



Maison du Livre



LARIME

Laboratoire de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur
les Mutations des Economies et des Entreprises
مخبر للبحوث متعددة الاختصاصات في التغيرات الاقتصادية و إدارة الأعمال

The 15th Anniversary of the LARIME Research Laboratory 2011-2026

CALL FOR CHAPTER PROPOSALS

EDITED VOLUME

Disruption in Contemporary Organizations: A Management and Organization Studies Perspective

Editors

Anissa Ben Hassine, Professor of Public Management at ESSEC Tunis, LARIME Laboratory, University of Tunis, Tunisia
benhassineanissa@gmail.com

Khaled Tamzini, Professor of Management at FSEG of Sousse, LaREMFiq Laboratory, University of Sousse, TUNISIA
tamzinik@gmail.com

Disruption in Contemporary Organizations: A Management and Organization Studies Perspective

Book overview

This edited volume is published to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the LARIME laboratory. It adopts a resolutely interdisciplinary perspective to explore the theme of disruption, a phenomenon that now defines the contemporary organizational landscape.

We invite original contributions from scholars across diverse disciplines, addressing one of the thematic axes outlined below. Submission guidelines and procedural details can be found at the end of this call.

Introduction

Recent debates among management scholars have increasingly emphasized euphonic and normatively appealing themes such as social inclusion, new forms of work, or the democratization of markets. While these topics are undeniably important (both academically and practically) they tend to underplay the more exigent and systemic challenges currently confronting organizations. Contemporary firms operate in an environment characterized not by episodic change but by **persistent disruption**, shaped by complex interdependencies, paradoxical demands, and dynamics that are difficult to predict or control. Geopolitical instability, regulatory fragmentation, rapid technological advances, demographic transformations, and climate- and crisis-related shocks collectively undermine assumptions of environmental stability and call for a strategic focus on adaptability, sensemaking, and continuous renewal (March, 1991; Greenwood et al., 2011; Witt, 2019; Henisz et al., 2021).

In this age of disruption, management increasingly requires organizational agility, innovation, and resilience rather than reliance on static planning and efficiency-driven models. Importantly, disruption manifests across all organizational activities, functions, and domains. **Strategic disruption** involves profound changes in geopolitical and institutional contexts, market structures, technologies, and dominant business models, destabilizing established sources of competitive advantage and challenging organizations' dominant logics (Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000; Burgelman, 2002; Jacobides et al., 2018; Teece, 2010). **Marketing disruption** reflects fundamental shifts in industry logics and market arrangements, transforming how value is constructed and communicated, how firms and customers interact, and how legitimacy is mediated through increasingly algorithmic and digital channels (Fligstein, 2001; Kjellberg & Helgesson, 2006; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Gillespie, 2014). **Supply chain disruption** exposes the fragility of globally interconnected production and distribution systems, leading to unpredictable interruptions that constrain the free flow of goods, services, and information and require a move from efficiency-oriented toward resilience-oriented management approaches (Choi et al., 2001; Tang, 2006; Ponomarov & Holcomb, 2009; Wieland & Wallenburg, 2013). **Human resource disruption**, finally, arises from the combined effects of technological change and societal transformation, reshaping skill requirements, employment relationships, managerial authority, and employees' expectations regarding work, identity, and organizational membership (Autor et al., 2003; Kellogg et al., 2020; Kalleberg, 2009; Petriglieri, 2011).

These disruptive dynamics are not only fundamental in nature; they are also **systemic and mutually reinforcing**, often affecting entire organizations rather than isolated functions. As strategic disruption reshapes supply chains, marketing disruption alters skill demands, and technological change simultaneously transforms strategy, operations, and human resources, managing disruption becomes an inherently integrative challenge. Consequently, disruption cannot be addressed through isolated functional responses but requires a **holistic management approach** grounded in paradox management, organizational resilience, strategic and operational agility, risk governance, and the continuous reconfiguration of business models (Farjoun, 2010; Smith & Lewis, 2011). Against this background, the theme of this book is particularly relevant for research examining how organizations navigate the high waters of sustained disruptive change and develop the capabilities needed to remain viable in an increasingly unstable world.

Below an extended version of the eight types of disruption in Contemporary Organizations (A Management and Organization Studies Perspective) cited above.

1. Strategic Disruption: Reconfiguring the Foundations of Organizational Direction

Strategic disruption refers to deep structural changes that challenge the core assumptions underlying organizational strategy, competitive advantage, and long-term planning. Unlike incremental environmental change, strategic disruption destabilizes dominant logics and forces organizations to reconsider their positioning, identity, and purpose (Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000; Burgelman, 2002).

1.1 Geopolitical and Institutional Disruption

Recent research highlights how geopolitical instability, institutional volatility, and regulatory fragmentation increasingly shape strategic decision-making (Witt, 2019; Henisz et al., 2021). Trade conflicts, sanctions, and regional crises create discontinuities that cannot be addressed through traditional forecasting models, requiring firms to adopt adaptive and politically informed strategies.

Institutional disruptions, particularly in data governance, sustainability regulation, and compliance regimes, challenge the assumption of stable rule systems and push organizations toward scenario planning and strategic flexibility (Oliver, 1991; Greenwood et al., 2011).

1.2 Market Structure and Competitive Disruption

Strategic disruption also emerges from transformations in market structures, including the blurring of industry boundaries and the rise of digital platforms and ecosystems (Jacobides et al., 2018). These shifts undermine established sources of advantage and expose incumbents to new forms of competition from nontraditional actors.

From a strategic perspective, disruption introduces persistent paradoxes: exploitation versus exploration (March, 1991), efficiency versus adaptability, and stability versus change (Smith & Lewis, 2011).

1.3 Technological and Business Model Disruption toward Circularity and Frugality

Technological change acts as a catalyst for strategic disruption by enabling new business models that redefine value creation and capture (Teece, 2010). Digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and data-driven architectures do not merely improve processes but challenge firms' dominant logics and strategic frames (Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000). Organizations must therefore develop dynamic capabilities (the ability to sense, seize, and transform) in order to survive under conditions of sustained disruption (Teece et al., 1997).

Technological disruption increasingly converges with business model innovation aimed at sustainability and resource efficiency. Organizations are moving beyond linear, ownership-based models toward circular business models that emphasize reuse, recycling, remanufacturing, and closed-loop systems. The rise of the functional economy and usage-based models shifts value creation from product ownership to service provision, while resource sharing, pooling, and frugal innovation challenge assumptions about scale, growth, and consumption. These models disrupt dominant technological and economic paradigms by redefining value creation, cost structures, and customer relationships, while simultaneously addressing environmental constraints and societal expectations.

2. Marketing Disruption: Transforming Value Creation and Customer Engagement

Marketing disruption reflects fundamental changes in how markets are constructed, how value is communicated, and how relationships between firms and customers are organized.

2.1 Disruption of Industry Status Quo

Research in organization studies shows that markets are socially constructed and stabilized through shared meanings, practices, and legitimacy structures (Fligstein, 2001). Marketing disruption occurs when new actors challenge these structures by redefining value propositions, pricing models, or customer experiences, thereby destabilizing dominant market arrangements (Kjellberg & Helgesson, 2006).

2.2 Changing Customer–Firm Relationships

Digital platforms and interactive technologies transform customers from passive recipients into active co-creators of value (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). This shift erodes traditional asymmetries of power and information, increasing firms' exposure to reputational risks and legitimacy challenges (Bitektine & Haack, 2015).

Marketing thus becomes less about persuasion and more about ongoing sensemaking and engagement, where trust and authenticity are continuously evaluated (Hajli et al., 2017).

2.3 Disruption of Communication Channels

Algorithmically mediated communication reshapes how marketing messages are produced, filtered, and interpreted. Firms increasingly lose direct control over visibility and reach, as platform algorithms govern attention and relevance (Gillespie, 2014).

This creates new challenges for organizational legitimacy and brand coherence, reinforcing the need for interpretive and adaptive marketing capabilities (Vaara et al., 2016).

3. Supply Chain Disruption: Fragility in Interconnected Systems

Supply chain disruption refers to systemic interruptions that undermine the flow of materials, information, and services across organizational networks.

3.1 Sources of Supply Chain Disruption

Research in operations and organization studies emphasizes that globally dispersed and efficiency-driven supply chains are particularly vulnerable to shocks (Choi et al., 2001; Tang, 2006). Geopolitical tensions, pandemics, climate events, and cyber risks expose hidden interdependencies and amplify disruption effects across networks.

3.2 Organizational and Network-Level Consequences

Supply chain disruptions generate cascading failures that exceed the boundaries of individual firms, highlighting the importance of inter-organizational coordination and governance (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2020). Traditional risk management approaches, which assume linear causality, are increasingly inadequate in such complex systems.

3.3 From Efficiency to Resilience

Recent scholarship advocates a shift toward resilience-oriented supply chain strategies, emphasizing redundancy, diversification, and digital visibility (Ponomarov & Holcomb, 2009; Wieland & Wallenburg, 2013). However, this transition introduces new paradoxes between efficiency, sustainability, and robustness, reinforcing the strategic nature of supply chain management under disruption.

4. Human Resource Disruption: Redefining Work, Skills, and Organizational Membership

Human resource disruption arises from technological change, demographic shifts, and evolving societal expectations, fundamentally altering the employment relationship.

4.1 Technological Disruption of Work

Automation and artificial intelligence reshape job structures, skill requirements, and performance evaluation systems (Autor et al., 2003; Kellogg et al., 2020). Algorithmic management challenges traditional forms of managerial authority and raises concerns regarding autonomy, control, and fairness (Meijerink & Bondarouk, 2021).

4.2 Societal and Demographic Change

Generational diversity, workforce aging, and changing values regarding work–life balance disrupts established HR practices and psychological contracts (Rousseau, 1995; Kalleberg, 2009). Employees increasingly expect flexibility, purpose, and ethical responsibility from organizations, forcing HR systems to adapt.

4.3 Psychological and Identity Disruption

Continuous disruption affects employees' sense of security, identity, and organizational belonging. Research in organization studies shows that uncertainty and constant change can undermine trust and commitment, unless actively managed through leadership, communication, and participatory practices (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Petriglieri, 2011).

Thus, HR disruption is inseparable from broader issues of organizational legitimacy, culture, and ethics.

4.4 Environmental and Green Human Resource Management (Green HR) Disruption

Beyond technology-driven workforce transformations, human resource management is increasingly disrupted by environmental and sustainability imperatives. Green Human Resource Management (Green HR) represents a form of disruption that reorients HR practices toward environmental responsibility. This includes green recruitment and selection processes that prioritize environmental values and competencies, green training programs that foster pro-environmental behaviors, and performance management systems that integrate sustainability criteria. Such practices contribute to the dissemination of an eco-responsible organizational culture and reshape employee identity, motivation, and engagement. Green HR thus disrupts traditional HR logics by embedding sustainability into the core of people management rather than treating it as a peripheral concern.

6. Financial Disruption and Sustainable Finance

Disruption in finance reflects a fundamental reconfiguration of how organizations access, allocate, and govern financial resources. The rise of sustainable finance, impact investing, green bonds, and ESG-based evaluation mechanisms challenges traditional shareholder-value logics and introduces new performance criteria. Financial decision-making is increasingly shaped by long-term environmental and social risks, regulatory pressures, and stakeholder scrutiny. This form of disruption compels organizations to integrate sustainability considerations into capital allocation, risk management, and investment appraisal processes.

7. Governance Disruption and Stakeholder-Oriented Models

Governance disruption arises from growing demands for transparency, accountability, and stakeholder inclusion. Traditional hierarchical and shareholder-centric governance models are increasingly challenged by multi-stakeholder approaches that incorporate environmental, social, and ethical considerations into strategic decision-making. New governance mechanisms, including hybrid organizational forms, participatory governance structures, and integrated reporting systems, disrupt established power relations and redefine managerial responsibility. This shift reflects broader societal expectations regarding corporate purpose and legitimacy in the context of global disruption.

8. Interdependencies and Holistic Management Implications

Across all four domains, disruption emerges as systemic, interdependent, and persistent rather than episodic. Strategic disruption reshapes supply chains; marketing disruption alters skill requirements; technological change affects strategy, HR, and operations simultaneously.

Consistent with systems and paradox perspectives in management research, this book argues that disruption requires integrative managerial capabilities, including agility, resilience, and paradox management (Smith & Lewis, 2011; Farjoun, 2010). Managing disruption, therefore, is not about restoring equilibrium but about continuously navigating instability.

References

1. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20–39.
2. Autor, D. H., Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2003). The skill content of recent technological change: An empirical exploration. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4), 1279–1333.
3. Bitektine, A., & Haack, P. (2015). The “macro” and the “micro” of legitimacy: Toward a multilevel theory of the legitimacy process. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 49–75.
4. Burgelman, R. A. (2002). *Strategy is destiny: How strategy-making shapes a company's future*. New York: Free Press.
5. Choi, T. Y., Dooley, K. J., & Rungtusanatham, M. (2001). Supply networks and complex adaptive systems: Control versus emergence. *Journal of Operations Management*, 19(3), 351–366.
6. Farjoun, M. (2010). Beyond dualism: Stability and change as a duality. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 202–225.
7. Fligstein, N. (2001). *The architecture of markets: An economic sociology of twenty-first-century capitalist societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
8. Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies* (pp. 167–194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
9. Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 317–371.
10. Hajli, N., Sims, J., Zadeh, A. H., & Richard, M. O. (2017). A social commerce investigation of the role of trust in a social networking site on purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 71, 133–141.
11. Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Narthey, L. (2021). Spinning gold: The financial returns to stakeholder engagement. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(6), 1217–1245.
12. Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2020). Viability of intertwined supply networks: Extending the supply chain resilience angles. *International Journal of Production Research*, 58(10), 2904–2915.
13. Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(8), 2255–2276.
14. Kalleberg, A. L. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 1–22.
15. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410.
16. Kjellberg, H., & Helgesson, C.-F. (2006). Multiple versions of markets: Multiplicity and performativity in market practice. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(7), 839–855.
17. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87.

18. Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2021). The duality of algorithmic management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(4), 100785.
19. Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145–179.
20. Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 641–662.
21. Ponomarov, S. Y., & Holcomb, M. C. (2009). Understanding the concept of supply chain resilience. *International Journal of Logistics Management*, 20(1), 124–143.
22. Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(3), 5–14.
23. Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
24. Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381–403.
25. Tang, C. S. (2006). Perspectives in supply chain risk management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 103(2), 451–488.
26. Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 172–194.
27. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
28. Tripsas, M., & Gavetti, G. (2000). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1147–1161.
29. Vaara, E., Sonenshein, S., & Boje, D. M. (2016). Narratives as sources of stability and change. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 495–517.
30. Wieland, A., & Wallenburg, C. M. (2013). The influence of relational competencies on supply chain resilience. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 34(1), 1–19.
31. Witt, M. A. (2019). De-globalization: Theories, predictions, and opportunities. *Management and Organization Review*, 15(1), 5–17.

Calendar

- Publication and distribution of the call for papers: Tuesday, March 10, 2026
- Submission of extended abstracts: May 30, 2026
- Review by the scientific editors: June 15, 2026
- Submission of full chapters: September 1, 2026
- Review by the scientific committee: October 10, 2026
- Submission of revised chapters: November 5, 2026
- Publication of the book: End of December 2026