Postlog: Bringing Performance Back In

by
David M. Boje
Loyola Marymount University, USA

Introduction

One afternoon in February, 1976, Lou Pondy called me to his office and invited me to write a couple of sections for a paper he was revising titled, "Bringing Mind Back In". Needless to say, as a new doctoral student, I was honored. I wrote twenty pages, and then Lou took out scissors and tape and proceeded to cut out part of a phrase here and a paragraph there. After a roll of tape and many snips later, only five pages of usable material remained. To me, it was like watching a diamond cutter take a very crude stone, and with a few strokes of his mallet and chisel, break out the most magnificent diamond. There was passionate vitality, intense energy, and precision in his performance that day. In fact, on many occasions Lou was a master performer. I would like to continue my dialogue with Lou by expanding our original three-paradigm model of organization theory to include a fourth paradigm, which I call "social performance".

The Three Paradigms

In "Bringing Mind Back In" (1980), we described three paradigms first suggested by Ritzer (1975): the "social facts" paradigm, the "social behavior" paradigm, and the "social definition" paradigm.

A paradigm is characterized by its exemplars, theories, methods, and instruments and is "the broadest unit of consensus" within a scientific sub-community. Advocates put forth their paradigm as the best interpretation of organized behavior. Two of the paradigms, social facts and social behavior, rely on "etic" approaches to theorizing. In an etic approach, the researcher or consultant imposes outsider categories. In an emic approach, we pay attention to categories-in-use, the language and concepts of the insiders (Price-Williams, 1974). An "emic" approach is central to the third paradigm, social definition. The focus is on the grounded, lay categories, that people use to order their own experience. Lay categories can come from consultant's jargon. He is a "hard driver". "The etic system of the researchers, such as 'concern for task' versus 'concern for people' is becoming the emic system of managers as they undergo graduate and other training programs" and consultant interventions (Boje and Ulrich, 1985, p. 307). The three paradigms are briefly capsulized below with some extensions made for organization change. See Table I for a summary.

Social factists explain behavior as the result of macroscopic institutions. The social facts paradigm, an etic approach, is favored by organization sociologists, although not all sociologists are adherents. They reify collective and institutional characteristics (groups, classes, roles, norms) as though they were objective and material entities to be described and measured. Etic concepts like system, authority, boundary-spanning, and power are studied using questionnaires and structured-interviews. Change is the result of unseen large system and environmental forces, not interventions by change agents. Interventions such as system analysis, sociotechnical variance analysis, and data collection feedback are associated with this paradigm.

Social behaviorists seek to explain individual behavior as externally controlled by etic constructs such as contingencies of reinforcement and numerous other stimuli. The social behavior paradigm tends to outcrop more among industrial and organizational psychologists. While behaviorists use all the methodologies, the favored method is the controlled experimental laboratory. The locus of change is internal, but people can be taught new tricks if the right feedback and reward mechanisms are in place. I think training exercises in group processes, behavior modification, and other communication skills workshops fit here.

Social definitionists, according to Ritzer, treat man as "an active creator of his own social reality". These investigators do not assign a status of objective materiality to social facts. The way in which people come to define their situation is the focus of interest. Questionnaires and structured interviews are too static to capture meaning-shaping processes. *In situ* observation and immersion, including field ethnography, semiotics, and ethnomethodology are preferred methods. The challenge is to become part of the social scene and look at life from the insider's point of view. I think of T-groups, confrontation meetings, imaging, and non-directed learning approaches to change as aligned with social definition.

The point of our original article was not to stereotype researchers, consultants, or change strategies; it was to encourage bridge-building among the three paradigms. Action theory, for example, was viewed as one such bridge.

> Instead of taking the purely behavioral perspective that behavior is the result of contingencies of reinforcement, or the social-factists' approach that it is determined by norms, values, structures, and other macroscopic variables, action theory builds in an intermediate stage. This intermediate stage is the meaning that an actor assigns to his enacted surroundings and to the expected outcomes of his actions. The actor interprets his/her reality and acts upon that interpretation. In this process, the individual is free to select alternative meanings of a situation (p. 89).

From such a bridge, the categories of meaning emerge from the people's own lay logic and *in situ* definition of their own reality. Bridging paradigms would result in our taking a serious look at how people "make sense" of their lived experience. Then, that sense can be related to *a priori* researcher and consultant-defined concepts. Interventions can begin with how people are making sense of their situation; workshops can manipulate context to try out new behaviors, and surveys can be grounded in the people's language.

	Social Facts Paradigm	Social Behavior Paradigm	Social Definition Paradigm
View of the Subject	Social structure institutions as reified behavior	Reinforcement contingencies as external controls on behavior	Conscious experience giving meaning to behavior
Exemplars	Lawrence and Lorsch, Richard Hall, Perrow, Etzioni, Evan, Pugh and the Aston School, James Thompson, Aldrich, Meyer, Aiken and Hage, Woodward, Duncan etc.	B.F. Skinner, Vroom, Lawler, Porter, Likert, Fiedler, Hulin, Hackman, etc. and many more	Some of Weber, parts of March and Simon, Silverman, Weick, Pondy as well as Mitroff, Frost, and many others
Theory	Systems conflict Functionalism Contingency organization sets Interorganization relations	Operant conditioning Job design Motivation theories like expectancy and equity Productivity and turnover	Phenomenology Sensemaking Symbolic interactionism Action theory Social construction of reality
Research Method	Structured interviews and questionnaires	Lab experiments	Open-ended interviews Passive observation
Change Strategy	Survey feedback System analysis Sociotechnology	Behavior modification Group process Communication workshops	T-groups Imaging Confrontation meetings

Table I.
Summary of Three
Organization Behavior
Paradigms

Lou Pondy and I asserted, in the late 1970s, that the social definition paradigm, struggling for parity with the two etic paradigms, is still valid today. However, the organization symbolism division of the Academy of Management and the European Working Group on Organizational Symbolism does give the paradigm two identifiable subcommunities. Social definition is becoming less of a frontier paradigm today. Gazing at the frontier, I see a new paradigm, a new direction for inquiry. It is a paradigm that arises from some bridge-building.

In 1983 Michael Jones, Bruce Giuliano and I attempted to bridge our respected paradigms by convening an "Organizational Folklore Conference" in which we brought together folklorists interested in performance with organization scholars

interested in symbolism[1]. We communicated concepts, analytic frameworks, and current findings in order to promote cross-paradigm research. A book edited by Jones *et al* (1988) picked up on themes from this conference.

Social Performance: A Fourth Paradigm

I see a new paradigm emerging. It is closely aligned with social definition because both are closely linked to the social construction of reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). However, there are some essential differences. Social definition is more phenomenological, bringing the mind of the interpreter back into the stimulus-response equation. Social performance, on the other hand, deals much more with the games, plots, rituals, and scripted performances of people in organizations.

In the social performance paradigm, the view of the subject is that the performance of behavior conveys meaning. Leadership, as well as organization change, is accomplished in performance. Fundamental exemplars of the social performance paradigm include Berne (1964), Bateson (1972), Goffman (1974), Garfinkel (1967), Wittgenstein (1967), Hall (1977), and Eckblad (1981). The frame "this is performance" demarks a subtle boundary between the performer and the audience and involves them both in a game with rules for the conduct of the performance.

The shift from a more social fact to a social behavior paradigm, and recently to a more social performance paradigm, is occurring in the field of folklore. Folklore had, before the days of Richard Dorson (1961), been preoccupied with stories, songs, and crafts as objectified social facts that disperse across geography. For example, the problem was to account for multiple versions of more traditional folktales such as *Cinderella* and *Tar Baby*. Occupational folklore (Byington, 1978; McCarl, 1976) grew out of this tradition by looking at folk songs, folk dances, folk art, and folk tales of occupational groups ranging from railroaders to lumberjacks, and from sailors, miners, and cowboys to firefighters. Folklorists, like Michael Jones (1981) and Robert Georges (1969; 1980a; 1980b; 1981) have begun to reframe one of my interests, "story research", from a social facts view of stories-as-texts to a more social performance view.

> In attempting to account for the seeming variation among human beings, folklorists and other scholars have not only generated a large number and variety of alternatives but have also shifted the focus of their investigations away from the *stories* people tell and toward the way individuals *behave* when they assume the contrasting, but complementary, communicative roles of narrator and auditor (Georges, 1980a, p. 323).

Stories are not fixed in form. They are determined by behaviors of people whose interactive performances create a communication event distinguishable as storytelling.

> Storytelling is never a single-person dominated, unidirectional act, as conventional communication models imply, but rather that it is an event whose nature and significance are determined by the behavior of all those who participate...The phenomenon which we conceive to be the "message" of the communicative act and identify as a story, then, has no existence "in and of itself" but rather is integral to, and inseparable from, the event during which it is generated (pp. 323-4).

84

Stories from a social fact paradigm were objects being passed more or less accurately from one subcommunity to the next. Stories from a social behavior paradigm were co-determined by the behaviors of tellers and hearers. Now, stories are being investigated as linguistic and social performances. New questions arise. Besides storytelling, what other occasions involve performance? How do people develop performance competencies? What are the consequences of the various qualities of performance? How are performances designed and changed? What are the various forms of performance throughout an organization?

There are several types of performances relevant to organization research. First, there are work performances, the kinds of performance programs described by March and Simon (1958). Performance programs are the series of steps in a production or administrative process that enact transformations and are susceptible to the kinds of variance analyses we find in socio-technical systems projects. Second, there are the informal games as described in Roy's (1959) "Banana Time", which provided players with informal distractions to punctuate the performance programs. Third, there is a class of performances called language games, as described in Lou Pondy's (1978) work. Fourth, we can look at storytelling as a form of social performance. Fifth, there are rituals for initiating new employees, launching this year's budget, replacing a CEO, etc. Finally, there are performances which Eric Berne (1964) calls scripts. Scripts are recurring transactions with a plot that yields a payoff to those involved.

Performance Programs
One of my favorite folklore studies was done by Michael Bell (1976). He did a performance analysis of two black barmaids named Harriet and Sarah. Their artistic performances organized and controlled the social order within the bar. These artistic performances, like March and Simon's (1958) performance programs, are stored, repeatable routines enacted by organizational participants. At a basic level, the task of installing a computer chip is a performance program[2]. At a more complex level, the performances of Harriet and Sarah socially construct a frame that channels patron behavior. Harriet and Sarah's performance styles differed. One performance maintained the frame of the social interaction, while the other was more intrusive and mingled into the flow of organization life to achieve social control. Harriet's social performance, for example, focused on maintenance of the framework.

> Most of the customers who come here during the day are looking to bullshit with someone. They aren't out to party like no young boys. If I can get something happenin', they'll play with it an' keep it going. Now, with this group here, I've got a head start. Most of these people know each other so I can use them at each other to get some action (p. 99).

While Harriet generated a frame supportive to "talking bullshit", Sarah saw her performance as keeping the energy from getting out of hand by preserving the frame the patrons had themselves enacted.

> The people who come here at night don't need me to tell them to party. They wouldn't be here less that was a part of their program. Nah, my problem is slowing their role (p. 102).

Sarah's *laissez-faire* performances enacted control more subtly. Harriet's performances were more dramatic in order to get things happening. She sought to draw people into her performance.

> Charlie sat up at the bar and ordered a drink. Harriet poured it and said: "That'll be ninety-five cents". Charlie turned to Tookie Brooks, a regular, and said: "Took, did you hear that? My bar, my whiskey, and she wants me to pay for my drink". Harriet cut in: "Charliee, I don't wanna rap. Just pay me my money, you sucker". "You watch your mouth, Harriet, or I'll hafta take you to the back booths for a lesson", continued Charlie. Harriet said again, "Just give me my money — you be here at the end of the day wantin' to know how many free drinks of your whiskey did I give away. Well you ain't gonna be one of them. Now pay up". They continued for fifteen minutes during which the assembled patrons followed the encounter closely. At its conclusion, one remarked: "That Harriet. Watchin' her give it to Charlie's worth the price of these drinks" (p. 106).

Informal Games

When I think of performance games, I think of Roy's (1959) classic informal game, "Banana Time", one way he chronicled to fight boredom and fatigue on an assembly line.

> Banana time followed peach time by approximately one hour. Sammy again provided the refreshments, namely, one banana. There was, however, no four-way sharing of Sammy's banana. Ike would gulp it down by himself after surreptitiously extracting it from Sammy's lunch box, kept on a shelf behind Sammy's work station. Each morning, after making the snatch, Ike would call out, "Banana time!" and proceed to down his prize while Sammy made futile protests and denunciations. George would join in with mild remonstrances, sometimes scolding Sammy for making so much fuss. The banana was one which Sammy brought for his own consumption at lunch time; he never did get to eat his banana, but kept bringing one for his lunch. At first this daily theft startled and amazed me. Then I grew to look forward to the daily seizure and the verbal interaction which followed (p. 162).

Banana time was one of several interplay performances with a standard plot and character roles that were repeated each day to reduce monotony and maintain a sense of camaraderie. These performances have initiator, by-stander, and victim roles. The game also has status frame regarding who can say or do what to whom and get away with it. The role of the consultant may be to diagnose the everyday informal gaming behavior of co-workers and management teams. Berne (1964) has cataloged a myriad of additional games people play.

Language Games

In 1978, Lou Pondy wrote a pivotal article which asked us to think about the implications if we were to think of leadership as a multiplicity of language games. The process of changing the meaning of a word, a sentence, or a story, by its particular usage in everyday life is what Wittgenstein (1967) has called a "language game". The meaning of an utterance is its social convention in the context of a move in a particular language game. Wittgenstein's language games are studies in the use of depth grammar as opposed to surface grammar. The significance of an act of leadership (surface grammar) comes from knowing the story (depth grammar).

> 663. If I say "I meant him" very likely a picture comes to my mind, perhaps of how I looked at him, etc.; but the picture is only like an illustration to a story. From it alone it would mostly be impossible to conclude anything at all; only when one knows the story does one know the significance of the picture (p. 168e).

Sociolinguists focus on "context" by analyzing how conversation happens, and in a few studies, how stories are told; that is, how people introduce stories; how they extend and interrupt stories; and, in general, how stories are contexted within conversational interactions. Harvey Sacks (1972a,b,c) and his followers (Sacks *et al.*, 1974; Jefferson, 1973, 1978; Ryave, 1978) have investigated the contexted occurrence of stories in ongoing conversations.

To a greater or lesser extent we are consciously aware that we are playing language games. Leaders like teachers, comedians, and judges are performers with an audience. It was said of General Douglas MacArthur, for example, that he gave a "real performance" for his audience.

> Crooking his leg over an arm of his chair, he would begin the overture softly, pausing to relight his pipe from time to time and shaking a box of matches for emphasis. Then springing up, he would begin his pacing, gesticulating with a sweeping arm or stabbing the air with his forefinger for emphasis. "His vocabulary", a journalist wrote, "ranged from double-barreled phrases to surprisingly blunt idiom". His voice would be low and guttural one moment; high, thin and dramatic the next. In a few sentences he could pass from serenity to amusement to trembling excitement (Manchester, 1978, p. 566).

The significance for us is twofold. First, if we relate Pondy's advice to organization change, then we can think of OD as a multiplicity of language games. Consultants engage in verbal performances with clients, who enact their own verbal performances. The interaction of these verbal performances constitutes moves in the language game. Second, if we take a sub-class of communication, the story performance, we can examine how the consultant's and client's communication of story meanings is established through a mastery of the "context" of story performance (Boje, 1989).

Storytelling
Storytelling is how organizational participants make sense of and influence their unfolding experience. War stories are used by both client and consultant to legitimize the continuance of techniques that worked well in the past (Boje *et al.*, 1982). Consultants disseminate a repertoire of stories to challenge the client's precedent repertoire of stories and present blueprints for alternative futures. True stories about such interventions attain a mythic quality. Wilkins (1984) instructs managers to use positive stories of their personal behavior and human resource system to create strong company cultures. Peters and Austin (1985) encourage leaders to engage in dramatic performances that induce story sharing. For example:

> Remember Ray Kroc's visit to a McDonald's franchise in Winnipeg? He finds a single fly. Even one fly doesn't fit with Q S C and V (Quality, Service, Cleanliness and Value). Two weeks later the Winnipeg franchisee loses his franchise. You'd better believe that after this story made the rounds a whole lot of McDonald's people found nearly mystical ways to eliminate flies — every fly — from their shops. Is the story apocryphal? It doesn't matter. Mr Kroc did do things like that (p. 326-7).

Myths are "constructed to exemplify why the given practices and procedures are the 'only way' the organization can function effectively" (Boje *et al.*, 1982, p. 18). Alvin Gouldner (1954) is one of a handful of organization researchers (Wilkins, 1979; McConkie and Boss, 1986; Lombardo, 1986; Boje, 1989) to collect and analyze

stories from the field[3]. Gouldner collected stories about two foremen, Doug who was friendly, informal, and lax with the men and Vincent who was just the opposite. "They overflowed with stories which highlighted the differences between the two managers" (p. 80). Gouldner's analysis employed the "Rebecca Myth" from a novel by Daphne Du Maurier concerning a young woman who married a widower only to be plagued by the memory of his first wife, Rebecca. This was the fate of Vincent who was always plagued by the memory of Doug.

The analysis of themes in stories and myths gives diagnostic clues to intervention possibilities. Consultants, as newcomers, are told stories to socialize them into accepted ways of interpreting appropriate organization behavior. As the consultant brings together participants, stories are performed. For example, stories are performed recounting the consultant's success in intervening in a problem area similar to the one faced by this client. Story recipients typically negotiate whether, and how, organization stories will be told, and whether the story will be completed and what, if anything, amounted from the storytelling event (Boje, 1989). As Bethke (1976) observed in a study of storytelling performance: "once two or more narrators begin to exchange accounts, stories flow as a result of thematic sequencing" (p. 125). In one team-building intervention by McConkie and Boss (1986), the team crafted a story that could serve as a model to illustrate how things ought to be. The story was called "The Parable of Happy Employee":

> Happy Employee, undaunted by economic tough times and the unfriendly receptions of Employment Directors throughout the land, finally secured a much desired (1) interview with a Department Head at Concord. Following the interview, the Department Head (2) introduced Happy to the Director, who also (3) interviewed him, and (4) concurred in the Department Head's decision to hire Happy. Once hired, (5) Happy was assigned a "big brother" (female employees receive "big sisters") who guided Happy through the first few months at Concord. Meanwhile, the Department Head joined with appropriate personnel to see that Happy received (6) an orientation about Concord and (7) developed a calendar, which specified dates upon which Happy and the Department Head, every other week for two weeks, would review Happy's progress. (8) Happy set goals with his Department Head, (9) the substance of which was reflected in organizational goals, and (10) which were appraised on a periodic basis (p. 195).

This story provides a recipe for changing an unhealthy pattern of bringing in new employees. Inventing and socializing participants into new myths may give social structure and process new meaning (Boje *et al.*, 1982, p. 27). Part of the executive function is to perform stories that convey a vision of healthy organization functioning (Peters, 1987).

Rituals
To be acknowledged as a responsible member of an organization, recruits, be they trainee, a recently promoted division head, or a new CEO, are taken through a sequence of ordeals to transform them from outsider to insider. "The novice emerges from his ordeal endowed with a totally different being from that which he possessed before his initiation; he has become another" (Beane and Doty, 1975, p. 164). Through story performances, traditions and myth, as well as the corporate history of the founding, the development and the heroic exploits of the organization are passed from veteran to novice. On a microscopic level, every interpersonal encounter may be governed by elements of ritual performance.

88

"Hello, how are you?" is a ritual greeting, with an implied ritual response. The PhD oral examination is quite an ancient ritual. Occasions from hiring, firing, sales awards to retirements are also ritual events. Opportunities for innovation are limited, and it is all too easy to violate a ritual. Organised life is more determinate than chaotic.

When organizations change, they seek and install new rituals. "Within the process, people mourn old ways, renegotiate new values and relationships, and anoint heroes" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 175). Change agents give some healthy space for people to act as people instead of role agents. This is especially the case when established rituals for interacting with subordinates, problem solving, and meeting together have out-lived their usefulness (Wacker, 1983; Dandridge, 1983). Consulting has ritualized performances, such as the "dog and pony" show. Choosing to have a CEO present at a strategy session gives symbolic legitimacy to the new change (Trice and Beyer, 1983).

Scripts
Organization consultants are familiar with Eric Berne's (1964) work on transactional analysis where he analyzes games people play. However, Berne also founded script analysis. Specific programs, games, and rituals are recurring components of scripts. The complete performance of a script may play for an organization's lifetime. The role of OD is not only to enact better technical programs, games, and rituals, it also is to write a healthier plot into the life script of the organization. The components of the script:

> ...serve to fill in the time [the organization] waits for the final fulfilment, simultaneously advancing the action. Since the last act of a script characteristically calls for either a miracle or a catastrophe, depending on whether the script is constructive or destructive, the corresponding [components] are either constructive or destructive (p. 62, additions mine).

Can we analyze organization performances and suggest better plots and better characterizations? Do organizations, departments and work groups repeat certain performances over and over again?

"Phrog Farm" by Jerry Harvey (1977) is one of the more typical games played in an unhealthy organization. Organizations turn a lot of healthy people into "phrogs". OD consultants come along to drain the swamp. If they were to spend time draining the swamp, there would be no flies to flick.

> OD generally consists of phrog kissing, which is magical, harmless, and platonic... Any activity designed to facilitate phrog kissing is an example of ODD behavior — cosmetic organization development or organization development by deception — or OD as practiced by phrogs. Activities such as phrog chorus-building, interlily-pad conflict resolution, phrog sensing, phrog-style assessment, marsh groups, tadpole development, and phrog coaching in the absence of swamp drainage and area reclamation are examples of phrog kissing by ODDITIES (p. 18).

Stated in our context, OD gets sucked into developing the programs, games, and rituals of those in the phrog farm, but the life script of the swamp remains the same. Schaef and Fassel (1988) have written about organizations, which like the phrog farm, have scripts so addictive that they make people acting them out totally powerless and even "co-dependent". They are "addictive systems". They are

dysfunctional systems. People deny their phroginess. Dysfunctional personalities can and do surround themselves with co-dependents who act as co-conspirators in the denial performances.

Co-dependents have an inability to be happy with themselves. They see their identity through the eyes of someone else, usually an addict. The addict can be addicted to work, to perfection, to crazy-making, or to drugs. Co-dependents seek their affirmations and strokes through the other person. They stay in abusive relationships, thinking that they will soon get better. The performance says more about power than the verbal content:

> For example, in a sales meeting, the sales manager *says* to his reps that even though this has been a poor month, he knows the reps will do better next month. His tone of voice is cynical and judgmental; his teeth are clenched, his eyes narrow, and his neck strained. Everyone leaves the meeting with the process meaning: the *message* is he is furious (p. 68).

Moch and Huff (1983) have collected similar performance-ritual examples. When an OD consultant comes in to ''fix'' a dysfunctional system, the layers of pain and denial and pretending begin to get peeled away. ''If people quit playing the co-dependent role, addictions could not survive, for addicts must have the collusion of co-dependents to maintain their closed addictive system'' (Schaef and Fassel, 1988, p. 73). People begin to acknowledge that George is acting out in a dysfunctional manner. Yet, as collusive agents, co-dependents are part of the addictive system. Pleasing, appeasing, no wave-making, protecting, covering for, while still trying to change George is part of the script. So is making George do a turn-around as his entourage speaks openly about his clenched teeth. Managing organization change means transforming such unhealthy performances into healthy performances.

Conclusions
In summary, the social performance paradigm is a useful addition to the three prevailing paradigms of organization theory and organization change. The performance paradigm draws attention to a set of components that is given less focused attention in other paradigms. We have looked at performance programs, games, rituals, story tellings, that are part of the scripted performance of organization. Much of life in organization is pre-ordained by the scripts that people live out. The plots for the scripts are taught to each succeeding generation of employees. The mythical themes in the organization's founding story provides plot elements. Each game, program, and ritual learned by the recruit transforms the recruit into an organization player. Much leadership and some consulting is accomplished by designing alternative social performances.

Some leaders have been gifted performers who could script out a life plan for an entire nation, such as MacArthur and his post-war administration of Japan. MacArthur used props and scenery for dramatic impact. to enhance his persuasiveness with the Japanese people. John Kennedy was a master performer. I still recall seeing him step out of the comfort of his limousine to walk the last block to the White House. The marches and non-violent protests of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King were dramatic social performances that became

90

empowering life scripts. On the dark side, the scripts of Stalin and Hitler were tragic and evil plots.

While it could be argued that the role of OD is to "de-mythify" and de-program, and un-script an organization, it may be more the case that man is by his very nature a social performer. MacIntyre (1981), for example contends that:

Man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially a story-telling animal (p. 201).

Walter Fisher (1984, 1985) defines man as "homo narrens", man the storyteller. Besides being narrators, people enact rituals and games as part of the basic fabric of community. Doing consulting may well mean helping people in organizations choose healthier performances. Rewriting the script means constituting a story that contributes to the emotional health of other players and gives sanction to the unfolding of a healthier drama.

Finally, the meaning, import, and relevance of performance is not inherent in the inspection of programs, games, stories, and rituals. Rather, these are components in the broader context of an organization's life script. Social performance, for me, is the fourth paradigm. At the "surface" level, social performances get the work done. At a "deep" structural level, performance is part of being in a community. A well-crafted performance is an act of expression and style. It is an art leaders of style understand all too well. Performances focus, teach, illustrate, illuminate, and entertain. Performances as scripts beckon us to participate in their unfolding drama. One of my favorite performers in the classroom, in administration, and in networking at a conference was Lou Pondy. He invited me to participate in his script. I pray he sanctions my rewrites.

Notes

1. The Organizational Folklore Conference took place in Santa Monica, California on 10-12 March, 1983. It was directed by Michael Jones, David Boje, and Bruce Giuliano. The conference was funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Skaggs Foundation. Many of the organization behavior attendees were active in a recent Organizational Symbolism conference at Champaign, Illinois. Lou Pondy was one of the conference organizers.

2. Eckblad (1981) uses the word "scheme" instead of performance program. See Lord and Kernan (1987) for a review of Eckblad's approach. As with the work of March and Simon (1958, pp. 136-71), "schemes" are self-contained chains of behavior that can be arranged into more complex performance programs. Performance programs are selected like sub-routines to be reassembled to produce novel responses to non-routine situations.

3. See Boje (1989) for a review of storytelling research in sociolinguistics and organization theory. Joanne Martin's work in particular has bridged paradigms. Martin and her colleagues have done laboratory studies (Martin and Powers, 1979; Martin et al., 1979; Martin et al., 1980). See Martin (1982) for a summary of this work. She extended this work to the social fact paradigm by examining why similar story forms proliferate across organizations (Martin et al., 1983).

References

Beane, W.C., and Doty, W.G. (Eds.), (1976), *Myths, Rites, Symbols: A Mircea Eliade Reader*, Vol. 1, Harper & Row, New York.

Bateson, G., (1972), *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, Ballantine, New York.

Bell, M.J., (1976), "Tending Bar at Brown's: Occupational Role as Artistic Performance", *Western Folklore*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 93-107.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T., (1967), *The Social Construction of Reality*, Doubleday, New York.

Berne, E., (1964), *Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relations*, Grove Press, New York.

Bethke, R.D., (1976), "Storytelling at an Adirondack Inn", *Western Folklore*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 123-39.

Boje, D.M., (1989), "Storytelling is a Leadership Performance", Research paper series, No. 130, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles.

Boje, D.M., Fedor, D.B. and Rowland, K.M., (1982), "Myth Making: A Qualitative Step in OD Interventions", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 17-28.

Boje, D.M. and Ulrich D., (1985), "The Qualitative Side of Leadership", in Tannenbaum, R., Margulies, N. and Massarik, F., *Human Systems Development*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, pp. 302-18.

Byington, R.H., (1978), "Strategies for Collecting Folklife in Contemporary Urban/Industrial Contexts", *Journal of Western Folklore*, Vol. 13, pp. 185-98.

Clark, B.R., (1972), "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 178-84.

Dandridge, T.C., (1983), "Ceremony as an Integration of Work and Play: The Example of Mattel", paper presented at the Organizational Folklore Conference, Santa Monica, California, (March).

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A., (1982), *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.

Dorson, R.M., (1961), *Folklore Research Around the World: A North American Point of View*, Bloomington.

Eckblad, G., (1981), *Scheme Theory*, Academic Press, New York.

Fisher, W.R., (March 1984), "Narrations. A Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument", *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 51, pp. 1-22.

Fisher, W.R., (December 1985), "The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration", *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 52, pp. 347-67.

Garfinkel, H., (1967), *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Georges, R.A., (1969), "Toward an Understanding of Storytelling Events", *Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 82, pp. 313-28.

Georges, R.A., (1980), "A Folklorist's View of Storytelling", *Humanities in Society*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 317-26.

Georges, R.A., (1980), "Toward a Resolution of the Text/Context Controversy", *Western Folklore*, Vol. 39, pp. 34-40.

Georges, R.A., (1981), "Do Narrators Really Digress? A Reconsideration of 'Audience Asides' in Narrating", *Western Folklore*, Vol. 40, pp. 245-52.

Goffman, E., (1974), *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Harper & Row, New York.

Gouldner, A., (1954), *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, The Free Press, New York.

Hall, E.T., (1977), *Beyond Culture*, Anchor Books, New York.

Harvey, J.B., (1977), "Organizations as Phrog Farms", *Organizational Dynamics*, (Spring), pp. 15-23.

Jefferson, G., (1973), "A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation", *Semiotica*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 47-96.

Jefferson, G., (1978), "Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation", in Schenkein, J., (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, Academic Press, New York.

Jones, M.O., (1981), "A Feeling for Form as Illustrated by People at Work", in Lindahl, C. and Burlakoff, M., (Eds.), *Folklore on Two Continents: Essays in Honor of Linda Degh*, in Press.

Jones, M.O., Moore, M.D., and Snyder, R.C., (Eds.), (1988), *Inside Organizations: Understanding the Human Dimension*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.

Lombardo, M.M., (November 1986), "Values in Action: The Meaning of Executive Vignettes", Technical report No. 28, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina, pp. 1-36.

Lord, R.G. and Kernan, M.C., (1987), "Scripts as Determinants of Purposeful Behavior in Organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 265-77.

MacIntyre, A., (1981), *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.

Manchester, W., (1978), *American Caesar: Douglas MacArthur 1880-1964*, Dell Publishing, New York.

March, J.G., and Simon, H.A., (1958), *Organizations*, Wiley, New York.

Martin, J. and Powers, M.E., (1979), "Skepticism and the True Believer: The Effects of Case and/or Base Rate Information on Belief and Commitment", paper presented at the meetings of the Western Psychological Association, Honolulu, May.

Martin, J., Patterson, K. and Price, R., (June 1979), "The Effects of Level of Abstraction of a Script on Accuracy of Recall, Ppredictions and Beliefs", Research paper No. 520, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, June.

Martin, J., Patterson, K., Harrod, W. and Siehl, C., (1980), "Memory for the Content of Scripts Presented at Varying Levels of Abstraction", paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September.

Martin, J., (1982), "Stories and Scripts in Organizational Settings", in Hastorf, A. and Isen, A., (Eds.), *Cognitive Social Psychology*, Elsevier-North Holland, New York, pp. 225-305.

Martin, J., Feldman, M.S., Hatch, M.J., and Sitkin, S.B., (1983), "The Uniqueness Paradox in Organizational Stories", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 28, pp. 438-53.

McCarl, R.S., Jr., (1976), "Smokejumpers Initiation: Ritualised Communication in a Modern Occupation", *Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 89, pp. 49-67.

McConkie, M.L. and Boss, W.R., (1986), "Organizational Stories: One Means of Moving the Informal Organization during Change Efforts", *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 2 (Summer), pp. 189-205.

Moch, M. and Huff, A.S., (1983), "Power Enactment through Language and Ritual", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 11, pp. 293-316.

Peters, T., (1987), *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution*, Harper & Row, New York.

Peters, T. and Austin, N., (1985), *A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference*, Warner Books, New York.

Pondy, L., (1978), "Leadership is a Language Game", in McCall, M.W., Jr. and Lombardo, M., (Eds.), *Leadership: Where Else Can We Go?*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC, pp. 87-99.

Pondy, L. and Boje, D.M., (1980), "Bringing Mind Back In: Paradigm Development as a Frontier Problem in Organizational Theory", in Evan, W., (Ed.), *Frontiers in Organization and Management*, Praeger, New York.

Price-Williams, D.R., (1974), "The Problem of Categories", *Ethos*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 95-114.

Ritzer, G., (1975), "Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science", *The American Sociologist*, Vol. 10, pp. 156-67.

Roy, D.F., (1959), "Banana Time: Job Satisfaction and Informal Interaction", *Human Organization*, Vol. 18, pp. 158-68.

Ryave, A.L., (1978), "On the Achievement of a Series of Stories", in Schenkein, J. (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, Academic Press, New York.

Sacks, H., (1972), Transcripts of unpublished lectures, School of Social Science, University of California at Irvine.

Sacks, H., (1972), "On the Analysability of Stories by Children", in Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D., (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

Sacks, H., (1972), "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology", in Sudnow, D., (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, Free Press, New York.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G., (1974), "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation", *Language*, Vol. 50, pp. 696-735.

Schaef, A. and Fassel, D., (1988), *The Addictive Organization*, Harper & Row, San Francisco.

Trice, H.M. and Beyer, J.M., (1983), "The Ceremonial Effect: Manifest Function or Latent Dysfunction in the Dynamic Organization?" paper presented at the Organizational Folklore Conference, Santa Monica, California (March).

Wacker, G.J., (1983), "New Technology, Old Rituals: Implications for Changing Offices", paper presented at the Organizational Folklore Conference, Santa Monica, California (March).

Weick, K.E., (1979), *The Social Psychology of Organizing,* (2nd ed.), Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.

Wilkins, A., (1979), "Organization Stories as an Expression of Management Philosophy: Implications for Social Control in Organizations", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Wilkins, A., (1984), "The Creation of Company Cultures: The Role of Stories and Human Resource Systems", *Human Resource Management.*

This article has been cited by:

1. Lawrence T. Corrigan. 2016. Accounting practice and the historic turn: performing budget histories. *Management & Organizational History* **11**:2, 77-98. [CrossRef]

2. Mary E. BoyceUniversity of Redlands, Redlands, California, USA. 1996. Organizational story and storytelling: a critical review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **9**:5, 5-26. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

3. Christopher Parker, Robin Neff Lorenzini. 1993. Social navigation: Interpretation and influence of the culture change process. *Strategic Change* **2**:1, 33-55. [CrossRef]

4. David M. BojeLoyola Marymount University, USA. 1991. Consulting and Change in the Storytelling Organisation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **4**:3, 7-17. [Abstract] [PDF]