J. (1999), “The Flexible Firm: Strategies for a Subcontractor’s Management Control”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 24, pages 31-55.

Nadler, D., and M. Tushman (1989), “Organizational Frame Bending: Principles of Managing Reorientation”, *The Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pages 194-204.

Neimark M.K. (1994), “Regicide Revisited: Marx, Foucault and Accounting”, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 5, pages 87-108.

Oliver, C. (1991), “Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, pages 145-179.

Oliver, C. (1997), “The Influence of Institutional and Task Environment Relationships on Organizational Performance: The Canadian Construction Industry”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pages 99-124.

Ostlund, U., Kidd, L., Wengstromc, Y., and N. Rowa-Dewar (2011), “Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Research Within Mixed Method Research Designs: A Methodological Review”, *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, Vol. 48, pages 369-383.

Parker, L.D. (2012), “Qualitative management accounting research: Assessing deliverables and relevance”, *Critical Perspectives in Accounting*, Vol. 23, pages 54-70.

Power M. (1994), “The audit society”, In A.G. Hopwood, and P. Miller (eds.) ‘Accounting as Social and Institutional Practice’, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rice, P. L., and D. Ezzy (1999), “Qualitative Research Methods, a Health Focus”, Oxford University Press: Melbourne.

Roberts J., and R.W. Scapens (1985), “Accounting systems and systems of accountability — understanding accounting practices in their organisational contexts”, *Accounting,Organizations and Society*, Vol. 10, pages 443-456.

Schatzki, T.R. (2002), “The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change”, Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA.

Scott, W. R. (1995), “Institutions and Organizations”, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, USA.

Sinclair A. (1995), “The chameleon of accountability: Forms and discourses”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 20, pages 219-237.

Tushman, M., and C. A. III O’Reilly (1996), “Ambidextrous Organizations: Managing Evolutionary and Revolutionary Change”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pages 8-27.

Tushman, M., W. Newman, and E. Romanelli (1986), “Convergence and Upheaval: Managing the Unsteady Pace of Organizational Evolution”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pages 29-44.

Tyrrall, D., and D. Parker (2005), “The Fragmentation of a Railway: A study of Organizational Change”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 3, pages 507-537.

Vaivio, J. (1999), “Examining “the Quantified Customer”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 24, pages 689-715.

Weber M. (2012), “The Theory of Social and Economic Organization”, Illinois, The Free Press & The Falcon's Wing Press.

Wilmott, R. (2000), “The Place of Culture in Organization Theory”, *Organization*, Vol. 7, pages 95-128.

Yin, R. K. (1994), “Case Study Research: Design and Methods”, 2nd Ed., Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.