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The author presents multiple paradigm research into the organisational culture of a birdwatching association, where he conducted his ethnographic research. On top of the functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist and radical humanist paradigms as presented by Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan, he applies the fifth paradigm into the analysis of the organisation. The so-called complexity paradigm, which was formed in 1980’s based on findings about complex systems and networks that emerged in natural and social sciences, summarizes all other paradigms, integrating them into a coherent unit. According to the author, the approach that exploits the benefits of each previously known paradigm illustrates comprehensively the complexity of organisational cultures, whereas the new paradigm upgrades our previous knowledge on organisations.
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1 Introduction

Burrell and Morgan (1979) introduced four paradigms into the organisation theory: functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist and radical humanist. They arranged these into a table presenting the approach based on order, regulation and stability, as opposed to the approach emphasizing radical change, at the same time comparing the subjective approach to the objective one. In the article I shall present each of their paradigms, and then explain how to review an organisation through these four “prisms” – just what Hassard (1991) achieved in the multiple paradigm research. Finally, I shall present the fifth, i.e. complexity paradigm, integrating the aforementioned paradigms into a coherent unit (Figure 1).

To explain how to implement multiple paradigm research including the complexity paradigm, I shall use the example of analysing the Bird Watching and Bird Study Association of Slovenia (DOPPS), where I carried out ethnographic research.
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between 2006 and 2008 within the European project EuMon.\footnote{Full name of the project: EU-Wide Monitoring Methods and Systems of Surveillance for Species and Habitats of Community Interest. Acronym: EuMon. Financing: EU Seventh Framework Programme. Head of project: Dr Klaus Henle, UFZ Leipzig-Halle, Germany. Project webpage: http://eumon.ckff.si/} In the course of research I conducted thirty semi-structured interviews and organised three focus groups (group debates on a topic). I also participated in various actions and bird surveys, thus executing participant observation.

I had chosen this association to perform my ethnographic research due to their relatively long history\footnote{DOPPS was formed three decades ago, which is a long period as compared to other Slovenian nature monitoring associations. However, as compared with e.g. the British Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), boasting a history of more than a hundred years and having more than a million members, it becomes clear that amateur ornithology in Slovenia is yet in its beginner stage.} as well as their familiarity in the Slovenian public, which had partly been achieved by the cooperation between DOPPS and a telecommunication company resulting in resounding advertising campaigns. However, the main cause for studying this association was its complex organisational structure intertwining voluntary efforts and professional work. As well as having approximately 1000 members, DOPPS also employs 19 people. What was once a purely voluntary organisation has thus since mid 1990’s been growing into a (semi-)professional organisation. In my opinion, the complexity of this association can best be presented using multiple paradigm research, as this provides us with the most transparent image of its organisational culture.

## 2 Functionalist paradigm

The functionalist paradigm was predominant in 1970’s and 1980’s. As explained by Burrell and Morgan (1979: 26), it is based on positivism, its formation having been influenced by the sociologists August Comte, Herbert Spencer, Émile Durkheim and Vilfredo Pareto. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985: 460) also consider anthropologists as its founding authors, i.e. Alfred Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski, partly also Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, who all influenced Deal and Kennedy (1982), Peters and Waterman (1982), Ouchi (1993) and Schein (1987, 1992, 1994).

The theories that are considered to be contained in the paradigm emphasize order, stability and balance in organisations, usually being oriented pragmatically towards problem solving. Using this approach, researchers try to discover how best to control people and what is the “right” way of knowing within an organisation. Such a representative is the central organisation theorist, Edgar Schein (1992), who introduced the organisational culture scheme that sets the so-called basic assumptions as the basis for cooperation among the members of an organisation (Figure 2).

According to Schein, the next, shallower layer of organisational culture are values and norms. Values are the principles that the organisation members believe to function well, whereas norms are unwritten rules explaining what is right and what not in various situations. Taking into account the shallowest layer of organisational culture, therefore the easiest to be approached by researchers, artefacts are material manifestations of basic assumptions. To reach the core of organisational culture, we first have to analyse the artefacts, i.e. the most visible cultural elements.

![Figure 2: Threefold model of organisational culture (Schein 1992).](image-url)
### Table 1: Organisational culture artefacts in DOPPS (categories and subcategories prepared according to Hatch, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>art, design, logo</td>
<td>- a bird in the association logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- photographs or drawings of birds in publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>architecture, decoration, furnishing</td>
<td>- functional office furnishings (including the worn-out furniture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- photographs or drawings of birds on walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- “desktops” on computer screens featuring scenes from nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dress, appearance, costume, uniform</td>
<td>- sports clothing (also at workplace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- good and sturdy outdoor clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- clothing often of “natural” colours (green, khaki, brown, grey, sand, light blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>products, equipment, tools</td>
<td>- quality binoculars and telescopes (Swarovski, Leica, Carl Zeiss etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>displays of posters, photos, memora-</td>
<td>- the premises of DOPPS Office feature many posters and photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bilia, cartoons</td>
<td>(e.g. illustrations of completed and planned projects and activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- photographs and drawings featuring scenes from nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>signage</td>
<td>- a panel with the association logo at the entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>jargon, names, nicknames</td>
<td>- members usually call each other by first names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some people have nicknames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explanations, theories</td>
<td>- rationalism, positivism and evolutionism – “each event in nature makes sense and can be explained” (older members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ecologism, holism and connectionism – “we are a part of nature and we are therefore responsible for it” (younger members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stories, myths, legends and their heroes and villains</td>
<td>- field stories (including individual acts of heroism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- “mythologizing” the charismatic founder of the association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>superstition, rumours</td>
<td>- little superstition (pragmatic, down-to-earth thinking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- spreading rumours through informal channels (“mouth-to-mouth”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>humour, jokes</td>
<td>- many jokes related to birds and nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- field anecdotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metaphors, proverbs, slogans</td>
<td>- slogans in cooperation with the main sponsor (e.g. Sharing the sky with birds, A day without birds is like a night without stars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speeches, rhetoric, oratory</td>
<td>- speeches present nature as the central value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- emphasizing commitment to the global community of the like-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>ceremonies, rituals, rites of passage</td>
<td>- field work (practical actions, surveys etc.) as rites of passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- youth ornithological camps as rites of passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- annual assembly as the core formal ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meetings, leisure, parties</td>
<td>- weekly meetings of the professional team (DOPPS Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- regular meetings of members of association regional branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- meetings of the whole association (e.g. annual assembly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- annual informal meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- international meetings of BirdLife International partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication patterns</td>
<td>- informal address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- informal discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- democratic exchange of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditions, customs, social routines</td>
<td>- traditional excursions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- common vegetarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- protective attitude to animals and plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- firstly reserve towards novices, then profound friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- simultaneous execution of various activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gestures</td>
<td>- frequent handshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>play, recreation, games</td>
<td>- recreation as basic activity (surveys, actions etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rewards, punishments</td>
<td>- awards Aviana and Golden Bee-eater (best published work in ornithology)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is notable that even DOPPS members identify with Schein’s threefold model, seemingly without being aware of it. The manager of the association thus mentioned in an editorial of the journal published by the association how their organisational model could be compared to the structure of a tree being composed of “roots (basis), the trunk (contents) and the treetop (appearance)” (Medved, 2009: 3). However, can the culture really be presented by means of such a simple model and described by means of the functionalist approach? Sackmann (1991) declares the latter far from perfect, as there is no clear “instructions” for analysing artefacts, therefore she considers it better when analysing organisations only to focus on the conceptual ingredients of culture. Likewise, Wright (1994) warns that Schein struggles too much to adopt the positivist stance in the slippery area of elusive organisational culture. She therefore considers it more productive to interpret culture rather than “measure” it positivistically, to analyse the organisation’s dynamics rather than “dissect” it statically.

3 Interpretive paradigm

The interpretive paradigm is based on the works by representatives of German idealist tradition of philosophy and sociology, i.e. Immanuel Kant, Wilhelm Dithley, Max Weber, Edmund Husserl and Alfred Schütz (Burrell and Morgan, 1979: 31–32), while the anthropologist to influence it most was Clifford Geertz (1973). Its main representatives seek to understand the world at the level of subjective experience (e.g. Alvesson, 1987; Alvesson and Berg, 1992; Czarniawska-Joerges, 1988, 1992; Pettigrew, 1979; Rosen, 2000; Smircich, 1983), whereas the social reality – if it does exist outside the individual – is hardly anything more than a network of assumptions and common intersubjective meanings (Burrell and Morgan, 1979: 30–31; see also Berger and Luckmann, 1988). Therefore the interpretivists place emphasis on symbols rather than dealing with tangible objects, i.e. artefacts.

To be found within this paradigm is one of the main contemporary organisation theoreticians, Mary Jo Hatch, who explains that organisations are based on common interpretive schemes, which show in the language and other symbolic constructs (Hatch, 1993, 2006). Such schemes and systems of meaning further enable for everyday activities to become self-evident (Smircich, 1983). The importance of symbols within the paradigm is most obvious in the so-called dynamic model of organisational culture, which Hatch (1993) created by upgrading the Schein model by adding the fourth, symbolic level, eventually integrating all the levels in a circular manner. Her model therefore ceases to be static, rather emphasizing the dynamics of the changing culture (Figure 3).³

How could then the symbols in DOPPS be exposed using this approach? The most obvious and noticeable symbolic meaning is that of birds appearing in association publications and other products, such as T-shirts, badges, labels etc. According to the findings of my ethnographic research, birds usually carry positive symbolic connotations, standing for freedom, love and happiness (Atwood Lawrence, 1997). Such symbolic meaning is particularly ascribed to some of the most “charismatic” birds, such as storks, swallows, owls etc., which makes birds in general, as it was explained to me by a prominent member of the association, “winners” in comparison to other, more “dull” taxonomic groups of animals. It is notable that some members of the association also identify with seemingly boring birds, such as the tawny Corn Crake, resembling the more familiar Quail. This seemingly unremarkable bird is ascribed particular value in conceptual notions of the members of the association based on the environmental projects implemented by the association – i.e. based on the efforts

³ Hatch also focused on the processes (manifestation, realisation, symbolisation and interpretation) that run between various levels of organisational culture.

![Figure 3: Dynamic model of organisational culture (Hatch, 1993).](image-url)
that have been made to preserve corncrake and its habitats, as
the number of birds had been found to decrease greatly due to
developments in agriculture and pasture management (Božič
et al., 2007). Its protection has been particularly intense since
2004, when project funds were acquired from the European
Union. Since then, the pastures where Corn Crakes breed have
been managed in several areas, numerous educational activities
have been prepared and a small natural reserve featuring the
so-called Corn Crake natural trail has been arranged. Corn
Crake was thus made the DOPPS bird, which is used on covers
of many publications. The artefact was thus transformed into
a symbol of the association’s view of the world and nature,
particularly emphasizing the harmony of humans and other
living creatures.

Other artefacts that I recorded during my research can also be “exposed” as symbols. The modest and functional
furnishings of the premises as well as sturdy clothing illus-
strate the non-hierarchical nature of the organisation and the
egalitarianism of its members who are (supposedly) equal, at
the same time showing an altruist attitude towards nature and
the environment. Yet even in the community of bird watchers,
symbols of prestige can be found. However, it is not expen-
sive four-wheel drives, which would defy the philosophy of
harmony with nature. Envious glances are rather triggered by
prestige brands of telescopes and binoculars.

During ethnographic research of organisational culture, the
interpretive paradigm can also be applied to try and trace
a hint of organisational culture in each symbol and set of
concepts. While doing so, we can imagine metaphorically to
be fitting the pieces of a broken hologram, as we try to see
the whole picture in each artefact (cf. Morgan, 1986). But this
approach soon makes us realise that there is always a piece of
“hologram” missing, while the image of uniform culture – if
indeed it does exist – is never perfectly clear.

4 Radical structuralist paradigm

As explained by Parker (2000), the smallest share of research
in organisations has been made using the approach of radical
structuralist paradigm4, the formation of which was particu-
larly influenced by Karl Marx, its development also having
been affected by Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Ilich Lenin and
Nikolai Bukharin, and later Louis Althusser. According to this
paradigm, the organisation mainly transforms under the infl-
fluence of the social context, its representatives stressing that
radical change and conflict are “built” in the society (Burrell
and Morgan, 1979: 24).

DOPPS can also be looked at from this viewpoint. In its
early period, which lasted almost two decades, the association
was marked by the informal and non-hierarchical cooperation
of members. At the time the association recorded a great rise
in the number of members; in mid 1980’s there were around
250, and at the turn of the millennium almost a thousand and
then the growth stopped. In late 1980’s and in 1990’, the orga-
nisational structure of DOPPS formalized and two branches
formed in the organisation having distinct views of its mis-
tion. The group of young members emphasized environmental
campaigns and professionalisation of activities, whereas older
members supported preservation of “original” activities of
DOPPS, i.e. bird watching and ringing as well as preservation
of the voluntary approach.

The situation grew tenser until the shift in 1999, which
was described by some members as the “revolution” that trans-
formed the organisation. The main founder of DOPPS and
charismatic informal leader was dismissed as the editor-in-
chief of the association’s journal, which resulted in his with-
drawal from the association and cessation of any contact with
the organisation. The changes that followed his leave were not
at all surprising, as many events had indicated a possible break
with the traditional values and manner of operation. Already
in the early 1990’s, DOPPS began approaching the interna-
tional association of ornithological organisations BirdLife
International, and in mid 1990’s they acquired an important
sponsor – a telecommunication company. Both novelties hin-
ted at a new orientation towards environmentalism and more
professionalized operation. Such changes can also be related
to the transformation from socialism to capitalism, which influ-
enced the voluntary ornithology (Bell et al., 2011). The new
circumstances demanded a new way of acting and thinking
as amateur bird watching and studying could not support the
preservation and development of the organisation. It thus had
to transform radically from a voluntary into a (semi-) profes-
sional organisation and move to a new level of organisational
culture (Podjed and Muršič, 2008).

5 Radical humanist paradigm

Radical humanist or postmodern paradigm (Parker, 2000; see
also Boje, 1991, 1995, 2008; Clegg, 1990), which was most
affected by the central postmodernist theoreticians Michel
Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard and Jean
Baudrillard, also explains conflicts in organisations as gene-

erative and not problematic as functionalists or interpretivists
would say. According to Parker (2000), one of its main repre-
sentatives in studying organisations, postmodern theories
of organisations are actually “anti-organisational” as they
emphasize internal divisions instead of looking for integrity
and consensus, at the same time describing the organisational
culture as a constant struggle for prevalence between different
fractions and coalitions, all trying to define the common aims
in their own way (see Batteau, 2000; Parker, 1995). Parker’s
approach particularly emphasizes the split of a single organi-
sational culture into several sub-cultures, which are further

4 Burrell and Morgan (1979) state Beynon’s (1973) and Clegg’s (1975) monographs as representative works.
5 The terminology in the field is quite unclear. The notions amateur and volunteer are often interchanged, and so are the professional and expert
(see Ellis and Waterton 2004, 2005; Podjed and Muršič 2008).
spread fractally into “sub-subcultures” and “sub-sub-subcultures” (cf. Strathern, 2008).

And how is DOPPS segregated? I first noticed the split between the professionals and volunteers or amateurs. Those employed are often seen by others as “more equal”, being paid for the job that some perform free of charge. The second split separates the experts or specialists from the beginners. Some members are extremely skilled in recognizing birds and in biology in general, whereas some don’t know much about birds, but they like to spend time in nature and enjoy the company of like-minded. The only problem is that the experts and the beginners often have to cooperate, e.g. in surveys, which poses the question whether the surveyors with “better” knowledge can trust the beginners and the results of their work. The third is the generation gap and it was the differences between the two generations, i.e. the older one that formed the association and the younger one that joined later, that led to the aforementioned “revolution”. In the years following the change, a new situation appeared in the association: the youngest members, i.e. the representatives of DOPPS third generation often appear as a homogeneous group fighting the principles of the current older or former younger generation. The fourth split is based on where the members come from, the most notable difference being the one between the centre and the periphery. In the focus group that I organised in one of the regional branches, the members for example complained about the association being centralised as all the information gathered in Ljubljana and only limited knowledge about the happenings at the association reached them. Yet one of the employees explained that the centre was also aware that the representatives of this branch considered “stupid everything said or done in Ljubljana.”

It is obvious that the organisational culture in DOPPS is not uniform as representatives of functionalist or interpretive paradigm might assume, but split at several layers. Each member of the association is positioned into “subgroups” defined in relation to other “subgroups” that all try to prevail over the others based on their ideas about how the organisation should work. Such struggles are not necessarily counterproductive as they stimulate the organisation to transform and adapt to members’ needs and environmental demands. Although the members seemingly pull each into their own direction, there are shifts going on in the organisation all the time, while conflicts prompt new ideas and test possibilities for further development of the organisation.

6 Complexity paradigm

It is my belief that apart from the aforementioned four paradigms as stated by Burrell and Morgan (1979), there is the fifth paradigm of organisational culture. It contains the features of all the paradigms mentioned and, being neither objectivist nor subjectivist it integrates them. From the viewpoint of radicalism or regularity it can be positioned neither to the left nor the right side of the table illustrating the layout or paradigms (Figure 1). The “entrance” of the fifth paradigm that I call the complexity paradigm into social sciences was first described explicitly by Urry (2003), as he wrote of the so-called “complexity turn”. The paradigm doesn’t (only) originate in sociology, anthropology, psychology, philosophy and economy like the other four, it is also based on findings in natural sciences. That is to say, it is grounded in the theories of chaos, complexity, complex adaptive systems, self-organisation, synergetics and autopoiesis (see e.g. Ashby, 1962; Haken, 1983, 1994; Kauffman, 1995; Maturana and Varela, 1998; Nicolas and Prigogine, 1977; Prigogine and Stengers, 1984; Waldrop, 1992), which flourished in 1980’s and are largely based on system theory and cybernetics (see e.g. Bateson, 1987; Bertalanffy, 1968; Luhmann, 2001; Wiener, 1948). What is common to the researchers of complexity is their attempts in using their holistic, connectionist or ecological approach, however we call it, to establish a new perspective for understanding the systems, be it natural or social, and use this perspective to consider them not a sum of isolated objects but a system of mutually related phenomena (Capra, 1997). Thus the theories of complexity are not only analogies or metaphors that can be used in social sciences (Morgan, 1986), as they provide the conceptual framework for a different view of the world (Mitton-Kelly, 2003).

The formation of a new paradigm was also influenced by network analysis, which was mostly designed by mathematicians. Its originators were Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi who studied the so-called random graphs (Erdős and Rényi, 1959), and their work was continued by Steven H. Strogatz and Duncan J. Watts, who particularly dealt with the small world model (Watts, 2004; Watts and Strogatz, 1998), as well as Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert, who unveil the secrets of the scale-free networks (Albert, Jeong and Barabási, 2000; Barabási, 2003). When it comes to contemporary social scientists, the transition into the so-called network society was studied in much detail by Manuel Castells (1996) who describes the networks as dynamic open structures, whereas the importance of networks in social research was discussed earlier by many sociologists and anthropologists (Boissevain and Mitchell, 1973; Granovetter, 1973; Mitchell, 1969, 1974; Radcliffe-Brown, 1940; Wolfe, 1978).

What is the essence of the complexity paradigm? This question can be answered in a simplified way by explaining the etymology of the word complexity. It derives from the Latin verb complexus, which stands for knit, weave, or from the noun complexus, meaning a network or web (Capra, 2003: 236; Mitton-Kelly, 2003: 26). The seemingly inexplicable behaviour in complex systems that exceeds the sum of individual component parts originates in mutual connections between elements and their connections to the environment. In case of social systems, the complexity is further influenced by the fact that people, as opposed to elementary particles studied by physicists and chemists, have free will, which means that they can use their actions to affect intentionally other individuals and the entire system. An individual can thus (co)decide how the system develops and transforms, and help weave new patterns of relationships between people (Mitton-Kelly, 2003: 34). This is the reason why the so-called butterfly effect is so much more explicit in social systems as small changes can induce consequences of gigantic extent (Capra, 1997: 132–134).
Complex social systems cannot be studied as if being isolated from the environment, as they always remain open and intertwined rhismatically with other systems (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1990). There are connection being made not only between individuals, they also intertwine the technology, symbols, conceptual systems etc. (Latour, 2005; Urry, 2003), therefore such systems can considered multi-layered and multi-dimensional networks of relations between people and other living creatures and objects. The dimensions and contents so intertwined are more than a sum of components, as the behaviour of the system transcends the ingredients that make it up (Urry, 2003: 13). The complexity perspective therefore exceeds reductionism and attempts at explaining the whole as the sum of its component parts. Therefore organisations cannot simply be “dismantled” into individuals and then analysed, but always considered units or organisations of “higher order” (cf. Maturana in Varela, 1998).

The dividing line between the system and the environment being blurred, the system creates and transforms the environment, at the same time transforming itself. Is therefore the society like the “invisible hand” (cf. Smith, 1991) that directs the lives and operations of individuals, something that doesn’t exist, but only serves as a “virtual reality, a cosa mentale, a hypostasis, a fiction” (Latour, 2005: 163)? This is what Latour (2005) tries to persuade us, and likewise is claimed by Giddens (1979, 2003) who mentions structuration, which is supposed to exceed the dichotomy between agency and structure and between the micro and macro perspective, as well as Urry (2003), ensuring us there is no difference between the structure and the process, between stability and changes, between the system and its environment. There are other researchers claiming the same (e.g. Byrne, 1998; Waldrop, 1992), having created in the past decades a new paradigm that exceeds the dividing line between social and natural sciences. This paradigm is increasingly useful and being used both in anthropology (see e.g. Cohen, 1995; Lansing, 2003, 2006; Mosko and Damon, 2005; cf. also Hannzer, 1992) as well as in organisation theory (see e.g. Anderson, 1999; Czarniawska-Joerges, 1992; Frank and Fahrbach, 1999; MacIntosh and MacLean, 1999; MacIntosh et al., 2006; Marion, 1999; Mitleton-Kelly, 2003; Morel and Ramanujam, 1999; Stacey, 1996; Styhre, 2002; also see Hatch, 2006: 330–332).

7 Organisation as a complex system

The starting point for my analysis of DOPPS from the perspective of complexity paradigm will be the ten features of complex systems according to Cilliers (1998: 2–7), which will be compared to my findings about the association (“the system”) and its members (“elements”). I shall thus prove DOPPS to be a complex system and at the same time show how general features of such a system apply with general definitions that apply to both natural and social systems.

The first feature of complex systems is a great number of their component elements. If the elements are few, the system can be described (i.e. mathematically using the system of differential equations). However, if it has many elements, we cannot describe the system or predict its development. The association integrates around a thousand members, interrelated in various ways. Considering this, the system is complex and unpredictable, but not chaotic.

The second feature of such systems is dynamics. To construct a complex system, the elements have to cooperate to establish new configurations, which in turn changes the system. Similarly, the association members show dynamism in activities within the association, while they also participate in information flow and exchange as well as establishing new contacts. An individual with no connections and interactions, and no information link to the network turns into an insignificant factor in the system – i.e. fails to be a part of it.

The third feature is a high level of interactions as each element in the system affects several other elements. The level of interactions in the association is also high – each individual cooperates with several members – and growing over the years, which is partly due to the growing number of members, but particularly thanks to new media of communication, such as e-mail, webpages and easily accessible publications. Considering this the complexity of the system has been on the increase.

The fourth feature is nonlinearity, which depends on asymmetrical relations between elements. Those having more connections thus have a greater “influence” and greater “power” to change the system. This feature enables minor reasons to cause great consequence (the so-called butterfly effect). In the association, the relations among individuals are also asymmetrical as the “elements” connect among themselves in various ways, some being more influential than the others. Of key importance in case of changes are the most influential individuals (in the network theory vocabulary referred to as nodes) who can easily direct the activities of a network or a system thanks to their numerous connections.

The fifth feature of complex systems is short reach of interactions as information is mainly transferred among close (“neighbouring”) elements, and only reaches the elements furthest away through numerous “mediators”. At first sight this is not the case in social systems, such as the association, as an individual can also be influenced by a person over a great distance. However, in my opinion the spatial proximity can be replaced by the social or habitual proximity (cf. Podjed, 2010). Therefore in social complex systems “vicinity” does not stand for two people (“elements” in the system) being physically close, as they can be close only in the manner of thinking or based on past cooperation, thus influencing each other.

The sixth feature is the appearance of feedback loops transforming the system. Each activity can thus be strengthened by means of positive loops or weakened by negative ones. Likewise it is possible to observe the flow of information (e.g. rumours) in the association, which is transmitted among people and either strengthened or weakened before returning to the original “author”, whom it reaches changed and reinterpreted.

The seventh feature is the openness of complex systems, which refers to their constant interaction with the environment. It is therefore difficult to set its boundaries, rather, they are arbitrary and defined by the observer, which actually makes the environment part of the system. In the case of the association it is also impossible to define who is inside the sys-
tem and who isn’t. This is because the association cooperates with several other organisations and many of its members are simultaneously members of similar non-governmental organisations as well as institutions and companies. Furthermore, the organisation is part of a greater international organisation, i.e. the BirdLife International partnership. It is therefore impossible to define precisely where the organisation begins or ends.

The eighth feature is the operation of complex systems under the circumstances that are far from balanced. This comprises the “flow” of elements leaving the system and of new elements joining it – just like in a whirlpool that only retains its shape when water is flowing through it. Balance, stability and symmetry in this case mean that the system is no longer dynamic and therefore ceases to exist. I noticed something similar when analysing the organisation’s history. The association was formed in late 1970’s and has since retained its original form, activity and aims, with members “flowing” through as they joined or left various activities within the association, at the same time bringing new ideas into the organisation. From this perspective, the association has closed organisation as it retains its original “form” and mission, at the same time having an open structure, meaning that its “elements” interchange constantly (cf. Maturana and Varela, 1998).

The ninth feature of complex systems is being influenced by history. Thus events from the past “change” the present and the future of the system. According to Cilliers (1998), each system analysis that fails to consider the dimension of time is imperfect and only an “illustration” of the diachronic process. Similarly, we can only get to know and understand the association if we learn about its past (history), which has been co-created by its members. We thus learn that seemingly insignificant events from the past can transform the association radically.

The tenth feature of complex systems is the fact that its individual elements don’t possess information on the entire system. If any element “knew” what was happening to all the other elements, it would have to contain the complexity of the whole system – which is naturally impossible. In case of social complex systems it often seems that some individuals (“elements”) – such as leaders – know about all the activities within the organisations. Of course this is not the case, therefore an integral image of complexity of the association cannot be acquired from individuals (only), e.g. through interviews, but only as an integral insight.

8 Conclusion and discussion

I have showed in the article how organisational culture can be looked at from the perspective of different paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist, radical humanist and that of complexity. In this respect, the complexity paradigm functions as the binder for contrasting views, not denying other paradigms, but upgrading and explaining them. When contrasted to the functionalist paradigm, it functions like Einstein’s to Newton’s physics, as both can explain the same phenomena on different levels. The complexity paradigm also relies on empirical proofs and tries to explain how an organisation functions, yet it states further that happenings in organisational cultures are not predictable, foreseeable or manageable, but rather dynamic, complex and mostly unpredictable. However, this does not mean that an individual – say the head of organisation – cannot direct the course of events through his action. Quite the contrary: active participation of any individual can influence the future of a complex dynamic system.

The complexity paradigm also employs the holism or integrity as advocated by the representatives of the interpretive paradigm. From this perspective, each member of organisation (and each artefact produced by the organisation) is an important component part of organisation, interpreting and transforming the whole. The organisation thus changes as well, and in turn the organisation changes the individual.

The radical changes of late 1990’s can partly be explained using Hegelian and Marxist theories of conflicting approaches or views of the world (thesis and antithesis) causing the crucial break and the formation of a new social form (synthesis). However, from the perspective of complex systems we can particularly pay attention to the effect of positive feedback loops, which in the crucial moment overrule the “self-regulating” negative feedback loops (Capra, 1997: 56–64). Positive loops thus lead to radical changes or bifurcations and to a sudden emergence of new forms of order (Capra, 1997: 186). Such dialectical changes can also be looked at from the viewpoint of networks. If DOPPS is to be considered a complex network, in which some nodes are more networked (meaning more influential), it becomes clear why and how the transformation of 1999 occurred. It was then that the founder, i.e. the central node of the network and the informal leader, left the association in protest. His resignation provided an opportunity for a practically sudden establishment of new centres of power and new relations between members as well as new organisational culture.

The radical humanist or postmodern paradigm can also be replaced by the complexity paradigm. If an organisation is to be considered a dynamic complex network and its culture primarily a process rather than a state, internal struggles, oppositions, fractures, divides etc. become clearer. Particular parts of a multidimensional cultural system can also self-define, which enables the emergence of subcultures becoming further fractionally divided into sub-subcultures and merging vertically into supercultures. Actually the advocates of the radical humanist paradigm also support the change of perspective from hierarchical organisations to more egalitarian, non-hierarchical networks saying that “organisational life is more indeterminate, more differentiated, more chaotic, than it is simple, systematic, monological, and hierarchical” (Boje, 1995: 1001).

The complexity paradigm provides an important advantage by rejecting the objectivity of the researcher, thus the importance of their participation is not relativised. According to the Cartesian paradigm, scientific descriptions are believed to be objective, thus independent from the observer and the cognitive process. However, the new paradigm explains that epistemology should be included in phenomena explicitly. Such consideration comprises the “shift from objective to epistemic” science; to a framework in which epistemology – “the method of questioning” – becomes an integral part of scientific theories” (Capra, 1997: 40). On the one hand this means that the observer is part of the system he examines, thus influen-
curing through his actions the phenomena examined; but on the other hand the observer defines the object of his research, thus setting the boundaries of the system examined.
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Večparadigmatska raziskava organizacijske kulture: Predstavitev kompleksnostne paradigme

Avtor predstavi večparadigmatsko raziskavo organizacijske kulture v slovenskem ornitološkem društvu, kjer je od leta 2006 do 2008 izvajal etnografsko raziskavo. Poleg funkcionalistične, interpretivistične, radikalno-strukturniistične in radikalno-humanistične paradigme, ki sta jih predstavila Gibson Burrell in Gareth Morgan, uvede pri analizi te organizacije še peto, kompleksnostno paradigma, ki se je na podlagi naravoslovnih in družboslovnih odkritij o kompleksnih sistemih in omrežjih oblikovala v osemdesetih letih 20. stoletja in povzema vse ostale paradigmte ter jih povezuje v celoto. Avtor trdi, da lahko s takšnim pristopom, pri katerem izrabimo prednosti vsake od štirih doslej znanih paradigm, celovito prikažemo kompleksnost organizacijskih kultur, s kompleksnostno paradigmo pa nadgradimo dosedanje vedenje o organizacijah.

Ključne besede: antropologija, organizacijska kultura, večparadigmatska raziskava, kompleksnostna paradigma, ornitološko društvo