

Organization: The Metaphor of Creative Determination

Hartwell T Paul Davis

Regent University

Abstract

The use of metaphors in organizational studies has allowed scholars and practitioners to define, describe, and explain how organizations are structured and exist in their environments.

Metaphors are linked to organizational theories providing different viewpoints, suggesting different ways of thinking about organizational structure, and many times help make complex problems easier to understand. In this paper, the metaphor of creation and the term *creative determination* is used to present an argument in a major debate in organizational theory – the environmental determinism versus strategic choice debate. Central to the debate is the power of man over environmental determinism. In contrast to environmental determinism, the creation story postulates humanity was given complete authority over its environment subject to laws of nature that cannot be changed – therefore except for those laws of nature – humanity has complete control over all the rest. The creation metaphor suggests environmental determinism, rather than man, is constrained allowing mankind to excel in human endeavor to create and determine organizational structure and success.

Organization: The Metaphor of Creative Determination

Morgan's (2006) seminal work on *Images of Organization* proposed several metaphors that allow scholars, theorist, and practitioners to view different aspects of organizational structure. The purposes for organizational theory include the need to understand relational processes that effect management, the cultural concerns in the new global marketplace, and how to explain leadership challenges in a 21st century workforce. It includes knowing how structure impacts sustainability in a complex environment and how leaders can be responsible for the triple bottom line of planet, profit, and people, the concerns of every modern organization. The world in which organizations develop has become more complex because of environmental and technological changes, so to simplify understanding, metaphors provide frames of reference for sense-making to those who need to understand.

Morgan's (2006) metaphors included, for example, the metaphor of organizations as machines which are familiar to those in industrialized societies. Most baby boomers have grown up with machinery, particularly equipment, appliances, and automobiles that we expect to function in specific ways. Morgan notes the word *organization* is derived from the Greek word *organon* "meaning a tool or instrument" (p. 15). The concepts of something mechanistic and bureaucratic are familiar concepts that serve baby boomer in understanding organizations that fit the metaphor.

Morgan (2006) uses other metaphors such as *organisms*. The metaphor of organism works well for those in health organizations, science, and social fields that seek to understand organizations from a scientific point of view. Another, the metaphor of *political systems*, with a focus on power, control, and conflict has broadened understanding for scholars and practitioners

as we examine many sociological and cultural aspects of organizations, including power distance, gender roles, and uncertainty avoidance. Every metaphor adds to our understanding of a field that is increasingly dynamic and complex.

As we examine organizational metaphors we must touch on another organizational premise that gives rise to the questions of how organizations are created, developed, and sustained through their lifetimes. Many organizational theories such as contingency theory, organizational ecology, and open system theory emphasize environmental concerns. Morgan (2006) observed, “Environment and system are to be understood as being in a state of interaction and mutual dependence” (p. 40). These metaphors lead us to the question of how much influence does the environment have on creating, developing, and sustaining an organization? Or on the other hand – how much choice does an organization have in determining its own fate in the face of environmental pressures? These questions have gendered a debate between those who believe in a concept of *environmental determinism* and others who believe in *strategic choice*, which has implications for organizational sustainability.

Environmental determinism versus strategic choice

The concepts of environmental determinism and strategic choice are contrasting positions that exegetically remind us of other debates concerning the nature of man, for example the nature versus nurture debate, or the creation versus evolution debate. This leads us to the choice of Biblical creation and the term *creative determination* as a metaphor that suggest organizations do not come into existence or continue to exist because of happenstance, but their existence and sustainability are the result of the planned creative genius of organizational visionaries. The limits of environmental determinism are offset by the creative determination of men and women

who have given “organizational life” to the organization. The same kind of creative determination inherent in organizational creation is used to sustain an organization against environmental turbulence or when faced with chaos, bring the organization into a state of harmony.

What is suggested by the creation metaphor is that organizations are formed out of nothing or out of chaos and that several strategies employed by God in creation are evidenced in the creation and sustainment of human organizations. In the beginning “the earth was formless and empty, and darkness covered the face of the earth” (Genesis 1:2, NLT). Then God used creation to shape the earth and to transform chaos into a state of harmony. Man has learned throughout history the creational pattern that is replicated in social units that include the family, the business, and the government – and that represents a truth that contradicts the notion of environmental determinism. That truth is that humanity has been given power over its environment subject to conditioned “laws of nature” and “laws of God”. As humanity works within those conditions it has this promise,

When I look at the night sky and see the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars you set in place. What are people that you should think about them, mere mortals that you should care for them? Yet you made them only a little lower than God and crowned them with glory and honor. You gave them charge of everything you made, putting all things under their authority. (Psalms 8:3-6, NLT).

Rather than the environment, here represented by physical nature, having authority, mankind has utmost authority over environmental concerns that included earthly creatures and humanity itself. If humanity works within a framework of the laws of nature established by God, it will excel in human endeavor, including home, business, and government. It will in fact create harmonic conditions for an organizations environment.

The three main strategies discussed in this metaphor are (1) planned environmental change, (2) institutionalizing “laws of nature”, and (3) a creating relationships that are intended to be foundational to existence. These three strategies are hypothesized as creational elements that are replicated in all social structures including family units, business units, and government units. The creation metaphor suggest that each of these social units are creative in nature and the product of *creative determination*, meaning that the exercise of choice determines outcomes in terms of development, quality, success, and survivability.

God formed the world out of nothing, or out of chaos, and laid down the “laws of nature” which prevent its returning to the state of chaos. In the same manner organizations are formed by creative genius that begin with little more than an idea and from the state of nothingness or chaos bring to life the organization. Leaders who are faced with new challenges should remember that there were laws of nature inherent in the organizational creations that are intended to be preserved. These are the core values, mission, core products and services that formed the life of the organization from the beginning.

Creation by God was a well-planned series of events, each one of which contributing to the design and that was interdependent on one another. The creation metaphor should allow us to view environmental determinism in a new light, one in which it is seen as an opportunity for change necessitated by environmental interdependence. Environmental turbulence should not be seen as constraints but as necessary to inducing change, cleansing, or growth. Thunder storms, for example, are God’s way of refreshing our atmosphere and are a primary cooling mechanism for the earth. Changnon (2006) observes thunderstorms cool the earth, produces copious needed rainfall, maintains the global electrical circuit, and cleans the earth’s atmosphere of pollutants (AMS Paper). The metaphor emphasizes the role of strategic choice and *creative determination*

as factors most likely to define organizational destiny and suggest environmental determinism as a state of flux that is at times turbulent and at times calm, but by no means the real power for change.

Determinism in organizational theory

The issue of *determinism* has its roots in philosophy and is in contrast to the doctrine of free will or *strategic choice*. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) note “realism amounts to determinism – it leaves little room for choice because human nature and action are causally determined” (p. 329). Environmental determinism in organizational theory suggests that environmental factors, including issues of resource, culture, politics, and market are the determining factors in how organizations develop or are sustained. Choice, as a strategy, has lessor control in determinism theory because the causation and consequence of events are predicated on the lack of free will in controlling events.

Millican (2010) explains determinism and its relationship to two philosophical maxims, the *Causal Maxim* and *The Doctrine of Necessity*. Millican states the determinism thesis as being “All physical and mental phenomena occur in conformity with universal causal laws” (p. 616). It is related to the causal maxim which states, “Whatever begins to exist, must have a cause of existence” and the doctrine of necessity which states, “All physical and mental phenomena are governed by necessity” (p. 616). In the context of environmental determinism, this suggests that universal causal laws in the environment influence the existence of the organizational structure. It also means that changes in organizational structure are necessitated by the environment. Strategic choice in this case is reactionary rather than proactive.

Environmental determinism has suggested several organizational theories. Lawless and Finch (1989) note, “The population ecology model, for instance, recognizes little or no effect of strategy-making by top management on the success of individual firms” (p. 351). Within a resource pool, organizational environment includes resources that must be shared. The portion of the “pie” available to each organization depends on environmental factors, for example the distribution of skilled and unskilled labor or the availability of material resources. The ecological niche in which an organization finds itself places restraints and boundaries that create the space in which organizations may exist. Organizational leaders are compelled to work within the niche and its constraints.

According to Lawless and Finch (1989) “The resource dependence model, managing external relations is the key to survival, and is once again heavily influenced by environmental forces” (p. 351). The environments of supply and demand, regulatory dependencies, labor and knowledge dependencies, and market dependencies are external segments, each with its own controls. Organizational managers operate in reactive states to environmental forces by developing key relationships. Hatch (2006) notes,

Managing resource dependence requires careful definition and monitoring of the environment. It also calls for imagination with respect to balancing the power of others by developing countervailing power within your own organization (p. 83).

The model suggests more strategic choice, but emphasizes again the environmental factors that created strategic necessities.

Theoretical models of determinism suggest at some point in time environmental concerns out-weigh any decision or strategy of choice envisioned by leadership. Gopalakrishnan and Dugal (1998) summarize the debate writing,

The free-will or strategic choice theorists portray managers as relatively autonomous agents who act in proactive and potentially creative ways to alter their organizational destinies. The determinists, on the other hand, believe that managers are severely constrained by prevailing environment and structural conditions and therefore cannot substantively alter the organization's course. (p. 146)

Adaptability or choice – when outcomes are the same

A reasonable question could be whether organizational response to environmental concerns is one of adaptability or whether an organization by choice changes the environmental condition in which it finds itself. This is at the heart of the debate, and semantic differences have a way of keeping it alive. Adaptability assumes that changes are made on the basis of constraints dictated by the environment. An organization has “a choice” in making modifications or creating strategies but always within the constraints. It is easy to understand, for example, how an organization pursuing business in a country may have little control over the political and regulatory environment. The choice to bribe government officials can illicit the semantic debate – is it adaptation or is it a strategic choice that brings about a “change” in policy in favor of the organization? The answer may lay in the decision making process. Did government ask for the bribe in order to change policy or did the organization offer a bribe in order to change policy? One represents possibly no choice in the matter while the other represents a choice. Whether it was adaptation or a strategic choice must consider the nuance – could the change of policy take place without the bribe? What is evident is the role of the why and how of decision making that is being called into question in the debate between environmental determinism and strategic choice. When is it reactive and when is it proactive?

The importance of the backward look toward the future

The reason for the debate and the reason for the confusion -- the outcome could be the same either way. As in many philosophical debates theorist are looking at the end results, the outcomes, and work backwards to try to explain the cause. Exegetical research is a powerful tool as it looks at histories, cultures, and texts which are for the most part a backward look because we are trying to account for our understanding of "what is" in the world as we now know it. Most organizational theories and metaphors are the result of looking at the end product first and then make comparisons to things in historical knowledge.

But it is from our backward look that we make our decisions for tomorrow. In the example of an organization faced with political corruption, determinists might suggest paying a requested bribe might be a form of adapting to the environment. Determinists might also suggest offering a bribe might be a form of adapting to the environment as a means of creating a favorable policy change, in other words choice is a form of adaptation. If the organization offers the bribed when it was not asked for, could this be considered strategic choice, especially if the outcome was what the organization intended? Or consider the possibility of an organization that makes itself so valuable to the country in terms of new jobs and markets the country simply changes its own policies in order to accommodate the new business. This is called strategic choice when the organization is making the decision to open a new market, but even then environmental concerns will be at work.

Each of these scenarios is environmentally motivated. If an organization faced with an environmental issue acted in ways that ignored the environmental issue does it take away environmental determinism? The question is whether that is possible. Strategic choice is when

an organization creates a new set of rules that changes the conditions under which the organization functions. Some examples might be to switch from “buying to making” in material supply. Or strategic choice could be in-house training to develop skilled labor rather than depending on hiring available skilled labor. It can also include outsourcing. We shall look however at the creation story to identify elements that metaphorically describe how organizations create its own environmental determination.

The Creation Metaphor

The creation metaphor suggests that successful organizations continually overcome environmental determinism by acting in ways that alter its environment. It is strategic choice based on *creative determination* – the concept that creativity is a planned alteration of the environment where the creative act determines the outcome. Environmental changes are like the seasons that come and go, or the divisions of day and night that were planned for in creation. The creation itself is advantaged by the environmental changes which prior to the fall of man included no storms or cataclysmic events that could be considered “upsets of nature”. Three strategies, planned strategic change, institutionalizing laws of nature, and the relational strategy are suggested in the creational story and have implications for decision makers.

Creation: a planned strategic change

The world exists – and some would suggest the outcome is the same whether it was because of creation or evolution. Some have redefined creation which gave rise to the compromising theories of *theistic evolution* and of *intelligent design*. The first asserts that God used evolution to create the earth. The second asserts that while in creation there is design that reflects intelligence, it does not discount that parts of creation are the result of evolutionary

processes, and secondly that supernatural influence does not scientifically prove there is a God.

The theories of intelligent design and theistic evolution are theories that synthesize creation and evolution and are intended to appease both creationist and evolutionist. Lamoureaux (2007)

notes that for those who hold to these theories,

The doctrine of creation asserts that God created the world, not how He created it. His creative method, ultimately, is incidental to Christian faith. Whether the universe and life arose in six literal days some six thousand years ago, or whether they evolved entirely by natural processes ordained and sustained by Him, as evolutionary creationists contend, the cosmos is a creation. (p. 102).

In other words – “the outcome is the same”. Can this be true? Logically it would mean that if the world came into existence by the process of evolution, it must be sustained by the process of evolution. At what time is evolution complete? It is certain that evolution does not suggest a good model for organizational theory for it would seem to invalidate the need for leaders and organizers.

The pure creationist perspective, one that is not synthesized, rejects all aspects of evolution by stating that creation was planned, determined, created, and controlled not only by the design but by the ongoing continual involvement of the creator. Such deliberation assumes that the laws of nature are under the control of the creator, and that environmental events are with the creator’s permission.

One question to be asked in comparing the creation metaphor to organizational theory is do organizational leaders have as much control over their environments as God does over the world’s environment? God created the environment and has complete and all power while organizations in reality are only able to create portions of its own environment while being influenced by parts of the environment not created by the organization. The focus for

organizations is create what it can, change what it can, and adapt when necessary. The creation metaphor leaves open the understanding that man is not God, and that when God states that he has given authority putting all things under our authority (Psalms 8: 6), it is subject to God's higher authority.

One factor that would require more discourse and possibly raise theoretical debate because it interjects theology into the science of organizational theory – is the suggestion that the creation metaphor includes an interventionist aspect – meaning the God factor. Suffice it to say – one application of the metaphor is that “creator's intervention” is metaphorically suitable to the discussion of how organizational leaders become change agents in the *creative determination* of an organization's future. The creation metaphor posits that when environmental turbulence arises, organizations instead of doing nothing depend on interventions from organizational leaders.

Strategic change requires creative leadership

Organizations are born out of nothingness but the ideas and visions of its creators. At times this can be the emptiness that creates a need for a new product or service. It can be the chaos that creates a new market challenger or price model for an existing product. Williams (2012) observes “The goal of most organizational strategies is to create and then sustain a competitive advantage” (p. 145). While environmental turbulence may include shortages of resources, market competition, government regulation, and more – changing the environment through creativity and innovation is becoming characteristic for 21st century successful organizations. Williams also notes “Because external environments can be dynamic, confusing, and complex, managers use a three-step process to make sense of the changes in their external

environments: environmental scanning, interpreting environmental factors, and acting on threats and opportunities” (p. 50). The situational analysis, or *strength, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis* is a tool to develop proactive strategies, and is becoming commonplace as organizations now focus regularly on environmental concerns. Such analysis is a part of the decision-making process, but change only comes when proactive strategies result in solutions. One criticism of a SWOT analysis is that while it may offer alternate solutions the easy ones tend to be accommodating to environmental determinism. Changing the environment takes more than a SWOT analysis – it requires creativity.

Creativity is becoming a sought after attribute of leadership. Shin and Park (2013) observe, “In today’s dynamically changing environment, creativity is crucial if organizations, especially small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs), are to survive, perform effectively, and maintain a competitive advantage” (p. 71). They note however that innovation, a term often used in association with creativity, is not the same thing as creativity. Innovation refers to the ability to implement creative ideas while creativity is the ability to generate novel and useful ideas. Shin and Park posit that complex decision making “is largely influenced by the decision-maker’s psychological factors, such as their values and beliefs, rather than economic optimization” (p. 73). Creativity tends not to be driven by reaction to the environment, but from the standpoint of faith in what “can be”. It is a god-like characteristic described in Biblical terms for God who “callesth those things which be not as though they were” (Romans 4:17, KJV).

Creativity as proactive personality

Those that lead from the standpoint of creativity accept environmental turbulence as facts of life to be overcome. Rather than being paralyzed by uncertainty or being characterized by an

avoidance mentality, creative leaders have a proactive personality. This does not mean that they would not use avoidance strategies, control strategies, or cooperative strategies in dealing with environmental issues – it simply means that they approach adversity and risk undeterred from negativity. Instead of losing focus, creative leaders are goal oriented. Kim, Hon, and Lee (2010) in equating creativity with the proactive personality, explain “Proactive personality refers to individuals’ disposition toward engaging in active role orientation, such as initiating change and influencing their environment” (p. 38). Initiating change, taking action, and persevering until change occurs, are examples of creative determination that is active rather than passive in dealing with environmental issues. Bateman and Crant (2001) note proactive people manipulate their environment to enhance performance. It is all about a high level of involvement that promotes change and pushes back against environmental controls.

Metzl and Morrell (2008) state “Creativity is associated with divergent thinking, awareness of self, and expressiveness” (p. 305). Creativity as a form of expression tends to highlight the creator. Psalms 19:1 states, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows his handiwork”. It is during the process of creation that the images of the product, process, innovation, and other characteristics of an organization are formed. Corporate social responsibility is a created image. Ethical images are formed as organizations develop as new entities or while changes develop in its life cycle. Metzl and Morrell refer to this creativity as “flow”, stating “The concept of flow thus offers a form of well-being for the creator, supporting creativity as a protective or promotive factor during adversity” (p. 309).

Strategic planned change is essential to sustainability is not a singular event any more than the notion that the earth was created in a day. It is a series of events that begins with taking an environment without form or in a chaotic condition and altering the environment. What is

notable in the creation metaphor is that the resulting creation was designed around two primary sub-strategies – a strategy that allowed sustainment through carefully planned laws of nature that were not to be broken, and a strategy that brought harmony through patterns of relationship. The relationships themselves included relationship with the creator and then each element of creation had its own type of relationship. The creation metaphor suggests that environmental turbulence is the result of “breaking the law” – as suggested in the concept of sin being breaking a law of relationship.

To apply the concept to organizations, the metaphor of reproductive laws and relationship laws can be used to suggest how creators begin building rules from the very beginning of an organization that are intended to allow organizational growth and survivability. What happens when these rules are later broken?

Creation Institutionalizes “Laws of Nature”

Many have missed the importance of the intrinsic laws of nature built into the design of creation that has kept the earth from returning to the chaotic state of nothingness that existed prior to creation. In stating “laws of nature” we must emphasize that “law” carries with it several assumptions. First is the assumption that the creator of the law has both the authority and the power to create and enforce the law. Secondly, the law is *not intended to be broken*. Thirdly, that breaking the law results in negative consequences. The term “of nature” means that the laws are consistent with environmental compatibility, are determined by nature, and are universal. The laws of nature are a part of the creative “toolbox” that produces and sustains form, and suggest that they became part of the creational design. Without such laws the world would return to a chaotic state.

In thinking of creation, we understand that humans, other animals, and plants are all a part of an ecological-system. An ecological system refers not only to the mutual dependence between plants and animals but to all things in the natural environment. Without the sun for example, all life would not only die for lack of heat but for lack of air to breathe. Animals breathe in oxygen and breathe out carbon dioxide. Plants require carbon dioxide to live which comes from the breathing of the animals. Fabre (2005) notes,

Plants influenced by the sun, feed on carbon dioxide, decompose it into breathable oxygen with which they replenish the atmosphere and carbon with which they make wood, fruits, etc. Thus is the purity of the atmosphere preserved. Animals keep plants alive, and plants keep animals alive. (p. 131)

The sun is responsible for the photosynthesis which is the process by which green plants and other organisms turn carbon dioxide and water into carbohydrates and oxygen.

While this paper is not intended to prove creation, it suggests that the metaphor of creation is applicable to the notion of systems which are sustained by laws of relationships and mutual dependence that become critical factors in how systems exist and survive. The systems can be ecological systems or social systems, and even these have relationship one with the other. It is important to recognize the importance of the laws that hold systems together.

Laws of preservation

What are systems? In general a system is a complex whole formed from related parts. Systems are the results of independent entities that join together based on some perceived need, or the systems can be the result of a reproductive function. Even the reproductive function assumes a joining together of entities. The creation metaphor rejects evolution, happenstance, the big bang theory, or other notions that systems simply happen. Organizational systems are created, if we believe in creational theory. The two primary systems, ecological and social, are

about relationship, but all systems in order to be sustained depends on states of harmony between inter-related parts. Systems that are not in a state of harmony can be characterized as having environmental turbulence, dissonance, chaos, or disease. There are many terms that can be used; divorce, war, conflict, sickness, storms, pain – the list goes on for the many ways that can describe systematic troubles. The term “law” refers to any principle, custom, agreement, or authority which has the purpose of preserving peace and harmony that prevents a system from developing chaos, returning to chaos, or from eventual destruction.

Social organizations are all about relationships. These include family units, business units, and governmental units. The concept of law refers to those rules written or unwritten that are intended to create a state of harmony by which a system is preserved. Laws of nature refer to laws that are not created by the created (system), but by the creator(s) that gives the system its life. In the case of the ecological system those laws of nature included natural laws such as gravitation, reproductive laws, and many laws that are relational in aspect, such as those mentioned about the air we breathe.

The importance of law is such that new organizations must institutionalize from the beginning the “laws” that should not be broken. The creation metaphor suggests that laws established by the creator are not to be changed by the created. We unfortunately live in a generation and a world where the concept of “constitutionality” has taken on new meaning. Negretto (2012) writes, “Since 1978, all countries in Latin American have either replaced or amended their constitution” (p. 749). Negretto notes this is the result of frequent crisis, political actors, judicial interpretations, or power grabs. In 2006, Filipinos tried to change the Philippine constitution, but lost (Gatmaytan-Mago, 2007, p. 1). In the United States, there is an ongoing debate over “the living constitution”, code for offering alternatives to the original interpretations

of the United States Constitution (Fleming, 2012, p. 1173). While the word constitution is defined as a “statement of fundamental law”, it also refers to the general physical and psychological makeup of a person, and secondly to the composition of how things are combined.

The point is that all too common today is the notion that if a law does not suit a particular group of people there is no danger in changing the law. The consideration of original intent is ignored, and along with it the vision of the creator. As we examine the natural laws at the time of creation, we must be concerned with the destructive forces in the world in which we live because the laws of reproduction, creation, and relationship – the laws of nature – are being ignored in such a way that humanity is more than ever before experiencing social crises.

In the context of organizational theory, the creation metaphor suggests that there is a danger when core values and customs are ignored during those times when change is being considered. The tendency to give in so easily to social clamoring is at an all-time high where the mantra of corporate social responsibility infers that organizations must accommodate every whim of diversity. While notions of CSR and needs of stakeholders are important, it must be remembered that not all organizational change is good change.

Creation is about relationship

Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) write, “Many organization theorists believe that complexity is best addressed using one or another version of network theory” (p. 332). Network theories like creation are all about relationships. Whether it refers to social structure, social capital, or social construction, how relationships develop, are maintained, and sustained involves a multi-disciplinary understanding of organizations. Organizational metaphors including marriage, machines, political entities, or cultures all speak to relationship.

The importance of relationships as they were conceptualized in creation was that each one was intended to be purposeful and meaningful. For example, animals were not suitable help-meets for man. This did not mean that animals could not provide a form of companionship, but the nature of animal-human relationships was limited. A different and greater role was included in the husband-wife relationship.

Metaphorically the purpose of relationships should be a concern for how organizations develop. Higher-order relationships, such as husband-wife, infer that some relationships are for growth while other relationships may supply only basic needs. Several aspects of relationship development can be drawn from the creation metaphor including developing concepts of the role of relationships, the temporary or permanent nature of a relationship, how to protect a relationship, and how to prioritize relationships.

Summary

The creation metaphor postulates that organizations are created by choice and sustained by the constant intervention of those we call creators. Rather than environmental determinism dictating the courses of action that form the organization, it is the nature of those endowed with the gift of creativity and the determination to succeed that are the most important influencers for the life of any organization. This includes the notion of creating a family or creating a business. It includes leaders in government or leaders in the community. However creating and building a family, organization, or government must not ignore the need for laws that preserve and sustain what is built. Suggested by scripture is this warning, "Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; Every man's work shall be made

manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (I Corinthians 3:12-13, KJV).

References

- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103–118.
- Changnon, S. (2006, Jan 30). Thunderstorm impacts: A mix of curses and blessings. Paper given at the 14th Joint Conference on the Applications of Air Pollution Meteorology with the Air and Waste Management Association. Retrieved from https://ams.confex.com/ams/Annual2006/techprogram/paper_105612.htm
- Gopalakrishnan, S., & Dugal, M. (1998). Strategic choice versus environmental determinism: A debate. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis (1993 - 2002)*, 6(2), 146.
- Fabre, J.-H. M. (2005). Air, necessary to life. *Chicago Review*, 51(1/2), 125.
- Fleming, J. E. (2012). Living originalism and living constitutionalism as moral readings of the American Constitution. *Boston University Law Review*, 92(4), 1171-1185.
- Gatmaytan-Magno, D. (2007). Changing constitutions: judicial review and redemption in the Philippines. *UCLA Pacific Basin Law Journal*, 25, 1.
- Haedicke, M. A. (2012). Keeping our mission: Changing our system: Translation and Organizational Change in Natural Foods Co-ops. *Sociological Quarterly*, 53(1), 44-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01225.x
- Hatch, M. J., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2006). *Organization Theory: modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives*. (2nd ed.). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kim, T.-Y., Hon, A. H. Y., & Deog-Ro, L. (2010). Proactive Personality and Employee Creativity: The Effects of Job Creativity Requirement and Supervisor Support for Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(1), 37-45. doi: 10.1080/10400410903579536
- Lawless, M. W., & Finch, L. K. (1989). Choice and Determinism: A test of Hrebiniak and Joyce's framework on strategy-environment fit. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 351-365.

Lamoureux, D. O. (2007). Gaps, design, & "theistic" evolution : a counter reply to Robert A. Larmer.

Christian Scholars Review Fall 2007.

Levickaitė, R. (2012). Interlinks of cultural and creative economies through creative products and services. *Kūltūros ir kūrybos ekonomikų sąsajos per kūrybinius produktus ir paslaugas.*, 4(3), 256-261. doi: 10.3846/mla.2012.40

Metzl, E. S., & Morrell, M. A. (2008). The Role of Creativity in Models of Resilience: Theoretical Exploration and Practical Applications. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 3(3), 303-318. doi: 10.1080/15401380802385228

Millican, P. (2010). Hume's Determinism. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 40(4), 611-642.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization* (Updated Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Negretto, G. L. (2012). Replacing and Amending Constitutions: The Logic of Constitutional Change in Latin America. *Law & Society Review*, 46(4), 749-779. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2012.00516.x

Shin, S.Y. & Park, W.W. (2013). What makes small and medium-sized enterprises promote organizational creativity: The contingency perspective. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 41(1), 71-82. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2013.41.1.71

Williams, C. (2012). *Effective Management (5th ed.)*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage.