



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND LAW

Master Degree Project in Management

**Trapped between two Logics: Individual Experiences and
Responses to the Introduction of Competing Institutional
Logics**

Hans Kober Edler

Supervisor: Andreas Diedrich
Master Degree Project No. 2014:82
Graduate School

Trapped Between Two Logics: Individual Experiences and Responses to Competing Institutional Logics

Hans Kober Edlert

*MSc. Management. Graduate School. School of Business, Economics and Law,
University of Gothenburg*

Supervisor: Andreas Diedrich

Abstract

This paper aims to answer the call within the institutional perspective to move analysis down to the individual level of analysis. The paper is based on a qualitative case study of the initial implementation phase of a large structural and cultural change effort within a global life science organisation with head quarters in Sweden. Through the use of semi-structured interviews the findings in the paper show both the usefulness of the theoretical model developed by Pache and Santos (2013) in analysing the responses of individuals subject to competing institutional logics as well as they add to the theory by showing a situation where the people within the organisation experience feelings of being trapped between two logics. The empirical findings further showed that the “window of opportunity” in the change process created by the initial positive response from the people within the organisation was not fully utilised and the focus shifted from seeing the positive aspects of what the changes would bring to the negative experience of feeling that nothing is happening. A conclusion is that after presenting an organisational change the proper timing of actual implementation is of great importance.

Keywords: Organisational change, institutional logics, institutional complexity, experiences, responses

1. Introduction

At its simplest, organisational change can be defined as new ways of organising and working, however the actual process of change is often more complicated than its simple definition (Dawson, 2003). The struggles, successes, failures, and frustration that go along with changing the way business is done is something that managers and employees in hundreds of organisations have experienced (Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997). Czarniawska and Sevón (1996) argue for two main reasons for concentration on change when studying organization. The first one is the fact that only what moves is visible; smoothly run and well-routinized organizations do not offer much insight to researchers. The second one is that change is the periods during which people start questioning what they have previously taken for granted.

During periods of change old practices are destroyed and new ones constructed. This according to Czarniawska and Sevón, invite the questioning and de-construction of the previous social order.

Battilana, Leca and Boxenbaum (2009) divide changes in organisation into two separate categories, divergent changes and non-divergent changes. Non-divergent changes are changes that are aligned with the already existing institutions; divergent changes however, are changes that break with the existing institutional logic; that is the shared understandings of the goals to be pursued and how they are to be pursued. Within the community of institutional researchers there has been a call from several authors (McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Hallett, 2010; Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca, 2011) to move research within the field of institutional theory from the macro and field level of analysis down to the micro and individual level. Pache and Santos (2013) have in their research responded to this call and developed a theoretical model for analysing the responses of individuals who are exposed to conflicting institutional logics.

In this paper I have used the theoretical model developed by Pache and Santos (2013) to analyse the individual level experiences and responses of people within LifeTech, a global Swedish life science organisation, during the initial implementation phase of a large structural and cultural change effort. Historically the organisation has been run in a decentralised way, giving its organisations in different countries a high degree of autonomy in their decision-making, allowing them to operate almost as individual organisations.

Three years ago LifeTech was acquired by a large US based industrial company – BigTech – and one year ago a new President was internally recruited from the BigTech organisation. This new President has since his arrival started implementing major changes directed at changing the institutional logic prevailing in the organisation. His vision is to change the company into a centralised organisation, where everyone in the entire global organisation is working together with a unified global strategy. To accomplish this he is implementing changes to the structure, systems and decision-making and working processes within the organisation.

In this paper I answer the call within the institutional perspective to move analysis down to the individual level of analysis with the purpose of investigating the initial implementation phase of changes being introduced in a company by answering the following question:

- “How do individuals within LifeTech experience and respond to the changes being initiated by the new President?”

The findings of the paper not only show the usefulness of the theoretical model developed by Pache and Santos (2013) for analysing the responses of individuals subject to competing institutional logics, but they also furthers it by adding a new dimension. I show in this paper how individuals, who are identified with the existing logic within the company, do not try to make it prevail to protect their identities, when faced with a new logic that they are familiar in relation to. Instead they see the potential benefits to the business that the changes will bring.

Because of this, they have all responded positively to the introduced changes, and want to see them fully implemented as soon as possible. However because of perceived problems with the implementation, the study shows a situation where the individuals experience feelings of being trapped between the two institutional logics since they are not able to work according to the prescriptions of either logic.

Due to practical reasons I have delimited the study to the events that occurred within LifeTech between October 2013 and March 2014. Because of this I have only been able to study the initial phase of the change implementation. Even though the changes implemented by the new President affects the entire organisation, I have chosen to only focus this study on the changes relating to the central and local marketing and sales organisations of the company since this was the part of the organisation most affected during the time of the study.

The rest of the paper is structured in the following way; in the second section the theoretical framework is presented; the third section presents the methodology used when conducting the study; the fourth section presents the findings of the study and starts with a description of the setting for the study followed by a presentation of the empirical material together with discussions; the fifth and final section presents the conclusions of the study.

2. Theoretical Framework

The complexity of institutional processes and their influence on organisational behaviour has been implicit within the institutional perspective since Meyer and Rowan's (1977) observations that organisations confront sociocultural as well as commercial expectations (Greenwood et al. 2011). The publication of the article by Meyer and Rowan in 1977 has been labelled as the "birth date" of neo-institutional theory (NI), however, even though the article was inspired by observations of nonconformity on the local level, NI has evolved into a macro-cultural theory that explains why organisations conform to their environments (Hallet, 2010). Lawrence, Suddaby and Leca (2011) argue that institutional theory represents a dominant approach to the study of organisations, but that it is creaking under its own theoretical apparatus. The institutional perspective has had tremendous success in generating intellectual excitement for a macro-sociological understanding of how organisations operate, are structured, and relate to each other. Lawrence et al. (2011) argue that even though the institutional perspective has had this large scale success, in its development, the real life experiences of organisational actors have been somewhat lost, especially the connections between the lived experiences and the institutions that structure and are structured by them. This complex relationship between individuals and institutions is something that is central to social theory, however it has in general attracted little attention in neo-institutional studies of organisations. Hallet (2010) addresses the same issue and argues that even though NI initially was built on micro-sociological scaffolding, later, as it has spread, the micro-social concerns disappeared into the background. That even though institutions were originally viewed as human social constructions, now organisations and people are increasingly treated as mere institutional constructions. Because of this Hallet argues that ignoring local processes institutionalisation could be turned into a "black box".

According to Greenwood et al. (2011) early explorations within institutional theory sought to establish that sociocultural forces do affect how organisations behave. These studies were often concerned with showing the diffusion of particular practices throughout a given organisational field. Hallet (2010) puts forward the same arguments; that contemporary institutionalism has often been criticised for neglecting micro-sociology and that NI has drifted in a macro direction. According to Hallet (2010) NI does exceedingly well in explaining diffusion and homogeneity across organisations, world politics, and national states, and through this it has been successful in explaining why organisations have surface similarities. However he deems that through this macro directional drift, something has been lost.

Greenwood et al. (2011) argue that a turning point within the institutional perspective was provided by Friedland and Alford (1991) who shifted the focus of attention towards the idea of “institutional logics”, of which practices and structures are tangible manifestations. According to Greenwood et al. (2011) the interest in institutional logics has escalated, becoming one of the fastest growing areas of scholarship within organisational theory. Although there is no general consensus on how to define institutional logics, or even the location and scope of them, they are generally understood as macro-level belief systems that shape cognition and influence decision-making processes in organisational fields (McPherson & Sauder, 2013). Alternatively an institutional logic is defined as a field’s shared understanding of the goals to be pursued and how they are to be pursued (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009) or in other words, “the way a particular social world works that is embodied in the practices it is sustained by, and reproduced through, cultural rules, norms, and beliefs, it is the institutional logics that provide social actors with vocabularies and sense of self. Institutional logics not only direct what social actors want (their interests) and how they are to proceed (guidelines for action), but also who or what they are (their identity)” (Lok, 2010).

As with much research within the institutional perspective McPherson and Sauder (2013) argue that the majority of existing scholarship on logics has focused on the interrelationship between institutions and organisations. Research has been directed towards examining how institutions and organisations mutually influence each other, and on how macro-cultural logics influence the strategies and activities of specific organisational fields. This has resulted in a great body of knowledge on how logics influence the interactions between institutions and organisations and how logics are transformed as a result of competition and conflict at the macro-level of analysis. However there is much less knowledge about the effects of logics, and the complex interplay between competing logics at the individual level of analysis. Dorado and Battilana (2010) puts forward similar critique and state that many studies have contributed in explaining variances in organisational practices within and across fields; however, they have rarely examined how organisations deal internally with institutional complexity created by demands imposed by multiple institutional logics. Greenwood et al (2011) states that organisations typically face multiple institutional logics that may or may not be mutually incompatible i.e. the prescriptions of the different logics may be incompatible

and generate challenges and tensions for organisations exposed to them. When logics are in conflict with each other, as in instances of institutional change, their respective systems of meaning and normative understanding, built in to rituals and practices, result in inconsistent expectations.

According to Lok (2010), in most accounts of institutional change, the focus of analysis has been placed on the role of the change agents, showing how they infuse new beliefs, norms, and values into social structures by mobilising and orchestrating collective action in support of their projects. Much less attention has been given to understanding how, in their daily activities, the targets of institutional change projects deal with the demands of competing institutional logics. Pache and Santos (2013) argue that the growing body of literature on competing institutional logics suggest that under conditions of institutional complexity individuals play an important role in shaping organisational outcomes. Based on previous empirical studies they have in their article developed a theoretical model predicting how individuals within organisations are expected to experience and respond to competing institutional logics. The remainder of this section will be devoted to describing their theoretical model.

2.1. Individual responses to competing logics within organisations:

Pache and Santos (2013) state that individuals may be influenced by different logics in different ways, and because of this they propose that the degree of influence on an individual by a particular logic may vary as a function of the degree of availability, the degree of accessibility, and the degree of activation of the logic. In this context availability refers to the knowledge and information individuals have about a given logic, accessibility refers to the degree to which knowledge and information about a given logic comes to mind, and activation refers to whether available and accessible knowledge and information are actually used in social interactions. It is according to Pache and Santos a combination of these three factors that shape how individuals will relate and adhere to a given logic. In their model, based on their own previous empirical findings (Pache & Santos, 2013b), and the works of Lounsbury (2001) and Glynn (2000), they show that depending on the degree of availability, accessibility and activation of a given logic, individuals are presumed to relate to it in three different ways: as novices, as familiar or as identified with a given logic. The three categories developed further below should according to Pache and Santos (2013) not be viewed as discrete states but rather as steps on a continuum. A novice can become familiar, and someone who is familiar can become identified with a given logic.

Novice:

According to Pache and Santos's (2013) model the first way to relate to a given logic is to be a novice. Individuals who are novices with respect to a given logic have no or very little knowledge or information available about the logic. This situation may occur when an individual has not been exposed to the logic and its associated demands nor has interacted with others exposed to them. It can also be the result in instances where adherence to another logic is so strong that it blinds the individual from seeing alternative ways of viewing the world. A person who is a novice in relation to a given logic is not likely to adopt her

behaviour to the demands imposed by the logic, since in the absence of availability and accessibility; activation is not even an option.

Familiar:

The second way to relate is to be familiar. An individual who is familiar with a given logic has obtained available knowledge about it. This knowledge can have been made available through direct or mediated social contact. However, although the knowledge is available it is only moderately accessible; it does not come to the mind first since the individual has not build strong ties to this particular logic. Because of this the activation of the logic is possible but not automatic. Pache and Santos (2013) explain that the individual has been acquainted with the logic and its associated prescribed goals and means, but is neither emotionally nor ideologically committed to it. The person understands the demands that the logic imposes and is able to comply with these demands to gain legitimacy, however, complying with the logic is neither taken for granted nor part of the individual's identity.

Identified:

The third and final way to relate to a given logic in the model is to be identified. An individual who is identified with a given logic is one for whom the logic is available and highly accessible, and because of this also likely to be activated. The individual is acquainted with the logic and its organising principles and feels emotionally and ideologically committed to it. Such a relationship to a logic is according to Pache and Santos (2013) likely to develop when the individual has not only been socialised into the logic's worldviews and concepts but has through its own training or experience developed a connection to the logic which provides the individual with a positive sense of self.

When faced with two competing institutional logics, depending on their degree of adherence in relation to each of the two logics i.e. novice, familiar or identified, based on previous empirical findings Pache and Santos (2013) argue that individuals may resort to five different micro-level responses: ignorance, compliance, defiance, combination, or compartmentalisation.

Ignorance refers to an individual's lack of reaction towards a given logic, i.e. it is not a conscious attempt to resist a given logic, it is rather an absence of response due to lack of awareness of the logics influence. *Compliance* refers to an individual's full adoption of the values, norms, and practices prescribed by a given logic. *Defiance* refers to an individual's explicit rejection of the values, norms, and practices of a given logic. It differs from ignorance in that to reject something you have to be aware of and disagree with the resisted logic, as opposed to a lack of awareness. *Compartmentalisation* refers to an individual's attempt at purposefully segmenting her compliance with competing logics, i.e. an individual can display full compliance with a given logic (and reject a competing one) in a given context, and choose to display adherence to the competing logic in other contexts. Finally, *combination* refers to an individual's attempt at blending some of the values, norms and practices prescribed by the competing logics. Combining contradictory logics is not necessarily easy since what they prescribe might be incompatible. However, Pache and Santos (2013) state that empirical

evidence has shown that different coping strategies can be utilised in different situations, such as the selective coupling of intact elements drawn from each logic, or the development of new values, norms, or practices that synthesise the competing logics.

The core statement in the model of Pache and Santos (2013) is that an individual's response to competing logics is driven by the degree of adherence to each of the competing logics. The degree of adherence to certain logic is likely to shape the degree to which they are committed to it and the willingness to take action to see it prevail. In the case of LifeTech the high degree of adherence on a conceptual level to the newly introduced logic, in combination with perceived problems in the implementation of the new structures and procedures is experienced as a problematic situation for the individuals within the organisation.

3. Methodology

This paper is a case study that aims at investigating how individuals working at LifeTech experience and respond to the changes being introduced by the new President of the company. Since the purpose of the study is to understand what is happening inside the organisation on an individual level when the changes are being implemented I had the need to understand how the people within the organisation view the changes, how they have experienced them, and how they have responded to them. I have opted to conduct a qualitative study, studying internal documents and conducting semi-structured interviews with employees at the company. Qualitative studies are argued to be useful when a researcher wants to explore the experiences and behaviours of individuals (Gahuri & Grønhaug, 2005) and case studies are useful when the researcher wants to get a deeper understanding of the environment the study is conducted in and the processes that are unfolding. Case studies present an opportunity to answer the questions “what” but also “how”, and semi-structured interviews are a good approach if the researcher wants to understand the reasons for why the interlocutors have made certain decisions or acted in a certain way (Saunders et al., 2009). Since the aim of the paper has been to first understand what has actually been implemented and then to investigate how the people within the organisation have experienced and responded to the changes being introduced, I argue that the choice of a qualitative case-study approach has been an appropriate one.

In total I have conducted 20 semi-structured interviews both face-to-face and over telephone with different people within the organisation, each lasting between 45 and 75 minutes (see table 1). The face-to-face interviews were conducted with people located in Sweden and the telephone interviews with people located in UK, Germany, Denmark and Italy. All interviews were made between January and March 2014 during three separate visits to the company headquarters. All interviews were recorded with the permission of the interlocutor, and all interviews have subsequently been transcribed. Interviews conducted in Swedish have been transcribed in Swedish and selected parts of those transcriptions have subsequently been translated into English for use in this paper. All names of companies and individuals have been held anonymous upon request from and in agreement with LifeTech. An argument can be made that the anonymity of the interlocutors gave them the confidence to speak more

freely and that without it they might not have felt comfortable to be fully open, a problem that Walsham (2006) presents as an issue during interviews, especially if they are recorded.

The initial visit to the company was made to conduct a preliminary meeting/interview with the new President to discuss the objective of the study and to get a first understanding of the changes being implemented. During the second visit I started by interviewing the President again since it was clear from our first meeting that the changes being implemented originated from him. This interview gave an understanding of what the future plans for LifeTech looks like and why the changes are being implemented. During this visit I conducted five additional interviews with other members of the company leadership team at the headquarters in order to understand their views of the changes and what actions they have taken to implement the changes. From the first set of interviews I understood that there were several organisational changes on-going at the same time within LifeTech. However the part of the organisation most affected by the changes during the time of the study was the global marketing and sales organisations, both central and local, and these changes then became the primary focus of the study. Subsequently the second set of interviews were conducted with a number of people in management positions within or closely connected to the central and local marketing and sales organisations to understand both how they have experienced the changes and responded to the introduction of the changes. Since parts of the central and some local marketing organisations are located in the same facilities as the headquarters and thus have a direct physical connection with the President and the company leadership team I also opted to conduct telephone interviews with people at other geographical locations within LifeTech. This was done in order to investigate how the changes have been experienced in other parts of the organisation not directly connected to the headquarters and how the people in those parts of the organisation have responded to them.

When conducting the interviews I have engaged in a constant comparative analysis (Czarniawska (forthcoming) were I have used the information provided to me in previous interviews when preparing the questions for the next. The questions prepared for each interview therefore have been slightly different and more focused on specific topics further into the interviewing process. This have given me the opportunity to follow up on different themes such as: “Autonomous and Decentralised”, “The concept of One LifeTech”, “The Approval Process”, “Communication” and “Business as Usual” deduced from previous interviews and allowed me to build a more clear picture regarding the phenomenon I have deemed most interesting and necessary to understand in the change process. In addition to conducting interviews I have also studied internal documents, both presentations and communications regarding the changes as well as organisational charts and strategic plans. These documents have also guided my questions during the interviews and acted as a source for triangulation (Saunders et al. 2009) to verify statements made by the interlocutors. Interviews do not produce facts, merely the interlocutors individual account for what has happened or is going on (Czarniawska, forthcoming) and memories can be both fragmented and reshaped by how a person looks at things today, which could lead to a problem in finding out what has actually happened (Nor-Aziah & Scapens, 2007). Since I have had to rely on personal accounts and the memories of the interlocutors to be able to reconstruct how it has

been in the past and what was going on during the time of the study, triangulation has been an important aspect in the analysis of the material. Triangulation in this study was made through verifying statements made by the interlocutors by comparing them both to each other and to internal documents depicting the processes of events discussed. I have also asked the same questions to several of the interlocutors and tried to make them exemplify as many of their statements as possible. In this way I have been able to determine if some of the statements have been inconsistent in regards to what has actually happened.

After transcribing each of the interviews I have followed the Grounded Theory approach presented in Czarniawska (forthcoming) where I have compared the first sample of field material to the second one to look for similarities and differences. I then compared the first two samples with the third one and so on. Through this process I have coded and categorized the material to find connections between the different categories. During the process I have as Martin and Turner (1986) described moved from a low level of abstraction where the categories have included data as it was presented to me, to higher levels of abstraction where the concepts have taken on more of a theoretical meaning. Through this process I have been able to connect the empirical material to the theoretical concept of institutional logics, and how individuals, according to the theoretical model developed by Pache and Santos (2013), can relate in different ways to competing institutional logics. In presenting the empirical material I have divided the findings into three parts based on the categorisation of the material; (1) “How it has been”, where I describe the historical logic present in the organisation; (2) “Introducing the new way”, where the new logic introduced in the organisation is portrayed; and (3) “Experiences and responses in the organisation”, where I describe how the individuals within the organisation have experienced and responded to the institutional complexity created by the introduction of the changes. I have as Roberts (1993) argue to be useful in case studies like this, used theories to inform myself, not to indicate what the truth is; the explanations have been a combination of both theory and the empirical material. The theoretical framework has been used to create an understanding of the empirical material I have collected and the empirical material has been used to further strengthen the theoretical framework. The explanations of the results of the study is however to be found in the empirical material and not in the theoretical framework. The purpose with the study has not been to test or generate new theory but to contribute to and strengthen an existing theoretical framework with new empirical context.

In the next section of the paper the empirical findings of the study are presented under the three headings introduced above. Instead of having a longer discussion at the end of the paper, each part ends with a discussion where the empirical material is analysed and discussed using the theoretical framework. This was done to make it easier for the reader to follow the processes from how it has been, to what has been introduced and subsequently how individuals have experienced and responded to the introduced changes,

4. Findings

4.1. Setting

LifeTech is a Swedish, US owned, company in the life science industry. It started as a small R&D unit within a larger Swedish life science company in the 1960s and has developed into the world leader within its field with annual revenue of more than 500 million US dollars and over 1500 employees in 25 countries selling products in more than 80 countries worldwide. Around 10 years ago LifeTech was sold off as a separate entity and has been owned by Private Equity (PE) companies until three years ago when it was acquired by a large US based industrial company – BigTech. The LifeTech headquarters is located in Sweden, and is also the largest entity within the organisation with approximately 400 employees. The headquarters includes organisations for marketing, R&D, production and supply. Sales and marketing organisations (commercial units) are located in 25 countries and there is also a local R&D and production unit in Germany. LifeTech has historically been run in a highly decentralised manner, where the different country managers have been able to run their commercial units almost as their own separate businesses. This way of managing the company and running the business continued unchanged during the first two years with BigTech as owner. With the new LifeTech President there is a strong strategic and operational drive to re-structure LifeTech into a much more centralised organisation including global functions for marketing, R&D, production and supply, and local commercial organisations in the different countries for marketing and sales – all this with the goal to create “One LifeTech”.

4.2. How it has been

The product portfolio of LifeTech can roughly be divided in two different types of product areas; Alpha and Beta, with Alpha being the historical core product area of the company and Beta an addition to the total portfolio following an acquisition in the mid-1990s of a company located in Germany. Within the Alpha area LifeTech is the global leader with a global market share of around 70-80% and Alpha contributes with approximately 70% of LifeTech total revenue. The remaining revenue comes primarily from the Beta area.

During the period when PE companies owned LifeTech most activities were focused towards creating company value in the shorter term so that LifeTech could be sold with a high profit. Much work went into further developing and expanding existing business strategies and models, and to find ways to reduce costs by e.g. stream line the product portfolio and scaling up production. Planning was mostly conducted with a time horizon of one year and emphasis was on increasing sales and making investments just enough to be able to move forward and at the same time increase profit.

4.2.1. Autonomous and Decentralised

During the PE period the LifeTech was run with a high degree of decentralisation, both regarding the product areas (Alpha and Beta), and the commercial units in the different countries, where the managers were given almost complete autonomy in how to run their businesses. To run the company in this way was a decision made by the former President,

who was president of the company the entire time they were owned by PE companies. Several of the people interviewed stated that this was the way the former President wanted it to be done without really caring what the different countries did or how they did it as long as they delivered the expected financial results. One of the interlocutors explained that they worked with 'delegated responsibility' for the different countries. In the beginning of each year the central head office decided on a budget for each country with specific targets that they needed to meet financially. After the targets were set, the countries themselves had full autonomy in deciding on the most appropriate way of reaching those targets. The reasoning behind running the company in this way was the belief that the people within the countries had the best knowledge about their local market, that they knew the local customers and were best situated to judge what products their customers needed. The intimate knowledge about the local market, and the freedom given to them from the company leadership to act using that local knowledge was deemed the best way to move the business forward. However as was also stated in several interviews, it created a situation where the organisations in the different countries could live their own lives, separate from both the headquarters and from each other. One of the managers Beta managers explained how it had been in the following way:

Beta has been a business unit of its own. More or less with one general manager on top and the main focus was of course on delivering the right financial results. But all internal prioritisations, project movements, staff decisions etc. could be made here more or less autonomous.

One example of this delegated and decentralised authority is the development of marketing and promotional material. LifeTech had separate central marketing organisations for the Alpha and the Beta product areas with the task of developing marketing material intended to be used by all local commercial organisations. However because of local autonomy and the lack of overall company processes for making the country managers comply with central directives, the countries have been able to disregard the materials coming from the two central marketing organisations. The local commercial organisations have instead developed their own country specific material. As one of the interlocutors stated:

(...) from central we have been trying to push out campaigns and other initiatives to attract as many as possible to use them, however we have never had the mandate to actually force someone to use it. So they (the countries) could smile, look happy and say thank you very much, but then they went home and did what ever they wanted to, and they had everyone's approval to do so.

Historically there has also been a strong reliance on technical product expertise within both the central and the local marketing organisations in the different countries. Many of the people working within the marketing organisations started either within R&D or as technical product specialists before moving on towards marketing positions. Within the marketing organisations a broad variety of activities were taking place for both global use and local use. Most of them described as uncoordinated and opportunistic and with the roles and responsibilities not clearly defined and many of the activities undertaken have been in a

reactive manner. Focus has primarily been on product support with a mix of clinical support and technical support, i.e. the expertise has been within product knowledge. However there has been a lack of marketing knowledge and as a result little or none development of the marketing skills and practises have been made. As one member of the leadership team explains:

Previously we have had a marketing organisation that has been a bit all over the place. If you go back you have had product management and some marketing done here. The product management part has been working well, but we have never really had any people that have pushed our marketing forwards. Not to be cruel, but a lot of the people working in marketing has come from the R&D side, people who has thought it would be fun to do a bit of business. We have hardly ever brought in any “crazy” marketing people that you have had to hold back. Instead it has mostly been people from product management who have been a bit cautious and thought it interesting to work with the products.

The autonomy given to the people in the different countries in how to run their own businesses and make decisions on what activities they should be undertaking to move the business forward, in combination with the lack of communication between the different units created a situation where a lot of material has been duplicated in more than one place. One of the member of the leadership team explained that because the organisational structure was a bit unclear and the former President afforded them such a great deal of autonomy, the countries could do almost as they pleased. Since local commercial organisations were primarily concerned with the success of their own business and not the success of LifeTech as a whole they did not really care what was going on in other countries. Their primary concern was to meet their financial targets in whatever way they though best. The result of this was that a lot of investments where made towards practically identical things in different places of the organisation, leading to excess resource spending’s. The low amount of integration between the different parts of the organisation also made it difficult for LifeTech to present itself in a unified way towards the global market as a whole. Instead the company was in essence represented and presented in several different ways locally in the different countries.

4.2.2 Discussion – How it has been

To sum up, historically LifeTech had a decentralised structure, which afforded its organisations in different countries a high degree of autonomy in regards to decision-making, and the business, especially marketing activities, were built on local market knowledge and technical expertise regarding the products. To run the company in this way was a choice made by the former President during the PE ownership, who allowed the people working in the different countries to run their operations in their own way as long as they in the end delivered the required financial results. At that time there were two central marketing organisations (Alpha and Beta) with the task to develop and push campaigns and materials out to the countries, but since they had no mandate to enforce implementation, much of this was never utilised by the countries. Instead the local organisations relied on their knowledge of the local market, to know what would work best for them. They made decisions themselves on

what activities that they were going to undertake, utilising the two central marketing organisations predominantly as support for technical and product related questions. This way of working can be compared to what Hallet (2010) describes as the process of decoupling. By allowing the different countries to disregard instructions from the central organisations and rely on their own local knowledge to make decisions, the formal structures in the organisations made it possible for the countries to vary their local activities as they pleased.

As described earlier in the paper, institutional logics make up the values, norms, and practices (Pache & Santos, 2013) that shape cognition and guide decision-making processes (McPherson & Sauder, 2013). It directs what social actors want (their interests) and how they are to proceed (guidelines for action) and also what they are (their identity) (Lok, 2010). The institutional logic prevalent in how LifeTech was run historically is one based on a decentralised organisational structure that afforded autonomy in decision-making to the people within the local country operations. The interest for the people in the different countries was to focus on making their own local business as successful as possible. They were allowed to do so in the ways that they themselves deemed to be the most appropriate ones based on their local knowledge about the market, customers and technical expertise regarding the products. The central marketing organisations, instead of pushing campaigns to the local markets, were regarded as technical support functions that the people in the countries could use when they themselves felt it necessary. This all created a situation where the countries regarded themselves as if they were almost separate businesses within their own markets, not as smaller parts of a larger company on a global market. Since the company had been operating according to this logic for several years the people within LifeTech can be seen as what Pache and Santos (2013) define as 'Identified' with it. Information and knowledge about the logic was both available and accessible to the people, and this information and knowledge was activated, since everybody within the company worked in this way. In other words the people within LifeTech were acquainted with the organising principles the logic was based on and they have been both emotionally and ideologically committed to working in this way for a long time.

4.3. Introducing the new way

Following the acquisition by BigTech an interim President was recruited internally from LifeTech and continued running the company as before. This President left the company after a time of less than pleasing results. The results were by no means bad in the sense that the company produced negative results, however growth had gone from nearly double-digit to almost flat. Following this, in the spring of 2013, the new President was recruited internally from the BigTech organisation. The new President first came in contact with LifeTech when heading the due diligence prior to the acquisition by BigTech and his first impression of the company was very favourable:

My first impression was one of greatness. It was a highly scientific company that at the time seemed to unlock market value in creating value for the adoption of its products in the marketplace. It also seemed to have a very functioning, well-run leadership team, so we were very positive.

However, when he arrived at the company as the newly appointed President two years later, his impression changed:

Fast-forwards two years, we had bought the business, it met its plans in the first six months and then for two years it crumbled. It went from close to double-digit growth to being flat. Major leadership turnover changes, it seems now in hindsight, major leadership issues, and it was very sad. I was very happy to come here, but my first impression of the business was very sad, because of the fact that it had lost its way. (...) There was not even a need for change; it was more about trying to dissect what had happened. The need for change; It was obvious that the building was on fire. But the question was: Do we put out the fire in the building we are at, or do we build a new building. I opted for the later alternative, and we are now building a new building.

4.3.1. The concept of “One LifeTech”

His idea for the new building was to bring all of the separate entities together and move forward as one company towards a more unified global strategy. He based this change initiative on his own experience of how other companies similar to LifeTech within the same industry are structured and run. The changes were presented to the rest of the organisation during a large meeting in Sweden in October 2013 where representatives from the marketing organisations from all countries within the organisation were present. It was during this meeting that the future vision of a more unified company working together towards strategic global goals was presented under the concept name “One LifeTech”. The new President explained his vision in this way:

What we are doing is creating the spokes in a wheel to add connectivity. So we are not allowing the organisations to create their own solutions all the time. What we want to do is; we want to find the right solutions out in the regions, because they do a lot of great stuff there; import them to the Global organisation and package them; and then export the packaged solutions back to the countries again. In essence it is a centralisation of decision-making power.

However, to make these changes happen was not just about hiring new people and implementing the new structures and procedures. As several of the interlocutors have told me, the biggest change needed is in the mind-set of the people within the organisation. The changes being implemented challenged the established culture within the company. As one of the members of the leadership team explain it:

One LifeTech is having faith in the fact that we will work together, that I will contribute to in a meaningful way, and I will be rewarded for that. However this is not about me, this is about what we can do together. Which is a very different philosophy compared to how it has been. (...) Sure the changes are related to the organisational structure and the processes but there is also this cultural piece,

and without the three of those working together you are not going to have the changes that you are looking for.

After the new President arrived at the company he subsequently recruited a new head the new Global marketing organisation now including the two central marketing organisations for the Alpha and Beta product areas. Following the concept-launch of “One LifeTech” in October 2013, in December 2013 the new head of Global Marketing presented more specific changes to be implemented within the new Global Marketing organisation. The reasons given for the needed changes and what he wanted to accomplish with them was an organisation that would be able to; a) align with the overall strategic roadmap for LifeTech; b) effectively leverage the global marketing resources and spending; and c) establish more robust processes to reduce time spent on reactive and fire fighting actions to release time for proactive work aimed at increasing growth. To accomplish this he would also hire new talents with more marketing and analytical competencies as a supplement to the already existing product and country expertise. During this presentation he also introduced the organisational structure for the new Global Marketing organisation. Among other things he had added a new layer of marketing managers that would work directly under him, effectively leading the entire organisation. These new managers should have the specific marketing competencies that the new organisation would need and the recruitment of these individuals was seen as one of the more important factors for a successful implementation of the changes. Since the new recruitments were the ones who would effectively carry out the actual changes and have important roles in moving the company forward as “One LifeTech”, the hiring of these individuals was presented as a top priority by the leadership team. If they would not be able to find the “right” new people who had the experience and expertise needed to carry out the job of making the company successful in the future, both the President and the new head of Global marketing expressed a fear that the entire change project could fall apart.

4.3.2. The Approval Process

Another issue to be dealt with was the duplication of material and investments made by the different countries. As a result of the duplications and a need to find out where they are and what they relate to, an approval system for spending has been put in place. With this approval system every single spending made within the marketing organisations worldwide that exceeds 5000 US dollars has to be approved by the head of Global Marketing. Through this processes the intention is that the new Global Marketing organisation will have a better idea where and on what money is spent in the commercial organisations.

The new head of Global Marketing explained his view of the problems with resource spending in the different countries and what effects the changes being implemented will have in this way:

The first thing is that there are tremendous financial benefits, because there is an amazing amount of duplication at the moment. But the second thing is making the most out of the 17 million dollars that you have to work with. There is this balance between strategically how do I spend the 17 million dollar marketing

budget and then also making sure that tactically it is also appropriate. If you spread 17 million dollars in project spend on 100 different marketing resources around the globe you will never develop the speciality competences that can make significant change. So you will never put up a world-class website, instead you would put up 24 different homemade websites, and you can go across that in all of the various marketing mix aspects and be in the same situation. You will never have a great training program; you will have lots of basic, different training programs. So this is what we are now trying to fix, and we think that becoming “One LifeTech” is the right thing for the future.

The approval process can be seen as a first step towards this more holistic view on how resources are spent within LifeTech. In order to become “One LifeTech” and work together towards strategic global goals the approval process worked as a tool to get an understanding for the activities going on in the organisation.

4.3.3. Discussion – Introducing the new way

Since the new President of LifeTech started in the spring of 2013 he has initiated the work of implementing changes in the organisation with the vision of becoming one unified global entity under the concept name of “One LifeTech”. He has based the changes on his own experiences of what he has seen works best for similar companies as LifeTech within the same industrial sector. Where the old way of working in LifeTech was based on a logic, as discussed above, that promoted decentralisation and autonomy in decision-making for the local country organisations, where the entire organisation was run as a collection of globally dispersed business units who were all just reporting to the same entity in Sweden. The new way of working is based on a centralisation of the decision-making power, from the local country operations to the central organisations located at the headquarters in Sweden. The countries will no longer be able to rely exclusively on their local knowledge and technical expertise when running their businesses. Instead the new President wants to create an organisational structure, and implement new ways of working, that moves the decision-making power and strategic thinking in regards to marketing and sales activities from the countries to the central function of the new Global Marketing. The main idea is that instead of letting the local organisations come up with and execute the activities they themselves deem most appropriate within their local markets, the role of the new Global Marketing organisation will be to collect the knowledge from the different local markets, package it centrally, and then push the material back out to the markets, but with a more global strategic agenda. To be able to accomplish this the previous emphasis on people with technical product knowledge will be supplemented through the recruitment of new people who have the marketing competence required to run a global marketing operation. By restructuring the company in this way, adding new procedures and competences, the President wants LifeTech to be able to work as a unified entity, able to send out a global marketing message and move forward with a more focused global strategy for the entire organisation.

In essence what the President is doing is changing how the people within LifeTech are supposed to look at themselves and their own role within the organisation. By doing this the

President aims at introducing the organisation to a new institutional logic that is changing; what the people within the organisation should be interested in, i.e. the success of the entire organisation, instead of only focusing on their own local operations; the guidelines for how they are able to act, i.e. that they can no longer decide themselves which activities they are going to undertake or how to undertake them; and their identities, i.e. they should no longer see themselves as working for a company within a specific market but instead being a smaller part of a larger global company where everyone has to work together towards the same goal.

4.4. Experiences and responses in the organisation

4.4.1. The Concept of "One LifeTech"

The concept of "One LifeTech" and the vision of how to move forward with the organisation was as stated earlier, presented to the company at a meeting in Sweden in October 2013. During this meeting representatives from the different countries were invited to Sweden for a three-day conference aiming at presenting and discussing the changes being introduced. In several interviews it was stated that the people in the organisation saw the conference as a success, and the concept of "One LifeTech" was received with enthusiasm. People were especially happy with the fact that they after the meeting felt confident that the leadership team had their best interests at heart and that they had a good plan for moving the company forward. The meeting was, as some explained, seen as a highpoint in the change processes as they could really understand the benefits of working according to the new ways. The vision of what the new President wanted to accomplish with "One LifeTech", bringing the entire organisation together to work as one unit with one global strategy, was something that the people within the organisation both accepted and embraced as a good way to move forward. None of the people interviewed have made any statements of resistance towards either the concept or the vision that the concept represented. Even though they were not critical towards how the company had been run in the past, letting the countries come up with their own solutions and move their own businesses forward in what they deemed to be the best way, several people interviewed stated that they could absolutely see many of the benefits of the new concept. Having a stronger central organisation that would take on the responsibilities that had previously been placed upon the countries themselves and taking the lead in unifying the organisation were changes that they felt they could accept and wanted to see fully implemented within a short timeframe. As one of the interlocutors explained:

Instead of letting all the commercial organisations do everything themselves the basic thought is that Global Marketing is supposed to collect their ideas, sort out the good ones from the bad ones, package them centrally and then send out a more globally coherent marketing message. And this is something that we are grateful for in this group. The more things that come from Global the more grateful we are

4.4.2. Communication

Directly after the meeting held in October the people within the organisation were positive towards the concept of becoming "One LifeTech", and the vision that the President had for

the future of the organisation. However, after some time there were some aspects of the implementation that they were not quite happy with. One of the largest concerns with the implementation was the perceived lack of information and communication coming from the headquarters regarding what was on-going within LifeTech following the introduction of the concept. One of the managers in the commercial organisation explained that after the meeting in October they had hardly received any information about how the implementation of the presented changes were progressing. This manager was hopeful that there were a lot of things going on, however nobody in that local organisation knew what was actually being done. This commercial organisation manager was not alone in expressing similar critique and the experienced lack of communication regarding the change process was seen by several of the people interviewed as a big problem. Several interlocutors pointed to the fact that without a good working internal communication process and people actually knowing what was going on in the organisation they would never be able to work together towards a common goal.

At the time of the interviews, 3 to 5 months after the meeting in October 2013, the general feeling amongst the people in the organisation was that the lack of communication was becoming a problem because people did not know what was going on. It had also created a situation where people neither knew what they were expected to do, nor how to do it. One of the commercial organisation managers explained it in this way:

I mean the problem is that we are changing the culture (...) now the marketing organisation is not clear on what they are supposed to do, in terms of which kind of activities, what kind of practices, strategies. I mean as an idea it is clear, but in reality, the approach is not. (...) My point is that they have started the change process but they have not outlined where we are going. And this point is probably getting worse by the fact that there are empty boxes everywhere.

The “empty boxes” that the manager talked about refers to the new organisational chart for the Global Marketing organisation that was presented in December by the new head of Global Marketing. In this chart, apart from the four new positions directly beneath the new head, there are also seven other new positions to be filled by people with the specific marketing competencies that the President and the new head of Global Marketing have stated as necessary to be able to secure the future success of the new vision of “One LifeTech”. These empty boxes have created a great deal of confusion within the organisation, especially since they have been vacant for several months.

We have no clue, we are very curious. I can see a really good thought behind it; a will to try and do something, something that I am willing to give some time, but not at the cost of the business. Right now I am not getting any answers on things that I need to get done – I am living in somewhat of a vacuum right now.
(Commercial organisation manager)

The reference to the feeling of living in a vacuum is something that came up during several of the interviews, with people from different countries. They can see that some things are

happening that are moving them towards where they have been told they are supposed to go, but the experienced lack of communication has created a situation for them where they feel that they are trapped between the new way and the old way.

People do not really know what is going on. I do not know who you have been talking to but I think that it is especially within the marketing and sales organisation, they were the ones who were at the meeting in October, since people from marketing and sales within all the countries attended it. Within that organisation they know that something is going on, and they can see that some changes are being made, but they have really been left in a vacuum since there is not that much happening. A lot of things need to be in place for this thing (One LifeTech) to happen, but nothing is happening, it has become an unnecessarily long process. (Commercial organisation manager)

4.4.3. The Approval Process

The two aspects mostly discussed by people during the interviews were the new organisational chart for the Global Marketing organisation, and the approval process for spending, both at that moment sources of confusion and frustration. However, the approval process was seen as the most negative aspect. Some people could understand why it had been put in place. Others saw no point in it and were worried that it could potentially start affecting the business in a negative way:

The approval process is definitely a pain in the neck. It is so time-consuming and not going forward, and very laborious. I understand cost control is an issue, and for a certain period of time I think it is important that the President and the management team get to know how we are working and what we are doing. And it is also clear that we have to learn certain messages. But maybe other tools would be more efficient than these request forms, which just are frustrating for the people working in this process. (...) Because the customers are confronting you with their wishes and demands, and they then expect you or someone that is heading a country in a sales team to be able to make decisions. If you always have to say: "Ok, now you have to wait for 8 weeks before you get an answer" customers do not take you serious. They are laughing at you. And that is not very helpful for the business. And they do not accept you if you do that several times, they do not accept you as a business partner. (Commercial organisation manager)

The approval process that was put in place as a tool for discovering where and on what money was spent, in order to make the organisation more efficient in the future was perceived by people in the organisation as something that slowed the business down. In essence having the opposite effect in comparison to what was sought to be achieved through it.

4.4.4. Business as Usual

What also came up in several of the interviews was the fact that even though they knew they were now involved in a change process and that they could expect new ways of working being introduced in the future, at that moment they still had to do the same work and almost in the same way as they did before. However, now they had to do it with the added burden of not really knowing what was going on, whom they should talk to and having to put in extra work to get through the approval process. One manager explained that they still had exactly the same responsibilities as they had prior to the introduction of the changes, but that they had lost their mandate to take action. Instead of being able to make decisions themselves, they now had to go through a long process, which was seen as a big obstacle for the business at the moment. As a commercial organisation manager put it:

Personally I do not see the rational behind all of this, in this way they have castrated everyone up to the head of Global Marketing. We are obviously not trusted to make decisions regarding 5000 dollars.

At the time of the interviews, the general feeling in the organisation was still that they wanted to see “One LifeTech” fully implemented, and that it was now the way forward for them as an organisation. However, the negative feelings towards the slow implementation and the added workload by having to do everything they did in the past in combination with the new requirements had left the organisation in a state of stress and discomfort. The people were tired, and there were some people who even expressed feelings of not knowing if they had the energy to go on in the same way very much longer. One of the commercial organisation managers summarised the situation in this way:

For me, at the moment all of this is a complete catastrophe, if you want my honest opinion. As well as the vision has been thought out and the strategic aspect of it makes perfect sense, the execution has been a complete catastrophe. They are prioritising cost-controls and micro-management, and it is right now a decisions breakdown in the organisation that I have never seen before. I have never been in an organisation where the stress-level has been as high as here.

4.4.5. Discussion – Experiences and responses in the organisation

“One LifeTech” as a concept was received positively by the people within the organisation following the launch of it during the meeting in October 2013; people state that they could see how working in this way would positively contribute to the business. The new President was thereby successful in introducing and communicating the changes, and the objectives, to the people within the organisation. These changes imply an introduction of a new institutional logic that is supposed to define the goals to be pursued, and how they are to be pursued (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009) within the organisation. The new President has thereby created a situation of what Dorado and Battilana (2010) term institutional complexity, where the respective systems of meaning and normative understanding, that are build in to the rituals and practices, provide inconsistent expectations (Greenwood et al, 2011) for the people within the organisation. Since the people within the organisation where able to understand the

demands of the newly introduced logic, I argue that they cannot be what Pache and Santos (2013) define as 'Novice' in relation to it. If they were novice they would not have responded in such a favourable manner towards it since being a novice implies that the person does not have any available knowledge and information regarding a specific logic, i.e. if they were novices they would not have understood what the changes implied for them. Instead I would deem them to be what Pache and Santos (2013) define as 'Familiar' in relation to the newly introduced logic. They could understand the demands that the new organisational structure and practices would put on them and where able see positive aspects of working in the new way. However since they have at the time of the interviews not actually worked using the practices that this logic prescribes, it is impossible for me to know if they are completely emotionally and ideologically committed to it. What I can say for certain is that the changes were received positively, and that the people within the marketing organisations, following the meeting in October 2013 expected changes to start happening fast. However, as many of the people interviewed have stated during the course of this study, following the meeting in October, they lack communication and information from the headquarters regarding what is going on with the changes presented. All they know is that there is a new organisational chart for the new Global Marketing organisation, where several of the key positions have not been filled, and that they now have to go through an approval process every time they want to spend more than 5000 US dollars on a local marketing activity. This has created a situation where the people within LifeTech want the changes presented in October 2013 to be implemented, but they feel that nothing is happening. They have accepted the vision of the future organisation, and at least on a conceptual level the implied shift in institutional logic, and want things to start moving. The experienced lack of communication, the changes in the organisational structure (the new organisational chart), and the new formal system (the approval process), has left them in what many would describe as a vacuum, where they do not know what is going on and what they are supposed to do. They still have to perform the same tasks, in the same way as they did before since the structure and procedures needed to fully implement "One LifeTech" are not in place, however, because of the introduction of the approval system the countries are no longer able to decouple their local activities from the central organisation, which has had the perceived effect of adding workload and slowing the business down. The people within the organisation wants the changes to be fully implemented, however since the systems and structures needed for a complete implementation of "One LifeTech" are not in place, they have resorted to working and thinking according to the old logic, effectively decoupling the day-to-day operations with the values and norms of the newly introduced institutional logic, i.e. a state of "Business as Usual".

According to the theoretical model developed by Pache and Santos (2013), in a situation where individuals are identified with the prevailing institutional logic (logic A), and familiar with a newly introduced logic (logic B), their identification with logic A will keep them focused on ensuring the prevalence of logic A. Since they are familiar with logic B individuals will not feel threatened by B to the same extent as a novice individual would, however they will likely step into maintaining the integrity of logic A in order to avoid identity threats. Pache and Santos (2013) argue that in a situation where individuals are

identified with logic A and familiar with logic B, they are more likely to resort to compartmentalisation as a response to the situation i.e. segmenting their compliance in relation to both logics, adhering to one logic in a given context and the other logic in another context. However, what the results of this paper show is a different situation. Since the practices prescribed by the new logic are not in place it is impossible to fully determine how the people within the organisation will ultimately respond to the changes. However, what can be seen is that the individuals within the marketing organisations have accepted the new logic, at least on a conceptual level. They are positive towards the changes and have made no statements with regards to wanting to ensure the prevalence of the historical logic i.e. that they want to keep working in the same way as they have done in the past. Instead they want the changes to happen. On a conceptual/mental level an argument can be made that they have responded with compliance, at least concerning the values and norms prescribed by the new logic. However since the practices have not been put in place, it is impossible to determine if this will be the case in the future as well. Because they want to see the changes implemented, the experienced lack of communication and information following the meeting in October 2013 has created problems for the people within the organisation. They know that things are going to happen, however they do not know what they are, or when they will happen. By taking too long in implementing the structures and procedures needed for practical implementation of the changes, the momentum created by the initial positive responses to the changes is not fully utilised. This has created a situation where they on the one hand look forward to the changes being fully implemented, but on the other it is creating problems for them at the present. The new ways of working needed for the full implementation of the new logic are not in place, and because of both structural (the new organisational chart) and procedural (the approval system) changes relating to the new logic being implemented, they cannot go back and work according to the prescriptions of the old logic either. They are in essence, in this initial stage of implantation, feeling as if they are trapped between two competing logics.

5. Conclusions

The purpose of this paper has been to investigate the initial implementation phase of the changes being introduced in a company by answering the question: “How do individuals within LifeTech experience and respond to the changes being initiated by the new President?” I have in this paper shown that the changes being implemented by the new President imply a shift in institutional logics, from a logic that the individuals within the organisation are identified with, to one that they are familiar in relation to. The people do not, however, respond in the way predicted by Pache and Santos’ (2013) theoretical model. Instead of focusing on preserving the existing logic, the people within the organisation are positive towards the changes, and want to see them fully implemented. Instead of compartmentalisation as the model predicts, their response is more in lined with that of compliance, at least towards the values and norms prescribed by the new logic. However because of experienced problems with the implementation of the changes, a situation has occurred where the processes prescribed by the new logic are not in place and changes done in both structure and practises have made it impossible to work according to the prescriptions

of the old logic. Because of this, the fact that they cannot work according to the prescriptions of either logic the people feel as if they have been trapped between the two competing logics.

This paper contributes to the institutional perspective by answering the call to move analysis down to the individual level. It shows the usefulness of the framework developed by Pache and Santos (2013) for studying individual level response in relation to competing institutional logics, and it also adds to it by showing a situation where individuals are trapped between two competing logics during the initial implementation phase directed towards changing the institutional logic within an organisation. Although the findings cannot be generalised, the results however add to the understanding of individual experiences and responses of people who are exposed to competing institutional logics. One limiting factor of this research is the fact that it only studies the initial phase of the implementation, and can because of this, not say anything about the outcome of the change process as a whole. However, through focusing on this limited timespan the results of the paper serves as an indication for managers and practitioners intent on changing organisations. Through studying the initial implementation phase, where the changes are only introduced on a conceptual level to the people within the organisation, the study shows that there is a clear “window of opportunity” but that the momentum from the initial positive reactions to the introduced changes is not fully utilised. By taking too long in implementing the structures and procedures needed for the practical implementation of the changes, the focus of the people within the organisation change from the positive aspects of what the change will bring, to instead focus on the negative experience that they do not know what is going on and that things are taking to long.

This situation with a “window of opportunity “ is what I would recommend future research within competing institutional logics to pay closer attention to. To study what happens to people when introduced to the concept of a new logic; how they experience this situation, and how they in turn respond to this experience could potentially give great insights into how to manage change processes. This paper shows that in the timeframe where the changes are still only perceived as mental concepts of what is to come, the timing of actions taken by the people in charge of the change process can have profound implications for how the individuals experience and respond to the changes.

6. References

- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). “How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship”, *The Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 65-107
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). “Building sustainable hybrid organisations: the case of commercial microfinance organisations”, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 1419-1440
- Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (1996). Introduction. In Czarniawska, B. and Sevón, G. (ed) *Translating organizational change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Czarniawska, B. (forthcoming) "Social science research from field to desk." Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Dawson, P. (2003). *Understanding Organizational Change – The Contemporary experiences of people at work*, London, Sage Publication Ltd

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). "Bringing society back in: symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions". In Powel, W. W., and DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organisational analysis* (pp. 232-266). Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Gahuri, P., & Grønhaug, K. (2005). "Research Methods in Business Studies: A Practical Guide" 3rd Ed, Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

Glynn, M. A. (2000). "When cymbals become symbols: Conflict over organizational identity within a symphony orchestra". *Organization Science*, vol. 11(3), pp. 285–298.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). "Institutional Complexity and Organisational Responses", *The Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 317-371

Hallett, T. (2010). "The Myth Incarnated: Recoupling Processes, Turmoil, and Inhabited Institutions in an Urban Elementary School", *American Sociological Review*, nol. 75, no. 1, pp. 52-74

Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). "Institutional Work: Refocusing Institutional Studies of Organization", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 20 (1), pp. 52-58

Lok, J. (2010). "Institutional Logics an Identity Projects", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 1305-1335

Lounsbury, M. (2001). "Institutional sources of practice variation: Staffing college and university recycling programs". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 46, pp. 29–56.

Martin, P. Y., & Turner, B. A. 1986. "Grounded theory and organisational research." *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, vol. 22(2), pp. 141-157

McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). "Logics in Action: Managing Institutional Complexity in a Drug Court", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 58 (2), pp. 165-196

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). "Institutionalized organisations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 82, pp. 440-463

Nor-Aziah, A., & Scapens, R. (2007). "Corporatisation and accounting change: The role of accounting and accountants in a Malaysian public utility", *Management Accounting Research*, vol. 2, pp. 209-247

Pache, A-C., & Santos, F. (2013). "Embedded in Hybrid Contexts: How do individuals in organizations respond to competing institutional logics", *Research in the Sociology of Organisations*, Vol. 39B, 3-35

Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2013b). "Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 972-1001

Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T., (1997). "Understanding and managing cynicism about organisational change", *Academy of Management Executives*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 48-59

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). "Research Methods for Business Students", 5th ed, Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

Scapens, R., & Roberts, J. (1993). "Accounting and control: a case study of resistance to accounting change", *Management Accounting Review*, vol. 38, pp. 1-30

Walsham, G. (2006). "Doing interpretive research", *European Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 15, pp. 320-330