

UDC 005.7:005.591.4:004

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2415-3583/41.6>**Duhin Oleh**

PhD Candidate

Lviv Polytechnic National University

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5210-0597>**Luchko Halyna**

PhD, Associate Professor

Lviv Polytechnic National University

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3583-0923>

## DOMINANT LOGICS OF ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE MODELS AND THEIR PARADOX BLIND SPOTS

*Change programmes can meet their own targets while leaving work, authority, and adoption unchanged. The article treats this gap as a diagnostic problem: one explanatory logic can determine what counts as evidence and which intervention follows. A purposive corpus of 31 foundational, review, methodological, and boundary-setting works was compared by causal account, accepted evidence, default response, contribution, and excluded demand. The analysis produced a fourteen-logic taxonomy and a recursive mechanism in which an excluded demand returns as a symptom and reinforces the governing frame. For managers, the taxonomy supports review of the dominant explanation, contrary evidence, and a complementary action with ownership. The classification remains conceptual; expert assessment and comparative case coding are required before its completeness and reliability can be established.*

**Keywords:** organisational change, change management, dominant logic, paradox blind spot, organisational paradox, paradox mindset, paradoxical thinking change resistance, digital transformation, IT organisation.

**JEL classification:** D23, M10, M14, O33, L86

**Statement of the problem.** Change can look complete in a programme report and remain incomplete in the organisation. Activities are closed, training is delivered, a platform goes live, and indicators turn green. Yet employees continue to work around the new system, decisions stay where they were, or the intended practice survives only as a ceremony. Similar patterns occur in IT companies where the first author works in board-advisory roles. They are not confined to older or highly planned models. Reviews of organisational change research also report a persistent distance between scholarly evidence and approaches widely used in practice [29].

Managers usually respond to weak progress from inside the model already in use. They add communication, tighten indicators, enforce governance, schedule more training, or introduce another implementation stage. Each response may be reasonable. The problem starts when its underlying explanation becomes the only explanation allowed to influence action.

The established contrast between planned and emergent change does not resolve this problem. A planned programme may mistake task completion for adaptation. An agile programme may generate local learning while losing overall coherence. A culture initiative may produce symbolic agreement without operating discipline. Even a paradox-oriented initiative may become a continuing discussion of tensions without ownership or execution. Technology-based change makes the limitation particularly visible because the same initiative can alter infrastructure, routines, authority, expertise, and identity [12; 30]. No single mechanism covers this whole field of effects.

Research already provides substantial explanations of mobilisation, readiness, alignment, adaptation, technology, identity, power, sensemaking, socio-technical design, learning, legitimacy, and paradox. Organisational-purpose research asks why the firm exists, which value it creates, and for whom, while organisational-identity research addresses continuity and change in collective claims about who the organisation is [9; 11; 13]. These questions are not equivalent to bounded goals, culture programmes, or narratives about a particular initiative. What remains less clear is how one valid explanation takes control of attention, determines which evidence is credible, and selects the next intervention when change stops progressing. This is an explanatory problem rather than a shortage of models.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Organisational change research offers several overlapping accounts of why initiatives progress or stall. Planned approaches examined by J. P. Kotter and J. Stouten et al. [14; 29] explain mobilisation, sequencing, sponsorship, and reinforcement. Readiness research by A. A. Armenakis et al., A. E. Rafferty et al., and B. J. Weiner [2; 26; 31] addresses commitment and collective capability. The alignment models developed by W. W. Burke and G. H. Litwin and by D. A. Nadler and M. L. Tushman [4; 18] examine fit among strategy, structure, systems, work, and culture, whereas S. Denning [6] emphasises iteration, decentralised response, and feedback in agile practice. Digital transformation research by A. Hanelt et al. and G. Vial [12; 30] places technological capability within wider changes to strategy, structure, processes, and culture.



© Duhin Oleh, Luchko Halyna, 2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

Other traditions expose conditions that implementation models may understate. E. H. Schein's research [27] explains cultural assumptions and belonging, while D. A. Gioia, M. Schultz, and K. G. Corley [11] examine continuity and change in collective claims about who the organisation is. Research by G. George et al. and E. Hollensbe et al. [9; 13] defines purpose through the organisation's reason for existence, the value it seeks to create, and the stakeholders towards whom that value is directed. The political analysis developed by J. Pfeffer [23] brings interests, resources, and authority into view. Sensemaking research by D. A. Gioia and K. Chittipeddi [10] concerns how actors interpret and communicate an unfolding change. The socio-technical account developed by W. J. Orlikowski [22] connects technologies with tasks, routines, and roles, while the organisational-learning research of C. Argyris and D. A. Schön [1] examines error correction and revision of governing assumptions. The institutional theory developed by J. W. Meyer and B. Rowan [16] explains how formal conformity can become detached from practice. These perspectives are not interchangeable. Each directs attention to a different failure mechanism and therefore to different evidence.

The concept of dominant logic provides the bridge between these literatures. C. K. Prahalad and R. A. Bettis [25] describe it as a shared managerial frame that directs attention and structures the interpretation of strategic problems. Applied to organisational change, the concept raises a practical question: which explanation receives resources, sponsorship, and decision rights after results weaken? The answer reveals more than the formal label attached to the programme.

Organisational paradox research by M. Gaim et al., M. W. Lewis, and W. K. Smith and M. W. Lewis [8; 15; 28] adds a second condition. Some demands remain contradictory and interdependent; choosing one side cannot remove the continuing function of the other. E. Miron-Spektor et al. [17] propose that a paradox mindset may support acceptance of competing demands as simultaneously valid. Research by J. D. Ford et al., S. Oreg et al., and S. K. Piderit [7; 21; 24] similarly shows that resistance can contain mixed and ambivalent reactions rather than a single negative position. Earlier work by A. Beisser [3] also warns that determined movement towards an ideal state may reduce contact with current reality. Together, these arguments explain why evidence that appears obstructive under one frame may represent a necessary demand under another.

Paradox should not become a universal label for every difficult situation. As M. P. e Cunha and L. L. Putnam [5] caution, using paradox as a universal label would reduce its explanatory precision and make it difficult to test. The present analysis therefore applies three restrictions. A proposed blind spot must be connected to an identifiable dominant logic, an excluded but necessary demand, and a distinct symptom profile. Paradox logic is subject to the same rule. The resulting research question is specific: how does a dominant explanatory logic exclude relevant evidence and reproduce the symptom it is intended to address?

**Purpose of the article.** The purpose of the article is to develop a taxonomy of dominant change logics and to identify the paradox blind spot produced when one of them

is treated as sufficient. The claim is deliberately bounded. Every logic represents a consequential but partial condition of change; dominance, rather than the logic itself, creates the diagnostic risk. The intended contribution is a common classification for traditional and contemporary approaches, followed by a recursive mechanism that makes single-logic dominance, paradox neglect, and visible change symptoms open to later empirical examination.

**Summary of the main research material.** Conceptual basis and taxonomy: two analytical units must be separated. The textual material examined here consists of published formulations, reviews, critiques, and boundary-setting works. The proposed unit for later empirical application is the model in use: the managerial frame that becomes decisive when an initiative stops progressing. The article derives categories for coding that future unit; it does not claim to have observed models in use directly.

The purposive corpus contains the 31 works listed in the references. Twenty-seven sources formed the initial comparison of influential approaches in organisational change and technology-intensive transformation. Four targeted additions strengthened boundaries that remained weak in the initial classification: taxonomy-development method [19], organisational purpose [9; 13], and organisational-identity change [11]. A source was included when it formulated or critically examined an influential change approach, expressed a distinguishable account of how change advances, or supplied evidence for a category boundary or excluded demand. Foundational formulations were paired, where available, with reviews or critiques that exposed limitations. Sources devoted only to implementation technique without a distinguishable causal account were not treated as separate logics.

The corpus served three analytical roles. Foundational works specified the focal mechanism and preferred evidence. Reviews located an approach in a wider research stream and identified scope conditions. Critical and adjacent works supplied rival explanations and possible excluded demands. This is an audit trail for conceptual derivation, not a systematic or exhaustive map of each literature.

Comparison began with the causal account offered by each approach and the evidence it accepts as progress. The next decision concerned use: which intervention would normally be strengthened after disappointing results, what condition that response illuminates, and which interdependent demand it might exclude. Candidate categories were merged when these elements repeated an existing row. They were separated only when the default response or excluded demand changed the diagnosis in a material way. This last judgement mattered more than differences in model vocabulary. Taxonomy-development guidance informed the iterations and stopping logic [19], but no expert panel, observed case, or independent coding test was used at this stage.

A dominant logic becomes visible through three connected choices: the accepted explanation of the problem, the evidence treated as progress, and the intervention selected first. One-sidedness arises when that frame prevents another necessary condition from changing the diagnosis or the allocation of action. A paradox blind spot is the resulting failure to recognise and manage the excluded demand. It is narrower than a general omission. The demand

must remain necessary, relevant evidence must exist or be collectable, and the governing frame must limit the influence of that evidence. Paradox neglect is the organisational process that sustains this condition. Resistance-related symptoms may follow, but they do not define it.

Fourteen logics were analytically retained because their central explanation, preferred evidence, normal intervention, and excluded demand could not be fully absorbed by another category. Leadership was not retained as a separate logic because it identifies an actor rather than a causal mechanism. Stakeholder communication falls mainly within readiness, political, or sensemaking logic, depending on whether the intervention seeks commitment, influence over decisions, or revised interpretation. Staged approaches are classified by the response that governs their practical use.

Purpose created the most difficult placement decision. Goals specify bounded targets or results; organisational purpose concerns why the organisation exists, which value it creates, and for whom [9; 13]. A target can operationalise part of a purpose, but target achievement does not establish that purpose has been framed or realised. Purpose was not retained as a fifteenth logic because the corpus did not reveal a distinct default response that could not be classified elsewhere. It can nevertheless lose consequential standing under goal-dominant use and can enter culture, identity, or sensemaking decisions. Expert assessment may alter this placement.

The categories classify use, not the quality of complete models. Kotter's model and agile practice can both combine several logics. What matters is the explanation that gains additional resources, support, and decision rights when progress is judged weak.

Several boundaries require judgement. Technology logic asks whether a capability has been made available. Socio-technical logic asks whether that capability works with actual tasks, routines, and roles. Culture concerns assumptions and belonging that persist over time; organisational identity concerns claims about who the organisation is and how continuity is maintained or revised; sensemaking concerns interpretation of a particular unfolding change. The present taxonomy does not treat current and emerging identity as separate logics. Their relation belongs to later mechanism research rather than to category assignment here. Process logic coordinates action through an established method, agile logic supports response under uncertainty, and learning logic revises the assumptions that guide action. These distinctions should be tested through observed decisions rather than programme names. An initiative described as agile becomes process-dominant when weak results produce stricter ceremonies, goal-dominant when velocity becomes the decisive evidence, and political when the central intervention reallocates authority.

Mechanism and propositions. The taxonomy classifies the frames that may govern action; the mechanism below explains why their exclusivity may matter. It does not test the later purpose-identity pathway or validate an organisational-change framework. Those claims require separate evidence.

Single-logic dominance develops through a recursive cycle of attention, interpretation, and intervention. Programme tools often establish the first filter. Dashboards and reviews privilege the evidence already valued by the dominant logic. Signals outside that frame may remain unseen or be translated into familiar categories.

**Table 1 – Representative approaches and the default-response classification rule**

| Dominant logic             | Representative approaches                                    | Usual response when progress stops                                          |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Activity / campaign        | Kotter; staged mobilisation [14; 29].                        | Add communication, training, sponsorship, or reinforcement.                 |
| Goal / KPI                 | Goals, KPIs, dashboards, benefit-realisation [9; 13; 20].    | Tighten targets, measures, incentives, or accountability.                   |
| Process / governance       | Staged and governance-oriented change [14; 29].              | Enforce the method, review schedule, approval stages, meetings, or control. |
| Readiness / adoption       | Readiness and adoption approaches [2; 26; 31].               | Increase awareness, willingness, capability, or support.                    |
| Alignment / system fit     | Burke-Litwin; Nadler-Tushman [4; 18].                        | Realign strategy, structure, systems, roles, or culture.                    |
| Agile / adaptive           | Agile and adaptive change [6].                               | Iterate, decentralise, experiment, or increase feedback.                    |
| Technology / capability    | Digital transformation, platforms, data, cloud, AI [12; 30]. | Deploy, upgrade, integrate, or extend capability.                           |
| Culture / identity         | Schein; culture and organisational-identity change [11; 27]. | Reinforce values, belonging, behaviour, or identity.                        |
| Power / political          | Pfeffer; power and authority [23].                           | Reallocate authority, resources, incentives, or participation.              |
| Sensemaking / narrative    | Gioia and Chittipeddi [10].                                  | Reframe change or communicate meaning.                                      |
| Socio-technical            | Orlikowski; work-system design [22].                         | Reconfigure tools, tasks, routines, roles, and arrangements.                |
| Learning / knowledge       | Argyris and Schön [1].                                       | Add inquiry, feedback, reflection, or assumption testing.                   |
| Institutional / legitimacy | Meyer and Rowan [16].                                        | Strengthen policy, conformity, external acceptance, or support.             |
| Paradox / polarity         | Lewis; Smith and Lewis [15; 17; 28].                         | Surface both poles and govern the polarity.                                 |

*Source: developed by the authors based on the purposive conceptual corpus [1–31]. Models may contain several logics; classification follows the response that governs action in use.*

**Table 2 – Contributions and excluded demands of dominant change logics**

| <b>Dominant logic</b>      | <b>Contribution</b>                                                           | <b>Blind spot under dominance</b>                                 | <b>Excluded demand</b>                                             |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Activity / campaign        | Mobilisation, leadership support, visible action [14; 29].                    | Activity replaces real changes in work; fatigue rises.            | Action ↔ altered work                                              |
| Goal / KPI                 | Direction, accountability, measurable benefits [9; 13; 20].                   | Targets substitute for purpose-relevant outcomes; gaming follows. | Measures ↔ purpose                                                 |
| Process / governance       | Sequence, regular review, and control [14; 29].                               | Formal compliance limits new responses.                           | Discipline ↔ discretion                                            |
| Readiness / adoption       | Commitment and adoption capability [2; 26; 31].                               | Ambivalence and identity defence become capability deficits.      | Adoption ↔ self-protection                                         |
| Alignment / system fit     | Fit among strategy, structure, systems, work, and culture [4; 18].            | A useful tension is treated as poor fit.                          | Fit ↔ adaptation                                                   |
| Agile / adaptive           | Experimentation, feedback, responsiveness, local learning [6].                | Priorities drift and autonomy loses coordination.                 | Experiment ↔ coherence                                             |
| Technology / capability    | Digital, data, platform, and AI enablement [12; 30].                          | Implementation replaces wider change; workarounds remain.         | Capability ↔ work in practice                                      |
| Culture / identity         | Assumptions, belonging, professional meaning, and continuity claims [11; 27]. | Symbolic commitment or identity language replaces changed work.   | Identity continuity ↔ identity adaptation and operating discipline |
| Power / political          | Interests, groups, resources, authority [23].                                 | Political positioning hides learning and practical limits.        | Authority ↔ voice                                                  |
| Sensemaking / narrative    | Interpretation and communication of meaning [10].                             | Communication replaces changes in roles, tools, or decisions.     | Meaning ↔ action                                                   |
| Socio-technical            | Combined design of tools, tasks, routines, and roles [22].                    | Identity, power, or legitimacy is treated as a design problem.    | Design ↔ lived meaning                                             |
| Learning / knowledge       | Inquiry, feedback, error correction, assumption revision [1].                 | Reflection continues without altered commitments.                 | Learning ↔ closure                                                 |
| Institutional / legitimacy | Norms, regulation, external acceptance [16].                                  | Formal policy is mistaken for real practice.                      | Compliance ↔ practice                                              |
| Paradox / polarity         | Governance of interdependent tensions [15; 17; 28].                           | Reflection expands without ownership or execution.                | Reflection ↔ execution                                             |

*Source: developed by the authors based on the purposive conceptual corpus [1–31]*

Fatigue becomes insufficient communication; indicator manipulation becomes weak accountability; deviation becomes poor discipline; ambivalence becomes low readiness; and workarounds become a training deficit. Managers then choose the intervention their tools can observe and their governance can authorise. The new intervention reinforces the frame that selected the evidence.

Paradox neglect is the failure to identify, accept, and govern demands that remain contradictory and interdependent during change [8; 15; 28]. It differs from uncertainty, where material knowledge is missing, and from conflict, where actors hold incompatible positions or interests. Stability and renewal, autonomy and coordination, standardisation and local adaptation, experimentation and delivery, and short-term performance and long-term capability are common change tensions. Giving one pole temporary priority may be necessary. Removing the other pole's legitimacy and influence is the critical move.

The excluded demand then returns through the symptom management is attempting to remove. Consider a goal-dominant programme in which movement towards a target is treated as the decisive evidence of progress [20]. Employees may protect unmeasured values through informal behaviour. Reported performance improves while material outcomes remain unchanged. If managers interpret the gap as weak accountability, they tighten targets and control. Honest reporting becomes more costly, and indicator manipulation becomes more sophisticated. The intervention has strengthened its own blind spot.

The same mechanism can operate under other logics. When low adoption is defined only as a knowledge or willingness deficit, redesign of roles and decision rights receives less attention. When deviation is read only as poor discipline, additional governance reduces the local discretion required to solve emerging problems. When technology availability is accepted as evidence of transformation, workarounds may be treated as user resistance rather than information about work design.

This mechanism is organisational as well as cognitive. A dominant logic directs attention, resources, sponsorship, and decision rights towards one explanation. Its interventions also reshape the environment from which later evidence is collected, allowing the frame to partly confirm itself. Dominance should therefore be diagnosed only when evidence from other logics cannot materially affect a decision. Strong execution within one logic is not sufficient evidence of one-sidedness.

Six propositions follow from this mechanism:

P1: Perceived single-logic dominance in a change initiative is positively associated with perceived paradox neglect.

P2: Perceived paradox neglect is positively associated with resistance-related symptoms, including fatigue, formal compliance, manipulation of indicators, lack of coherence, and low adoption.

P3: Perceived paradox neglect mediates the negative association between perceived single-logic dominance and perceived change performance.

P4: Dominant logics are expected to show differentiated, but not exclusive, symptom profiles: activity dominance may be more strongly associated with fatigue, goal dominance with manipulation of indicators, process dominance with formal compliance, adaptive dominance with fragmentation, and technology dominance with low adoption.

P5: At the individual or team level, paradox mindset weakens the positive association between perceived paradox neglect and resistance-related symptoms [17].

P6: Perceived multi-logic integration, the consequential use of evidence from more than one relevant logic, is positively associated with perceived change performance, controlling for initiative type, intensity, and technical complexity.

The propositions specify probable relationships, not established causal effects. P4 is deliberately comparative and exploratory: the proposed profiles are tendencies, not diagnostic signatures, and each symptom has plausible alternative causes. A paradox mindset may help actors recognise competing demands, but it cannot by itself correct governance that rewards only one side. Employee voice and open leadership may allow excluded evidence to enter review. Time pressure, unequal power, and regulatory demands may prevent this correction.

Empirical testing also requires separation of levels and sources. Dominance can be operationalised at initiative level as shared perceptions of leadership priorities and the treatment of discrepant evidence. Paradox neglect concerns the absence of consequential governance for an interdependent demand. Symptoms concern employee experience and behaviour, while performance requires a separate assessment of achieved change. Individual paradox mindset should not be treated as an organisational property without an aggregation argument. Leader reports, employee reports, decision records, and outcome evidence should be separated where possible to reduce common-method bias. A survey association would support the proposed relations, but it would not establish their temporal order.

Managerial implications and validation agenda. Before increasing the strength of a familiar intervention, managers need to test the diagnosis that produced it. Which explanation currently dominates? What evidence is accepted as progress? Which conflicting evidence has been relabelled as resistance, low readiness, or poor discipline? Which demand remains necessary but lacks legitimacy, ownership, or decision rights? The answers indicate where a complementary action may be needed.

The intervention should match the excluded demand. Change fatigue may call for an evidence threshold that permits closure, rather than another activity campaign. Agile ceremonies without real autonomy may require revised decision rights, not further coaching. Low use of a platform may require changes to tasks, roles, or incentives before additional training. These responses do not reject the original logic. They restore a condition that the dominant frame cannot manage alone.

Multi-logic integration does not require the use of all fourteen logics in every initiative. That would replace one form of rigidity with another. Managers can identify the two or three tensions most material to the expected change and give both sides of each tension an owner, relevant evidence, and a legitimate route into decisions. At each

review point, the sponsor and affected teams can record four items: the current dominant explanation, evidence that could challenge it, the interdependent demand at risk of exclusion, and one complementary action with an owner and review date. Paradox awareness becomes governance only when an excluded demand can alter action.

The first unresolved issue is category quality. Expert assessment is needed for relevance, clarity, distinctiveness, completeness, representative mappings, and the placement of purpose. Classification reliability raises a different problem. Comparative cases should show whether independent coders infer the same governing logic from dashboards, review records, escalations, resource allocations, and accounts from affected employees. Survey items and logic-specific symptom profiles would be premature before those two issues are resolved. Cross-sectional data could then identify associations and statistical mediation, but not causal sequence; observing the sequence itself requires longitudinal or quasi-experimental work.

Several rival explanations must remain in the design. Fatigue and weak performance may follow from initiative volume, duration, technical complexity, limited resources, prior change experience, or external disruption. Change stage may also alter the effect of a logic. Activity and process dominance can support early mobilisation yet limit later learning. Adaptive dominance may help exploration while increasing coordination costs during scaling. Negative cases are essential: a one-sided initiative that performs well and an integrated initiative that fails would both sharpen the proposed mechanism.

The purposive corpus is selective and does not represent every change model or research stream. Category construction remains interpretive because it was not independently coded, and the proposed empirical unit was not observed directly. The blind spots were theoretically derived rather than measured. The propositions concern perceptions and require validated measures; each symptom profile has plausible alternative causes. P4 carries the greatest risk of equifinality because fatigue, gaming, compliance, fragmentation, and low adoption can arise under several logics or without logic dominance. The taxonomy does not establish that planned approaches are obsolete or that adaptive and paradox-oriented approaches are superior. It provides a classification and a mechanism for later tests of when a valid logic becomes one-sided.

Conclusions. A change model becomes diagnostically dangerous when it decides in advance what counts as evidence against itself. The fourteen-logic taxonomy changes the basis of comparison: models are read through the explanation that governs action after results weaken, not through age, label, or component count. Each logic makes a consequential condition visible. The blind spot appears when evidence attached to another interdependent demand loses practical standing.

The recursive mechanism offers one explanation for repeated intervention. A governing frame filters discrepant signals, translates them into familiar categories, and authorises another response of the same type. The excluded demand remains operative and may return as fatigue, formal compliance, indicator manipulation, fragmentation, low adoption, or another symptom. Even paradox logic can fail in this way when reflection expands without ownership or execution.

The immediate managerial test is whether contrary evidence can alter a consequential decision. If it cannot, adding more activity inside the accepted frame is unlikely to correct the diagnosis. Managers should identify the excluded demand and give a complementary response evidence, ownership, and a review date. For research, the

next task is narrower than testing all six propositions at once: establish whether experts recognise the categories and whether independent coders can infer the same governing logic from actual decisions. Until then, the taxonomy is a disciplined diagnostic proposal rather than a validated instrument.

### References:

1. Argyris C. & Schön D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 344 p.
2. Armenakis A. A., Harris S. G. & Mossholder K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 681–703.
3. Beisser A. (1970). The paradoxical theory of change. In J. Fagan & I. L. Shepherd (Eds.), *Gestalt therapy now: Theory, techniques, applications*. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 77–80.
4. Burke W. W. & Litwin G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 523–545.
5. Cunha M. P. e Putnam L. L. (2019). Paradox theory and the paradox of success. *Strategic Organization*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 95–106.
6. Denning S. (2016). Agile's ten implementation challenges. *Strategy & Leadership*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 15–20.
7. Ford J. D., Ford L. W. & D'Amelio A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 362–377.
8. Gaim M., Clegg S., Cunha M. P. & Berti M. (2022). *Organizational paradox*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 80 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009128155>
9. George G., Haas M. R., McGahan A. M., Schillebeeckx S. J. D. & Tracey P. (2023). Purpose in the for-profit firm: A review and framework for management research. *Journal of Management*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 1841–1869. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211006450>
10. Gioia D. A. & Chittipeddi K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 433–448.
11. Gioia D. A., Schultz M. & Corley K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 63–81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791603>
12. Hanelt A., Bohnsack R., Marz D. & Antunes Marante C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1159–1197. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639>
13. Hollensbe E., Wookey C., Hickey L., George G. & Nichols C. V. (2014). Organizations with purpose. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1227–1234. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.4005>
14. Kotter J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 59–67.
15. Lewis M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 760–776.
16. Meyer J. W. & Rowan B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 340–363.
17. Miron-Spektor E., Ingram A., Keller J., Smith W. K. & Lewis M. W. (2018). Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 26–45.
18. Nadler D. A. & Tushman M. L. (1980). A model for diagnosing organizational behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 35–51.
19. Nickerson R. C., Varshney U. & Muntermann J. (2013). A method for taxonomy development and its application in information systems. *European Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 336–359. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2012.26>
20. Ordóñez L. D., Schweitzer M. E., Galinsky A. D. & Bazerman M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of overprescribing goal setting. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 6–16.
21. Oreg S., Vakola M. & Armenakis A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 461–524. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886310396550>
22. Orlikowski W. J. (1992). The duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 398–427.
23. Pfeffer J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman, 391 p.
24. Piderit S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 783–794.
25. Prahalad C. K. & Betti, R. A. (1986). The dominant logic: A new linkage between diversity and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 485–501.
26. Rafferty A. E., Jimmieson N. L. & Armenakis A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 110–135. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417>
27. Schein E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 436 p.
28. Smith W. K. & Lewis M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 381–403.
29. Stouten J., Rousseau D. M. & De Cremer D. (2018). Successful organizational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 752–788. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0095>
30. Vial G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 118–144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>
31. Weiner B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, vol. 4, article no. 67.

Дугін О.В., Лучко Г.Й.

Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»

## ДОМІНАНТНІ ЛОГІКИ МОДЕЛЕЙ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНИХ ЗМІН ТА ЇХНІ ПАРАДОКСАЛЬНІ СЛІПІ ЗОНИ

Програми змін можуть досягати власних показників і водночас не змінювати організацію. Платформу впроваджено, але працівники її уникають; agile-церемонії збережено без автономії рішень; показники поліпшено, хоча втома, формальна відповідність, маніпулювання індикаторами, фрагментація або слабке прийняття залишаються. Стаття розглядає цю розбіжність як діагностичну проблему: провідне пояснення може визначати, які докази визнаються значущими та яке втручання обирається наступним. Мета полягає у класифікації домінантних пояснювальних логік моделей організаційних змін і визначенні парадоксальної сліпої зони, що виникає, коли одну логіку вважають достатньою у практичному застосуванні. Цільовий корпус із 31 фундаментальної, оглядової, методологічної та уточнювальної праці порівняно за причинним поясненням, прийнятими доказами, типовою реакцією на слабкий прогрес, внеском і потенційно виключеною вимогою. Аналіз дав чотирнадцять категорій: діяльнису, цільову, процесно-управлінську, готовності й прийняття, системної узгодженості, гнучко-адаптивну, технологічну, культурно-ідентичнісну, владно-політичну, смислотворчу, соціотехнічну, навчальну, інституційну та парадоксальну. Категорії описують модель у використанні, а не якість завершеної методології. Домінування починається тоді, коли взаємодоповнювальні докази вже не можуть змінити діагноз, розподіл ресурсів, відповідальність або наступне втручання. Запропонований рекурсивний механізм описує, як виключена вимога повертається у формі симптому, після чого менеджери посилюють рамку, що спричинила початкову помилку. Для практики таксономія задає короткий порядок перевірки: визначити керівне пояснення, допустити докази, здатні його поставити під сумнів, назвати виключену взаємозалежну вимогу та закріпити взаємодоповнювальну дію за відповідальним власником. Класифікація залишається концептуальною. Експертне оцінювання має перевірити релевантність, чіткість, відмінність і повноту категорій, а порівняльне кодування кейсів – чи можуть незалежні дослідники однаково визначити керівну логіку за фактичними рішеннями. До таких перевірок таксономію слід розглядати як дисципліновану діагностичну пропозицію, а не валідований інструмент.

**Ключові слова:** організаційні зміни, управління змінами, домінантна логіка, парадоксальна сліпа зона, організаційний парадокс, парадоксальне мислення, опір змінам, цифрова трансформація, IT-організація.

Дата надходження статті: 06.07.2026

Дата прийняття статті до публікації: 19.08.2026

Дата публікації статті: 03.09.2026