ABSTRACT
Organizational Management reached a watershed in the 1980s when theoretical concerns turned to organizational structure versus individual action. Since then, entrepreneurship theorists have taken a keen interest in management theory informing themselves of insights coming from the organizational field. This paper creates an opportunity to contrast the two approaches which are seen in a paradoxical relationship to each other. In the process existential anxiety is identified as a hindrance to decision-making and the flow of day-to-day forward progress. A literature on uncertainty and risk helps to clarify uncertainty which is often behind anxiety while it is being experienced. Two items from recent research give support to managing all such uncertainty.

INTRODUCTION
If the words creative-destruction, chaos, disequilibrium, unpredictability are read in an engaging way, each word can produce an emotional reaction to some degree. In the world of commerce, one person may respond by feeling challenged, energised or wanting to seize an opportunity, another may cringe, feel afraid or hear alarm bells ringing. Such are some of the elements which comprise entrepreneurship, and which confront organizational structures, also. Elements which distinguish an entrepreneurial culture at work are when some hearers recognize that from the disintegration of destruction, ideas, methods or ways of being, and meaning-making can be rechannelled creatively. Chaos does not need to spell – end, but rather, becomes enfolded into a new mix of outcomes. From the descriptor disequilibrium, a different perspective on organizational life may also be given; and implied in unpredictability is the possibility that intentional action is being taken.

One of the salient realizations of a paper such as this is the tradition from which has emerged the Structure::Action debate. On the one hand organizational social-structure represents aggregates and collective activity which is construed as macro-level phenomenon. At the same time individual action is regarded as a micro-level phenomenon participated in by individuals. One point worth noting is that organizational structure permits measurement—the basis of empiricism and determinism. Conversely, action is subjective and ephemeral and requires interpretation.
This paper sets out to contrast the two schools of thinking namely – Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management. It also brings forward a need to include the part anxiety plays in an existing organization and questions an absence of creativity in much of organizational life. Of great concern to Blau (1964), Coleman (1986), Poole and Van de Ven (1989) were the biases between action and structure which crept in when earlier theory was being articulated eg. Parsons (1951), Merton (1948), Giddens (1976). From the 1980s there has been awareness amongst Action::Structure researchers of theoretical creep towards micro or macro poles.

A preferred position is taken here which sees Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management theories in a paradoxical relationship which of necessity produce some theoretical tensions (Van de Ven and Poole 1989) and Van de Ven (1989). These will be discussed in the section Contrasting Viewpoints. In addition, the place of anxiety is introduced as central to this discussion as it is a human behaviour experienced by human beings both individually and collectively. Van de Ven (1989) in an editorial comment highlighted a need to take time into account in exploring when contrary assumptions/processes each exert a separate influence on poles of a paradox. The view of this paper is to include anxiety as a mediating variable along with temporality and spatial dimensions. Whereas these two latter can be modelled in stochastic analyses, anxiety (whether state or trait) is a behavioural intrusion for theorists of both Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management to consider. Such consideration, it is thought, needs to be given to the presence of anxiety for future inclusion in theory-making.

Human beings who become threatened by unpredictability in particular, or disequilibrium, or chaos, or creative destruction, are threatened by risk or uncertainty. Uncertainty leads to Anxiety—the corollary manifests as lethargy or inaction. It is neglectful and inconsistent when theories of Action or Structure fail to take the presence of anxiety into account. There is also imprecision with doing research which includes individual human behaviours but ignores the ubiquitousness of the Anxiety dimension.

Need to Include an Anxiety Quotient in Theory-making:

This paper is intended to appeal to the reader—both individual or leader in an organization, also to scholars in the fields of Entrepreneurship or Organizational Management to consider the intraorganizational and intrapsychic stress which inhabits the lifestyles of many in commerce. Perhaps one could notice the shape of the amorphous mass of anxiety carried around by people in both management and the workforce. And a question could be asked “Could things become different if the Action::Structure paradox was better understood or more holistically synthesized?”

Since the late 1990s there has been an unprecedented rise in stress levels—both in homes, and in institutions and organizations where people work. Much of this stress translates into anxiety which is:

(a) there in the first place as a trait in a person; or
(b) accrued in response to the social or organizational environment. How can the Anxiety construct be factored in to the Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management literature? It is argued that anxiety is expressed in different behaviours by those in Entrepreneurship, or Organizational Management?

In their convincing argument about presenting good theory Poole and Van de Ven (1989) articulated four ways for improving theory building. They advocated utilizing tensions, oppositions and contradictions for richer theory making. Primarily, they encouraged scholars to:

1. Accept a Paradox (exists) and use It Constructively.
2. Clarify Connections between Organizational Levels eg. part-whole, micro-macro, individual-society (Spatial).
4. Advance a New Conception of the Action::Structure relationship (which corrects for flaws in logic, or broadens the perspective). This dissolve the paradox.

Along with spatial and temporality, the inclusion of an Anxiety Quotient (4) is suggested as the important contribution of this paper. Point (4) above would then become point (5) which in the view of Poole and Van de Ven permits a creative way of teasing out a variety of difficult perspectives which
could potentially lead to new insights. A wrestling process is being advocated for by which a signalling insight quite often leads to novelty or discovery (Poole and Van de Ven, 1989). Alternatively, avoidance of paradox may be biased towards process steps and limited theoretical perspective-taking.

**THEORY ABOUT ORGANIZATIONS AS PARADOXICAL AND SOCIAL**

Organizational Management theories involve a special type of paradox (Poole and Van de Ven, 1989). They are social paradoxes because of people who inhabit an organization, and who are at one and the same time—individuals. It is possible to ignore the social aspect of organizational theory and for (A) a structural, deterministic bias to creep in; or (B) for a theorist to write on behalf of individual action. As has already been stated, human behaviour needs interpreting. Alternatively, if cumulative theory is seen as paradoxical, tensions and inconsistencies may be brought to light and the Action:: Structure relationship may be seen as a dilemma, instead of something which is unresolvable.

If the suggestion of this paper is followed, there are four (2 – 5) generic ways by which theories (A) or (B) may be related.

1) Keeping (A) and (B) separate and their contrasts appreciated...
2) Situate (A) and (B) at two different spatial levels in the social world eg. macro-micro levels (Nielson, 1967).
3) Separate (A) and (B) temporally in the same location.
4) Recognize through role conformity and lack of initiative that an Anxiety Quotient likely exists.
5) Find a new perspective which provides overlap and eliminates oppositional distance between (A) and (B).

Thus, within 1 – 5 there is opposition, spatial separation, temporal separation, an anxiety quotient and synthesis. By considering Entrepreneurship theory as one school of thinking (Ent) and Organizational Management theory as another school (OM) a way opens up to appreciate their contrasting characteristics.

**Contrasting viewpoints on behalf of Organizational Management and Entrepreneurship:**

While on the one hand people in organizations are individuals, the organization structures constrain action, even to shaping individual desires/antagonisms and purposes. On this point Poole and Van de Ven (1989:562) wrote “Individual actors create and maintain structures, but an organization is a powerful social institution with a life of its own.” An astute observer can recognize the disengagement in people created by a structural system which has solidified. And it is in the nature of organizations to impose structure from above. There may be inconsistencies of other kinds which create tension, also. The life of an organization is a macro-level structural issue. Macro-level structures draw out dissatisfaction and anxiety amongst both those who lead and those who serve an organization.

In addition, people are individuals who bring themselves to work each day with their raw energy and a range of emotions which can be either motivated or stifled. The issue of purposive action on the part of individuals has proved problematic for theorists. At an intrapsychic micro-level all members of an organization come with personal agendas of what happened last night (or before breakfast). The action quotient of the paradox is fraught with unquantifiable measurement of ephemerals. These may be mood states or anxiety which is created externally to the organization which then becomes present to an actor at work.

Conversely, from within the field of Entrepreneurship it is thought that genuine entrepreneurs handle anxiety provocation better than most. Once committed to a course of action it is likely an entrepreneur may act in a non-linear fashion to achieve perceived goals, and thus live with uncertainty. For example, once the first employee is taken on, then five, then ten, a startup company has others depending upon it and the founder for regular wages and sustainable employment. Oftentimes a satisfactory ‘structure’ is lacking, leading to an ad hoc structural way of proceeding, but the micro-level action engenders goodwill, ambition and enthusiasm within loyal, individual actors. These elements foreshadow goal-directed behaviour.

It is known that the role of in-house Human Resources units is designed to interface with and offset likely antagonisms present in a large organization. This contribution does not purport to speak to its
usefulness. Rather, the focus here is to invite the reader to be open-minded in the presence of bureaucratic structures which require role-taking at all levels. Role-taking has currently morphed into conformity (lack of initiative-taking) and inefficiencies expressed as assertiveness (or defensiveness using the tool of ‘broken record’). All-in-all, importance of the customer ceases to be so important and such role-taking becomes a foil or protective shield for the individual Self.

Following are four ways for good theory building as applied to Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management:

1) The analysis below does not set Entrepreneurship or Organizational Management in opposition to the other but seeks to contrast and evaluate the paradoxical nature of the relationship.

2) Using the Van de Ven and Astley (1981) and Van de Ven and Poole (1988) figure illustrating structural forms and personnel actions at micro and macro levels of organizations, we find the structural forms bureaucratized in order to facilitate the macro structure. Individual actions are required to be expressed through roles satisfactory to levels of Management. These may be expressed by individuals, through committees, to board/executive levels. These are aggregated as collective action in the Poole and Van de Ven figure (p.570). Organizational Management structures are unable to share with the Entrepreneurship approach initiative-taking which leads to creativity—and not because one is many times larger than the small to medium venture. Entrepreneurial ventures are bottom-heavy at the personal action level, full of uncertainty; and it is likely they have much less macro-level structure. However, a shared vision with the founder of an entrepreneurial venture generates enthusiasm for the anticipated goals. In this respect, Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management are different. Also, it is in the nature of a start-up company to have an exit strategy wherein its founder leaves before the company becomes bureaucratic. And an entrepreneur/founder may birth another start-up company in a serial manner.

3) In order for this analysis to be holistic a temporal component is also commented on. The life-cycle approach of a larger organization responds to markets and growth, is based upon investment and share-capital, and responds to economic trends. A smaller entrepreneurial venture, as it grows, depends upon venture capital (or angel investors) to succeed. All such have an equity interest in the company which may live through booms and busts. Those which succeed will be viable.

4) Bureaucratic conformity will be high in the organization; uncertainty will be a constant companion in the entrepreneurial venture. However, an entrepreneur’s anxiety threshold, referred to above as anxiety provocation, enables an entrepreneur to live with creative-destruction, chaos, disequilibrium and unpredictability. There are always challenges and operational tensions which stimulate a search for creative solutions. Ethical entrepreneurship thrives on uncertainty which is not the same as risk—risk can be quantified or measured.

5) New Conception by theorists of the Structure::Action relationship in organizations is desirable if conformity is to be challenged and initiative stimulated. This begs the question as to whether a market-driven organizational structure can reinvent itself along genuinely creative lines. But, it is thought, further growth is possible incrementally.

**REVIEWING A LITERATURE**

Where synthesis of an Action::Structure relationship is desired, and learning from either Entrepreneurship (Ent) or Management (OM) theory is indicated, it seems important to view the overarching presence of anxiety borne of uncertainty as distinct from risk. Uncertainty about life and uncertainty created within an organization creates anxiety states which lead to people feeling immobilized. Uncertainty in relation to economic matters is tied to future outcomes with attendant anxiety, also. “Uncertainty of the future is implied in the notion of action” (von Mises, 1949:105). Ignorance about insufficiently known natural phenomenon and about human acts of choice “taints all human actions with uncertainty” (p.105) von Mises claimed. It is refreshing to see his analysis is still current. In von Mises’ view every action refers to an unknown future as follows: “Future needs and valuations, the reaction of men to changes in conditions, future scientific and technological knowledge, future ideologies and policies can never be foretold with more than a greater or smaller degree of probability” (p.106). Risk can be quantified and is clarified further in Knight (1921) below.
Writing on Opportunity and Uncertainty, McMullen and Shepherd (2006:133) state “Those who decide to act entrepreneurially are distinguishable from those who do not.” The two research streams identified by them are:

Amount of Uncertainty; and
Willingness to bear Uncertainty

It is conjectured that a person’s tolerance to bear uncertainty is a critical capacity which ultimately propels some to act entrepreneurially, and others to desist. Without this high tolerance level referred to, anxiety which sets in can be disabling—if not immediately, then in the long term.

**Distinction between Risk and Uncertainty:**
Knight (1921) established an important distinction between risk and uncertainty:

“Uncertainty must be taken in a sense radically distinct from the familiar notion of Risk, from which it has never been properly separated…The essential fact is that ‘risk’ means in some cases a quantity susceptible of measurement, while at other times it is something distinctly not of this character; and there are far-reaching and crucial differences in the bearings of the phenomena depending on which of the two is really present and operating…It will appear that a measurable uncertainty, or ‘risk’ proper, is so far different from an unmeasurable one that it is not in effect an uncertainty at all.”

As a mathematical formula risk is (the probability that some event will occur) multiplied by (the consequences if it does occur). Genuine uncertainty, on the other hand, cannot be assigned such a (well grounded) probability. Such genuine uncertainty can often not be reduced significantly by attempting to gain more information about the phenomenon in question and its causes (Andersen et al, 2004).

**Unexpected or genuine Uncertainty:**
At an earlier time (mid 1920s) a polarization of views arose amongst physicists who were accomplished at studying the nature of physical systems. Once their interest in sub-atomic particles developed, Schrodinger and his colleagues espoused the new wave mechanics to the old quantum theory. Heisenberg and his closest colleagues who espoused the matrix form of quantum mechanics introduced uncertainty relations (now referred to as the Uncertainty Principle) (http://www.aip.org/history/heisenberg). This took account of an atom’s position, uncertainty of momentum, uncertainty in its energy with its uncertainty of location in time.

Heisenberg’s mentor Bohr, claimed that events in tiny atoms are subject to quantum mechanics; yet people deal with larger objects in the laboratory where the classical physics of Newton prevail. Scientists needed to connect observations in the everyday world with events and processes in the quantum world of the atom. There is an analogy here with theory for systems, and individuals. A cosmological system gives the observer within it a single-dimensional view of the macro-level; whereas viewing an individual in that system (having recognition of the four Heisenberg uncertainties) yields a three-dimensional view. Both inner and outer, or psychological and spiritual as well as physical behaviours become the reality. A 3-D view sharpens the focus of research. This is in the nature of McMullen and Shepherd’s uncertainty, where the inner world and the psychological makeup of individuals applies.

In reporting on experimental constraints and consciousness Tiller (1997) illustrates the unseen aspects as follows: -

“In the first experiment, there was no observer constraints placed on the ultimate result and my qualitative recollections of sharpness/bluntness was the final measurement gauge. I had allowed the universe maximum freedom to express itself in novel as well as in ordinary ways. In the second experiment, I interjected an observer constraint of a quantitative nature and asked for a result that violated physical experience. I didn’t get such a result: I did not proceed with other experiments of this nature because I was becoming aware of the possibility that if one wishes to observe subtle energy effects then one should not constrain the experimental protocol too tightly. It began to seem as if a type of Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle could be operating here on a global scale and that one should minimize physical observer effects in order to maximize possible subtle domain effects” (p.234).
Genuine uncertainty can often not be assuaged by amassing more information as is the case with much of organizational life. The field of economics, also, is highly predictive with probabilistic forecasting and decisions based upon the weight of opinion. Yet the elements of entrepreneurial action embody knowledge, motivation and a stimulus leading to a belief qualified by uncertainty (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006). Uncertainty is seen by Entrepreneurship theorists as detrimental to entrepreneurial action when properties such as hesitancy, indecisiveness and procrastination are thought to lead to missed opportunities (Casson, 1982), (Dewey, 1933; Yates and Stone, 1992).

Therefore, the focus here of amassing more information for the predictive purposes of risk analysis speaks to the research stream (1) of a type ‘A’ (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006) structure using knowledge which may then become a barrier to action. The following refers to the micro-level of human action expressed in an unwillingness to bear anxiety. Presence of an anxiety syndrome which may set in can affect cognition, or have endocrinal, psychosomatic or physiological symptoms. Such anxiety may also have multiple manifestations eg. lack of concentration, obsessive thoughts, feelings of overwhelm or helplessness and many other symptoms of discomfort.

As a condition, anxiety can become a nightmare for those hovering in indecision. While amounting to physiological effects or a churning feeling, in its extreme form anxiety, because of too much uncertainty, can be paralyzing. Add to this the human tendency towards entropy and a scenario exists whereby people in organizations who do not have autonomous actions opt for staying in their (so called) comfort zones. In such a zone a person may produce a predictable outcome, or routine functions. This suggests however, that a leader in an organization, or an employee operating constantly in his/her comfort zone, fails to excel or apply themself in decision-making, through being captive to anxiety which limits them.

RECENT RESEARCH
In the neurosciences, brain imaging became well advanced in the 1990s. As a tool for research, Positron Emission Tomography (PET) and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is uncovering some of the mystery associated with brain functioning. An organ in the brain which encodes situational emotional meanings in a person is the Amygdala. Traces for ambiguity or uncertainty have shown up in MRI. Associations about danger or threat suggest that the Amygdala is also involved. Whalen (1998) credited the Amygdala with interpreting situations which contain uncertainty by reason of finding MRI measures within the Amygdala (Rosen and Donley, 2006).

Such activity in the brain habituates after subsequent presentations of stimulus, so that the individual concerned becomes accustomed to danger or threat. Many people are ever cautious or live constantly on the look out for unpleasant stimuli which could engulf them. In commerce challenging situations may be promising or aversive—but the preferred position for many individuals is in their comfort zones. In addition to the Rosen and Donley (2006) contribution above, they are also reporting that mechanisms of emotional learning about stimuli (eg. uncertainty or threat) can be independent of consciousness (Damasio, 1994; Dolan, 2002; LeDoux, 1996).

The Amygdala is thought to play a role in appraisal during times of uncertainty and heightened vigilance (Rosen and Donley, 2006). There is now sufficient evidence that the Amygdala is also involved in positively valenced emotion in both humans and animals (Baxter and Murray, 2002). Whalen (1998) believes that the Amygdala “is engaged most readily by biologically relevant, associative ambiguity, defined as learning situations in which stimuli have more than one possible interpretation—leading to more than one prediction of subsequent biologically relevant events” (p.181). Therefore, the Amygdala can also be thought about as a ‘relevance detector’ (Sander et al, 2003); although research supports the notion that the Amygdala may be engaged differentially in situations of expected uncertainty (risk) and unexpected uncertainty (Rosen and Donley, 2006).

How often across the passage of time have great discoveries come about as a deduction from what was not supposed to happen, or the unexpected? Recent research into the field of Social Entrepreneurship has brought to light data about Intentional Action, Persistence and Depression-resilience (Gillin, 2006). Although a connection to anxiety is made obliquely, nevertheless a start has been made to capture data which identifies anxiety-prone leaders and employees. Once identified as anxiety, the proposition of this paper (that “the existence of externally and internally generated anxious behaviours are constricting and of enormous hindrance to having a potentially motivated workforce and productivity),
ongoing research may be able to speak to the parent disciplines of Organizational Management and Entrepreneurship.

Currently, a fourteen item list of assertions were taken from a larger instrument administered to Social Entrepreneur Leaders and Support Team personnel. Late in 2007 these were administered to MBA enrollees. Respondents were intentional, persevering and feel a personal responsibility to make things better. Sixty-nine percent were not beset by depression, using the occasional blue mood as a motivator to break through personal circumstances with good outcomes. An impression to emerge is that those who attend coursework, in addition to working, are at the achieving end of a continuum in the workforce. This pilot needs to be directed at anxiety states/trait instead of depression, and to be markedly refined. A response set needs to be found which more accurately reflects employees in general because these results were inconclusive—a work in progress.

In contrast to OM personnel, a profile of Support Team persons (in the social entrepreneurship research referred to here), gives insight about a special relationship between leader and lead in the field. A ‘Support Team’ is inseparable from a Social Entrepreneur/CEO. It enhances and adds exponential value to what a social entrepreneur can do alone. Enthusiasm raises energy levels, together with inspirational and positive beliefs and attitudes, joy in serving and personal satisfaction levels. These all help in cohesing the team (Gillin, 2006:268), and producing desirable outcomes.

CONCLUSION
Anxiety in the workplace is the topic of this paper. Set against a backdrop of Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management the suggestion is made that an anxiety quotient be included in theorizing about the field of commerce. Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management are in a paradoxical relationship to each other as they interact with market forces.

From Organizational Management theory has come the framework of the Action::Structure paradox. This has proved useful in examining the micro-macro levels of real world organizations and institutions. Facility to be able to use spatial and temporal factors further tease out differences in preparation for some synthesis, also. From Entrepreneurship a phenomenon is recognized amongst entrepreneurs wherein they are a class of people who handle anxiety associated with uncertainty better than most. Their approach to life at a motivational level is one of freedom and possibility thinking – nonlinear, rather than one of restriction.

A case is made to admit an anxiety quotient in seeking to advance a new conception which sees Entrepreneurship and Organizational Management as related and capable of learning from each other. This present view sees the existence of externally and internally generated anxious behaviours as constricting and of enormous hindrance to having a potentially motivated workforce and productivity. Bureaucratic structures contribute to perceptions of accomplishing much but keeping people in a safe zone with lowered productivity.

It is intended that the use of a small literature has assisted in clarifying differences between risk and uncertainty. Future research design promises to increase data collection on individuals who are ‘actors’ in the field of Commerce. Through the lens of Neuroscience the reader is brought up-to-date with findings from Magnetic Resonance Imaging, adding finer points about the brain physiology of humans. Having said that entrepreneurial action is associated with tolerance to bear uncertainty, and such uncertainty is indeterminate, it is now emphasized that high level tolerance to bear uncertainty is an antidote to discomfort and anxiety. For many in organizations the risks outweigh anxiety management. Capitalist activity is built on hierarchies of responsibility in a seamless series of role-taking promotions to become ‘higher up’ in a profit-making organization, or the bureaucracy. There is a systemic disadvantage to acting entrepreneurially in these instances. Even a vote of the shareholders can seriously reshape a publicly listed company.

A new wave of research on how to express an anxiety quotient and how to factor it in to the Action::Structure paradox is a next step in theory-making. Also, once it is accepted that anxiety exacts its toll, if steps are taken to synthesize and apply Action::Structure learning, a promising holistic approach will be in place for organizations as well as entrepreneurship ventures.
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