



Editorial: Organizational Plasticity: What is it? How Does it Work and Why Does it Matter?

Journal:	<i>Evidence-based HRM: a global forum for empirical scholarship</i>
Manuscript ID	EBHRM-01-2021-0010
Manuscript Type:	Editorial

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Editorial: Special Issue on Organizational Plasticity

The entire management enterprise has been built on efforts directed towards *efficiency* (with varying emphases over the decades; see Scott, 2003). This can be defined as the appropriate disposal of resources such that either the least possible inputs are used to produce an output or more output comes from the exploitation of a given amount of inputs (e.g., Simon, 1997[1947]). This approach has provided tremendous support to the development of management as a discipline and it still contributes to the way management is practiced. As a result of this we know a great deal about how to structure, plan, create, organize, maintain, and improve processes, procedures, and routines (Abrahamson, 2002). Instead, we know very little about how to disorganize, create simpler structures from complex structures, isolate and deconstruct/debunk unnecessary routines, reduce bureaucracy to functional levels, for example (Abrahamson & Freeman, 2013). And this information would have come at great use to face the constraints to organizational actions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Some have categorized all these aspects under the umbrella of disorganization management (Herath et al., 2016, 2017; Herath 2019). However, today's organizations are sometimes required to move toward more flexible and adaptive forms (Fioretti, 2012) due to an ever-changing environment and workforce (Myerson et al., 2010; Raguseo et al., 2016). Especially in the domain of Human Resources Management (Ngoc et al., 2021), this need for flexibility has been increasingly evident in the past year, when businesses have had to find different ways to manage the workforce due to unprecedented circumstances arising from the COVID-19 pandemic (Gigauri, 2020; Carnevale & Hatak, 2020).

A combination of flexibility and adaptability that makes internal organizational processes malleable and open to change is summarized here with the word *plasticity*. One of the challenges of this area of study is that it is both costly and difficult to study. It is so

1
2
3 because it usually is practiced by trial-and-error in a fluid process where decisions are either
4
5 unplanned or only partially planned (in a way reminding of what Magnani calls cognizing
6
7 “through doing”; see Magnani, 2007; Secchi, 2011). This happens because *organizational*
8
9 *plasticity* is motivated (or based), on the one hand, and practiced (or implemented), on the
10
11 other, under conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty. In the former case, pressures to respond
12
13 to what could be a temporary condition of the market or to adapt to an ever-changing
14
15 technological environment are generally difficult to interpret. This, in turn, determines
16
17 uncertainty in the way in which *plasticity* is implemented, generating a working solution
18
19 rather than a recipe. This is not it. *Organizational plasticity* can be observed at multiple
20
21 operational levels. While the individual could adopt plastic actions (micro), organizational
22
23 procedures and processes could also be made plastic (macro). In addition to this classic
24
25 dichotomy, there are several *meso* domains (Secchi & Cowley, 2020) in which plasticity
26
27 could manifest; for example, formal and informal social networks.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Given the above, the study of *organizational plasticity* through traditional
35
36 methodologies reveals itself to be largely insufficient. In fact, the above suggests that
37
38 complex systems research methods capable of tackling uncertainty and ambiguity may be of
39
40 help. This makes advanced computational simulation techniques particularly useful for the
41
42 exploration of a topic such as this one, especially since they allow for a representation of
43
44 complex adaptive systems (Edmonds and Meyer, 2017; Miller & Page, 2007). Moreover,
45
46 they (can) maintain strong ties with actual organizations, making their findings particularly
47
48 relevant (Homberg et al., 2020). The idea for this Special Issue was motivated by the
49
50 exploration of the opportunity (potential) that agent-based computational simulation
51
52 modeling could have when applied to the study of *plasticity*.
53
54
55

56
57 In putting the aforementioned ideas to action, we organized a symposium on the topic
58
59 of organizational plasticity in January 2018 co-funded by the European Academy of
60

1
2
3 Management and The University of Huddersfield Business School in the UK (the venue).
4
5 This symposium was also the Third Agent-Based Models of Organizational Behavior
6
7 Workshop (ABMO3). We were able to bring together a collection of academics and
8
9 practitioners from a variety of disciplines and interests for a two-day worth of in-depth
10
11 discussions. Here, we cast a wide net that welcomed contributions from any discipline that
12
13 had something to add to the conversation on plasticity, including but not limited to
14
15 psychology, sociology, management, computer science, engineering, cognitive science,
16
17 decision science, language, artificial intelligence, economics, and philosophy. The
18
19 submissions we received in the ABMO3 Symposium ranged from empirical investigations to
20
21 cross-methods studies, and theoretical and philosophical perspectives.
22
23
24
25

26 From the perspective of content, our discussion at the ABMO3 Symposium addressed
27
28 the following key questions:
29

- 30
31
- 32 • What is the plastic organization? What are its characteristics and possible shapes,
33 especially when referring to Human Resource Management (HRM)?
34
 - 35 • What are the characteristics of the individuals that deal with plasticity within the
36 organization? How could contemporary cognitive paradigms such as distributed
37 (Hutchins, 1995) or systemic cognition (Cowley & Vallee-Tourangeau, 2013) help us
38 understand cognitive mechanisms that support or hinder change?
39
 - 40 • How is organizational cognition framed in a plastic organization? How is it different
41 from a standard/non-adaptive organization? Recent work on the crisis of standard
42 cognitive paradigms is of help (Secchi & Adamsen, 2017; Herath, G, 2019; Secchi &
43 Cowley, 2020).
44
 - 45 • What is the limit of organizational flexibility? How much and what kind of flexibility
46 leads to better (or worse) decision making outcomes? Micro, meso, and macro
47 (especially HRM) levels of analyses are considered and relevant here.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
- Through the famous ‘garbage can’ model (Cohen et al., 1972), the literature indicated that anarchy is sometimes preferable to hierarchy (Fioretti & Lomi, 2010; Herath et al., 2016; Herath, 2017). Are there other alternatives to the anarchy-hierarchy model? How so? And how do these alternatives reflect on HRM practice?

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Following the contributions received in the workshop, we embarked on a long journey developing these ideas into fully-fledged articles that have finally reached the publication stage. This Special Issue thus is the culmination of our efforts in the past two years. It was open to those who participated in the ABMO3 Symposium and, at the same time, to a wider audience, to extend the range of interested academics. In the end, though, the topic of this Special Issue—i.e. exploring plasticity through agent-based modeling—is very much a niche and we mainly received submissions from the ABMO3 Symposium’s participants. As readers are about to find out, the quality of these submissions has been remarkable in terms of the variety of topics covered and of the way in which agent-based computational simulation has been employed. Not only *organizational plasticity* is a relatively uncharted domain, but the method used here is also unusual for HRM research. Before we can add more on these points, it is probably useful to outline some of the salient elements of the five articles featured in this Special Issue.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The starting paper of the collection “On the quest for defining organisational plasticity: a community modelling experiment” by Siebers, Herath, Bardone, Farahbakhsh, Knudsen, Madsen, Mufti, Neumann, Richards, Seri, and Secchi is a viewpoint piece¹ that sets the agenda for this Special Issue and our exploration of *organizational plasticity*. This article shows how the novel community modeling framework (Philolab) was operationalized to brainstorm new conceptual ideas on *organizational plasticity* in a structured and efficient set

¹ The double blind peer review process for this paper was handled by the Editor-in-Chief independent of the author(s)

1
2
3 up with a multidisciplinary group of 14 participants (split into two independent working
4 groups). This definitional article demonstrates how two independent working groups with the
5 goal of defining plasticity through agent-based modeling arrive at a set of axioms that share
6 several core elements. For example, both groups indicate a mix of internal and external
7 causality mechanisms for the emergence of plasticity. These core elements thus pave the way
8 for developing a shared definition of *organizational plasticity* that transcends disciplinary
9 boundaries.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 The second paper “Towards developing a measure of disorganization”, written by
20 Herath², approaches the exploration of plasticity through disorganization. Disorganization is
21 often seen as an antecedent to plasticity. However, while we see rich conceptual development
22 in this domain, we are yet to move these ideas forward through empirical investigation. As
23 such, this paper is one of the first of its kind to explore the problem of specifically measuring
24 disorganization. Herath uses the WERS (Work and Employment Relations Survey) UK data
25 to develop a disorganization index with items sourced from existing measurement tools.
26 Results showcase disorganization having a positive effect on the individual financial
27 performance of workers. Importantly, this paper highlights the limitations of adopting pre-
28 existing scales for measuring disorganization and presents a forceful case for the
29 development of a dedicated measurement tool for disorganization. The underlying
30 assumption here is that plastic features are more likely to emerge when disorganization is
31 practiced.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 Neumann’s “From organizing to organizations: a typological scale of human relations
50 management outside the legal world” is the third paper of this Special Issue. The author looks
51 at the interplay between hierarchical structure and informal networks in the unique setting of
52 criminal organizations. This interplay between hierarchy and deviations from it is often a

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
² The double blind peer review process for this paper was handled by the Editor-in-Chief independent of the author(s)

1
2
3 setting where conversations around the utility of plasticity emerge. Using an applied case
4 study methodology, this study shows how undifferentiated networks based on informal trust
5 lack mechanisms for conflict resolution while hierarchical organizations provide the highest
6 degree of structural resilience up to the level of self-organized system criticality. One of the
7 messages from Neumann's paper is that unbridled plasticity is not necessarily a net positive,
8 especially given the specific contextual characteristics of some environments.
9

10
11
12 The following paper, the fourth, "Organisational plasticity: can we really model
13 human-agent behaviours?" by Richards takes aim at the tools (specifically agent-based
14 modeling) often vouched for the exploration of phenomena such as plasticity. Through the
15 use of a creative review and of analogies, this paper articulates the important trade-offs
16 between predictability and realism when we consider the complex nature of human behavior,
17 and more so that of interactive human-agent behavior. As such Richards raises essential
18 critical points as he questions the relevance of these tools for exploring human behavior. The
19 study brings to bear the complications involved which are relevant to anyone using
20 computational simulation tools for exploring *organizational plasticity*.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 The final paper of the collection, "Cognitive attunement in the face of organizational
39 plasticity" by Secchi³ explores the practical implications of plasticity from a micro
40 perspective. This means that the study designs and performs an agent-based simulation built
41 on assumptions about cognitive dispositions of employees in an organization. Secchi
42 operationalizes elements of systemic cognition (see above) to understand how the agent-
43 employee copes with and adapts to an increasing number of tasks. In so doing, the simulation
44 lays the ground for a better understanding of the links between micro and macro structuration
45 of *organizational plasticity*.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

³ The double blind peer review process for this paper was handled by the Editor-in-Chief independent of the author(s)

1
2
3 The summary of the articles makes it apparent that this Special Issue offers a robust
4 exploration of *organizational plasticity* by examining some of the most important questions
5 in our continued effort to develop a better understanding of the phenomenon. In particular,
6 the tension between the micro-individual and the macro-structural are very important
7 elements to understand how HRM could not just cope with but embrace plasticity. Through
8 the variety of takes, the tapestry of ideas, and the unique insights of the contributions above
9 renders this Special Issue a foundational collection of articles exploring this emerging topic.
10 As such, we believe this Special Issue is of relevance to a broad array of HRM academics as
11 well as practitioners who are interested in understanding the inner workings and implication
12 of *organizational plasticity*. We hope you enjoy reading this collection of articles as much as
13 we have enjoyed putting them together.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Acknowledgments**

31
32 We would like to thank Professor Thomas Lange (Editor-In-Chief) and Dr. Fabian Homberg
33 (Associated Editor) for giving us the opportunity to develop this Special Issue and for
34 handling the papers submitted by the guest editor's independent from their authors. We also
35 extend our gratitude to the European Academic of Management, Organisational Behaviour
36 Special Interest Group, and The University of Huddersfield Business School for co-funding
37 the ABMO3 Symposium which helped source articles for this Special Issue. Finally, we
38 would like to thank Symposium participants, all of our contributors, reviewers for their
39 exceptional and tireless work, especially during a global pandemic.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Dinuka B. Herath & Davide Secchi*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abrahamson, E. (2002). Disorganization theory and disorganizational behavior: Towards an etiology of messes. *Research in organizational behavior*, 24, 139-180.
- Abrahamson, E., & Freedman, D. H. (2013). *A perfect mess: The hidden benefits of disorder*. Hachette UK.
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-25.
- Cowley, S. J. & Vallee-Tourangeau, F. (Eds.). (2013). *Cognition beyond the brain. Computation, interactivity and human artifice*. London: Springer.
- Edmonds, B., & Meyer, R. (2015). *Simulating social complexity. A Handbook* Springer, Cham.
- Fioretti, G. (2012). Two measures of organizational flexibility. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 22(5), 957-979.
- Fioretti, G., & Lomi, A. (2010). Passing the buck in the garbage can model of organizational choice. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 16(2), 113-143.
- Gigauri, I. (2020). Influence of Covid-19 Crisis on Human Resource Management and Companies' Response: The Expert Study. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, 6(6), 15-24.
- Herath, D. (2017). Say yes to mess—why companies should embrace disorder. The Conversation, UK
- Herath, D. (2019). *Business plasticity through disorganization*. Bingley, England: Emerald
- Herath, D., Costello, J., & Homberg, F. (2017). Team problem solving and motivation under disorganization—an agent-based modeling approach. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*.
- Herath, D., Secchi, D., & Homberg, F. (2016). The effects of disorganization on goals and problem solving. In *Agent-Based Simulation of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 63-84). Springer, Cham.
- Herath, G. (2019). Studying the Cognitive Elements of Disorganization. In *Business Plasticity Through Disorganization* (pp. 113-116). Emerald Group Publishing.

- 1
2
3 Homberg, F., Secchi, D., & Herath, D. B. (2020). Agent-based modeling as a tool for public
4 management research. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration,*
5 *Management and Policy.* Edward Elgar Publishing.
6
7
8 Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
9
10 Magnani, L. (2007). *Morality in a technological world. Knowledge as a duty.* New York:
11 Cambridge University Press.
12
13 Miller, J. H. & Page, S. E. (2007). *Complex Adaptive Systems. An Introduction to*
14 *Computational Models of Social Life.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
15
16 Myerson, J., Bichard, J. A., & Erlich, A. (2010). *New demographics, new workspace: Office*
17 *design for the changing workforce.* Gower Publishing, Ltd..
18
19
20 Ngoc Su, D., Luc Tra, D., Thi Huynh, H. M., Nguyen, H. H. T., & O'Mahony, B. (2021).
21 Enhancing resilience in the Covid-19 crisis: lessons from human resource
22 management practices in Vietnam. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 1-17.
23
24
25 Raguseo, E., Gastaldi, L., & Neirotti, P. (2016, January). Smart work: Supporting employees'
26 flexibility through ICT, HR practices and office layout. In *Evidence-based HRM: A*
27 *Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship* (Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 240-256). Emerald
28 Group Publishing.
29
30
31 Scott, W. R. (2003). *Organizations. Rational, Natural, and Open Systems* (5th edition ed.).
32 Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
33
34
35 Secchi, D. (2011). *Extendable rationality. Understanding decision making in organizations.*
36 New York: Springer.
37
38
39 Secchi, D. (2017). Guest editorial: Agent-based models of bounded rationality. *Team*
40 *Performance Management,* 23 (1/2), 2–12.
41
42 Secchi, D., & Cowley, S. J. (2020). Cognition in Organisations: What it Is and how it
43 Works. *European Management Review,* forthcoming.
44
45
46 Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60