

Distinct Approaches Utilized by Leaders to Defend Organizational Legitimacy

Posted on September 12, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/distinct-approaches-utilized-by-leaders-to-defend-organizational-legitimacy/>

Introduction

Organizational legitimacy is the perception that an institution's actions are appropriate, credible, and consistent with accepted social norms, values, and expectations. Leaders do not create legitimacy by declaration; it is granted by employees, customers, investors, regulators, professional bodies, communities, and other audiences that judge whether the organization deserves trust and support. Legitimacy matters because organizations depend on these audiences for resources, cooperation, authority, and reputation. A crisis can arise when performance fails, misconduct becomes visible, regulations change, or social expectations evolve faster than organizational practices. Leaders generally respond through two broad approaches. Substantive management changes what the organization actually does by altering structures, resources, procedures, incentives, or leadership arrangements. Symbolic management changes how decisions and actions are explained, framed, and understood. The two approaches are most effective when combined. Communication without genuine reform can appear manipulative, while meaningful reform that is poorly communicated can remain invisible or misunderstood. Defending legitimacy therefore requires alignment between organizational conduct, stakeholder expectations, and credible explanation.

Substantive Legitimacy Requires Real Organizational Change

Substantive management strengthens legitimacy by changing the conditions that created the problem. Leaders may improve role performance, comply with regulatory or institutional demands, reduce harmful resource dependencies, or replace outdated practices with systems that better match stakeholder expectations. A hospital facing patient-safety failures, for example, cannot restore trust merely by announcing that safety is important; it may need new procedures, staffing practices, training, reporting mechanisms, equipment, and independent review. Coercive pressures from regulators or investors can also push organizations toward stronger controls, although formal compliance has little value if implementation remains superficial. Resource dependence matters because an organization that relies excessively on one investor, supplier, or political sponsor may struggle to act independently or credibly. Leaders can diversify partnerships, revise incentives, and

adopt recognized standards when those changes improve actual performance. Substantive reform should therefore be judged by observable changes in outcomes, accountability, and practice rather than by the existence of a new policy document or leadership announcement. (Suchman, 1995; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983)

Symbolic Management Is Not Automatically Deception

Symbolic management focuses on interpretation, communication, and meaning. Leaders may explain a controversial decision, acknowledge a failure, apologize, frame an organizational goal in socially accepted terms, or use ceremonies and public commitments to signal alignment with stakeholder values. These actions are not inherently dishonest because stakeholders need explanations to understand why decisions were made and what reforms are intended. Symbolic management becomes problematic when leaders use language to conceal misconduct, deny well-supported evidence, or create the appearance of responsibility without changing the underlying system. An effective apology, for example, should identify what happened, accept appropriate responsibility, explain corrective action, and show how recurrence will be prevented. Reframing can also be legitimate when it adds context, but it should not rename harm in order to make it appear acceptable. Ceremonial structures such as ethics committees, diversity policies, or sustainability statements may initially serve symbolic purposes, yet they can become substantive if leaders provide authority, resources, and measurable accountability. The distinction therefore depends less on whether communication is symbolic and more on whether communication is anchored in reality.

Why Stakeholders Judge Words Against Actions

Legitimacy is fragile because stakeholders compare what organizations say with what they can observe. A company that repeatedly promotes safety while tolerating unsafe practices, or claims commitment to equality while rewarding discriminatory behavior, creates a gap between symbolic presentation and substantive conduct. That gap can intensify a crisis because audiences may interpret inconsistency as hypocrisy rather than ordinary error. Leaders should therefore begin by identifying which form of legitimacy is threatened. Pragmatic legitimacy concerns whether stakeholders receive valued benefits, moral legitimacy concerns whether conduct is judged appropriate or ethical, and cognitive legitimacy concerns whether the organization is understood and accepted as a normal part of the social environment. Different problems require different responses. Poor service may demand operational reform, an ethical violation may require accountability and restitution, and unfamiliar organizational change may require explanation and education. Leaders also need feedback because legitimacy cannot be measured solely from inside the organization. Surveys, complaints, regulatory findings, employee reports, media coverage, and community consultation can reveal whether intended reforms are visible and credible.

Conclusion

Leaders defend organizational legitimacy most successfully when substantive and symbolic approaches reinforce one another. Real change addresses the practices, structures, or dependencies that created stakeholder concern, while credible communication explains what changed, why it changed, and how the organization will be held accountable. Substantive action without communication may fail to rebuild trust because stakeholders cannot see the reform, while symbolic messaging without operational change eventually damages credibility. The practical task is therefore to align performance with accepted expectations and to communicate that alignment honestly. Role performance, compliance, resource restructuring, and institutional reform can improve actual conduct; acknowledgment, justification, apology, and public commitments can help audiences interpret those changes. Neither category should be treated as inherently good or bad. The ethical question is whether leadership reduces the gap between appearance and reality. Organizations maintain legitimacy when their statements, incentives, procedures, and observable outcomes tell a consistent story and when stakeholders have enough information and voice to judge that story for themselves.

References

- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). The double-edge of organizational legitimation. *Organization Science*, 1(2), 177-194.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.