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1. **Introduction**

Event System Theory (EST), introduced by Morgeson, Mitchell, and Liu (2015), offers a transformative dynamic perspective for understanding organizational change. Unlike frameworks emphasizing stable traits or gradual processes, EST uniquely positions discrete, impactful events as critical catalysts that reshape organizational trajectories, behaviors, and outcomes. This paradigm shift provides essential insights into why and how organizations evolve in response to specific occurrence that static models fail to adequately capture. EST's core value lies in its ability to illuminate the dynamic interplay between events and organizational systems, explaining phenomena such as latent potential activation during leadership transitions (Liu et al., 2015) or the profound motivational impact of seemingly mundane occurrences (Kiefer, 2025).

This review synthesizes EST's theoretical foundations, diverse empirical applications—spanning leadership emergence, crisis management, mergers, and policy entrepreneurship—and critical evaluations. While EST has demonstrably enhanced our understanding of event-driven change, critiques highlight areas for development, including operationalization challenges, under-explored cultural dimensions, and the simplification of event strength. By consolidating these insights, identifying methodological advancements (e.g., longitudinal designs, interdisciplinary integration), and outlining future research directions (e.g., AI-driven events, cross-cultural validation), this review aims to assess EST's contributions, address its limitations, and foster a more robust, predictive framework for analyzing organizational dynamics.

1. **Theoretical Foundations of Event System Theory**

Event System Theory (EST), introduced by Morgeson, Mitchell, and Liu (2015), provides a powerful theoretical framework for understanding how discrete, bounded occurrences fundamentally shape organizational dynamics, driving change across multiple levels (individual, team, organizational). Departing from perspectives emphasizing stable traits or incremental processes, EST centers on the catalytic role of events characterized by specific attributes, their temporal and spatial context, and their inherent potential to propagate and trigger adaptive responses within complex organizational systems.

**2.1 Core Conceptualization: The Nature and Attributes of Events**

Within EST, an event is defined as a specific, bounded incident occurring at a particular time and place, distinct from ongoing routines or processes. The impact potential of an event is primarily determined by three core attributes, collectively referred to as event strength (Morgeson et al., 2015; Lerman et al., 2020):

1. Novelty: The degree to which the event is unexpected, unfamiliar, or represents a departure from the norm. Novelty captures the element of surprise and unfamiliarity.
2. Disruption:The extent to which the event interrupts, displaces, or alters established routines, workflows, or expectations. Disruption signifies the break from continuity.
3. Criticality: The perceived importance, significance, or relevance of the event to the goals, values, or well-being of organizational actors (individuals, teams, the organization). Criticality reflects the stakes involved.

These attributes are not merely binary. The combination and intensity of novelty, disruption, and criticality determine an event's salience and its capacity to command attention and necessitate a response. For example, a major data breach exhibits high levels of all three (Zhao et al., 2025). Crucially, these attributes are often subjectively perceived and can evolve over the course of an event (Zhang et al., 2023).

* 1. **The Dynamics of Event Impact**

Events act as catalysts through distinct mechanisms:

1. Routine Interruption & Adaptation: High-strength events, particularly those high in disruption and criticality (e.g., a public health emergency; Liu et al., 2023), force organizations to deviate from established routines. This necessitates adaptation, such as implementing new security protocols (Zhao et al., 2025) or crisis communication strategies.
2. Triggering Learning and Knowledge Processes: Events, especially novel and disruptive ones, create situations demanding new solutions. This stimulates improvisation, problem-solving, and knowledge sharing as individuals and teams grapple with unfamiliar challenges (Chen et al., 2021; Lumineau et al., 2011).
3. Catalyzing Creativity and Innovation: Novel and critical events can push individuals and groups beyond existing frameworks, fostering creative thinking and the generation of non-normative ideas to address the situation (Chen et al., 2021).
4. Multi-Level Propagation:Crucially, events rarely remain contained. Their effects propagate across organizational levels (e.g., from an individual safety incident to team-wide safety protocols to organizational policy changes; Hu et al., 2021).

**2.3 The Role of Time and Space**

The impact of events is profoundly shaped by their temporal and spatial context.

1. Temporal Dynamics: In terms of duration, acute events (e.g., a project setback) often demand immediate reactive responses (e.g., resource reallocation). Longer-lasting events (e.g., evolving regulations) necessitate different, often structural, adaptations over time (Strizver & Ployhart, 2024). In terms of timing, the point at which an event occurs within a process or lifecycle is critical. Early-stage disruptions (e.g., in team formation) may allow for reconfiguration and potentially build long-term resilience. Disruptions occurring late in a process can cause irreversible damage to performance outcomes (Zhang et al., 2023).

2. Spatial Embeddedness: For location of origin, events can originate at different levels. Top-down events (e.g., strategic shifts initiated by leadership) typically propagate downward through formal structures. Bottom-up events (e.g., grassroots innovations) can exert upward pressure, influencing higher-level policies and strategies (Morgeson et al., 2015; Boo & Kim, 2022). For proximity, the physical or psychological closeness of actors to the event epicenter influences their perception and response intensity (Liu et al., 2023).

**2.4 Event Dissemination Mechanisms Across Organizational Levels**

A core tenet of EST is that events rarely remain isolated; their influence propagates dynamically across organizational levels, triggering adaptive responses and systemic change (Morgeson et al., 2015). Understanding the mechanisms governing this propagation, how event information, interpretations, and impacts disseminate, is crucial. This dissemination occurs through three interconnected pathways, further shaped by variations in how individuals and groups perceive the event itself.

* + 1. **Formal Institutional Channels**

Formal channels represent the official, structured pathways through which event-related information, directives, and responses flow within an organization's hierarchy. These include top-down and bottom-up Communication, like official announcements, policy directives, memos, scheduled meetings, reporting systems, and performance management processes. They play a role in ensuring sanctioned information dissemination and coordinated action. They also provide legitimacy and authority to the organizational response. One propagation example can be that a corporate merger announcement (Hu et al., 2021) issued via CEO email (macro), then formally cascaded through divisional briefings (meso), at last leading to revised team objectives and individual role adjustments (micro). However, these channels can be slow, filtered, and may lack nuance or suppress dissent.

* + 1. **Informal Communication Networks**

Informal networks encompass the unofficial, socially constructed connections among organizational members (e.g., friendship groups, communities of practice, "grapevines"). Their Characteristics are rapid, often unstructured, and carrying information, emotions, rumors, and interpretations that may diverge significantly from formal messages. They facilitate rapid information spread and collective sense-making, especially for ambiguous or emotionally charged events. One propagation example can be thatrumors about potential layoffs following a merger (Liu et al., 2023) spread quickly through coffee break conversations and messaging apps, then fueling anxiety and distrust (micro/ meso levels) potentially before or contradicting official reassurances. These channels significantly influence morale, psychological safety, and the informal interpretation of event criticality and disruptiveness.

* + 1. **Cognitive Framework Shifts (Sensemaking)**

This mechanism focuses on the interpretive processes through which individuals and collectives understand and assign meaning to events (Weick, 1995). Events, particularly novel or disruptive ones, challenge existing assumptions and mental models ("frames"), triggering sensemaking–the active process of constructing plausible explanations and shared understandings. The interpretation of an event (its meaning, causes, consequences) is fundamental to its dissemination. Collective sensemaking transforms an event from an isolated incident into a shared organizational reality, driving subsequent responses and further dissemination of this new understanding. One propagation example can be that a workplace safety incident (Hu et al., 2021) triggers discussions via both formal safety reviews and informal conversations, leading to a collective reframing of "safety" from a compliance issue to a core value (cognitive shift at micro/meso), resulting in the spontaneous formation of peer safety observation groups (behavioral change disseminating new practices micro/meso). This process is deeply intertwined with formal and informal channels, which provide the arenas and conduits for sensemaking discussions.

* + 1. **The Critical Role of Differences in Event Perception**

The pathway and impact of event dissemination are profoundly influenced by heterogeneity in how the event's core attributes are perceived across the organization. These differences stem from:

1. Individual Factors: role (e.g., executive vs. frontline worker), prior experience, expertise, and psychological traits (e.g., tolerance for ambiguity).

2. Situational Factors: proximity to the event epicenter (spatial & psychological), and timing of exposure.

3. Contextual Factors: cultural background, departmental subculture, and level of psychological safety.

The differences in event perception may influence the pathways of event dissemination in following aspect:

1. Propagation Initiation and Willingness. Individuals perceiving high criticality are more likely to initiate dissemination (e.g., report formally, warn colleagues informally). Those perceiving low novelty may dismiss it as unimportant.

2. Information Filtering and Distortion: Perceptions act as filters. A frontline worker might emphasize the disruptive impact on daily routines when discussing a new IT system, while an IT manager highlights its novelty and strategic criticality. This selective emphasis shapes the message disseminated through both formal and informal channels.

3. Channel Selection: Perceived event sensitivity or negativity may drive individuals towards informal networks for sharing concerns or seeking support, bypassing potentially slower or less receptive formal channels. Conversely, events perceived as requiring official action are more likely routed formally.

4. Sensemaking Dynamics and Framing Contests: Differing perceptions fuel divergent interpretations during sensemaking, leading to "framing contests." For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic (Liu et al., 2023), healthcare workers (high proximity, high perceived criticality/disruption) likely framed the event differently regarding stigma risks than the general public (lower proximity), influencing the content and emotional tone of disseminated narratives via media (mixed formal/informal) and community networks (informal). Similarly, in policy entrepreneurship (Chen & Yuan, 2021), government officials, entrepreneurs, and academics held distinct perceptions of a "technological window's" novelty and criticality, influencing how they advocated for policy changes through different channels and shaped the emerging policy consensus (cognitive shift).

**2.5 EST's Integrative Value**

By conceptualizing events as bounded incidents with specific attributes operating within temporal and spatial contexts, and recognizing their inherent capacity to propagate across levels through identifiable mechanisms, EST offers an integrative lens. It bridges micro-level perceptions and reactions with meso- and macro-level structural and strategic changes, providing a dynamic and systemic understanding of organizational evolution driven by discrete catalysts.

**3. Applications in Management Research**

The dynamic and multilevel nature of Event System Theory (EST) has positioned it as a valuable framework for examining organizational phenomena across diverse management contexts. By focusing on how events - defined by their novelty, disruption, and criticality - shape behaviors, structures, and outcomes, EST provides a lens to analyze organizational adaptation, leadership responses, and crisis management. This section synthesizes insights from empirical and theoretical studies to illustrate EST’s applicability in three key domains: organizational change and adaptation, team dynamics and leadership, and crisis management.

**3.1 Organizational Change and Adaptation**

EST has shown it can help explain how organizations deal with disruptions such as mergers, restructuring, or crises. For example, Raddatz (2024) used EST to look at how both positive and negative daily events during changes in organizations affect things like employee performance and commitment. He made a distinction between organizational-level events (e.g., mergers) and individual-level events (e.g., disruptions in workflow). It was found that the level of commitment that employees initially have towards changes in organizations influences how they anticipate daily events, which then affects their engagement and perceptions of fairness. Also, Morgeson et al. (2015) pointed out that events like mergers do not happen in isolation but tend to set off a chain reaction that spreads across different levels of the organization, changing routines and creating a need for adaptive actions. For instance, Liu et al. (2023) showed that mergers disrupt established norms within institutions, which forces organizations to make changes to their practices in order to keep up their legitimacy. This connects with the work of Peretz and Morley (2021), who discussed how de-globalization affects multinational corporations, where national and organizational contexts play a role in shaping how systemic changes relate to performance. EST, when viewed as a way of seeing organizational change as a series of events that are all connected, helps to show that resilience and agility come from the ability of organizations to reinterpret and adapt to the strength of these events over time, as seen in the works of Morgeson et al. (2015) and Raddatz (2024).

**3.2 Team Dynamics and Leadership**

EST’s approach on event features gives fresh thoughts on how leadership appears and how teams perform. For example, Liu et al. (2023) looked at how extracurricular activities impact leadership confidence in students, and they found that events which are disrupted or critical—but not necessarily new—predict leadership positions better, especially for those in formal roles. This is similar to Owen et al. (2015) who analyzed General Nathanael Greene’s leadership during the American Revolutionary War, focusing on how severe situations like lack of resources or strategic failures required leadership that was flexible and practical. EST also talks about how leaders’ reactions to events can change, based on where and when the events happen. A study by Chen et al. (2021) focused on policy entrepreneurs in China’s Optics Valley, showing that experts used critical events, like shifts in technology, to change the direction of policy by timing their actions and fitting with organizational structures. These kinds of studies highlight how EST can link leadership actions in response to events with team results, such as innovation (Li et al., 2024) or resilience in crises (Owen et al., 2015).

**3.3 Crisis and Emergency Management**

EST’s focus on the intensity of events and their timing fits well with theories on handling cascading disasters. Liu et al. (2023) used EST to study the stigma during the COVID-19 crisis, showing how event novelty and criticalness worsened public stigma, and how the closeness of the event and its length made the risks even greater. This is similar to Yao’s (2023) study on social enterprises, which found that critical events like environmental disasters created chances for entrepreneurial action by disrupting systems. EST also connects to a model that focuses on event features, management systems, and timing, by showing how strong events, like pandemics, interact with how prepared organizations are and the time pressures they face (Liu et al., 2023). For example, Kiefer et al. (2025) found that negative events during mergers caused trust issues, while positive events helped reduce backlash, showing how smaller events build up into larger effects. By combining EST with crisis management theories, researchers can better understand how events spread across systems and how to handle risks in broader context (Yao, 2023).

**4. Methodological Approaches**

**4.1 Empirical Designs**

Event System Theory, known as EST, focuses on events and their changing nature. Methods are needed which take into consideration different places and different times when events take place in organizations. Longitudinal designs, particularly experience sampling methods (ESM) have been deemed important when examining events and their impacts on behaviors and well-being of individuals. For instance, a particular study done by Reindl and colleagues (2021) observed daily events at work using ESM and explored how they related to people's well-being. This study displayed how sudden events, such as disruptions or interactions with other people, can lead to immediate and quick impacts on emotions. Another study led by Zacher (2021) and various associates employed a different approach, investigating changes in performance over time, looking particularly at the COVID-19 lockdown period and how different types of events influenced recovery, whether they were new, disruptive or significant. These kinds of methods appear to align with the concept of EST in regard to evolving events. Researchers have the ability to separate occurrences before, during, and after they happen, a crucial element for understanding how situations alter over time, as was indicated by the findings of Bliese and others (2017). The focus on events is emphasized by researchers. These methods do give attention to individual alterations in how events influence levels within organizations and across various times (Morgeson et al., 2015).

Nevertheless, measuring these transient events can introduce difficulties. This nature of events, which is often irregular and disparate, does not conform smoothly to typical static approaches. Morgeson et al. (2015) have pointed out that events typically do not have clear boundaries, which leads to the necessity for researchers to evaluate how new, disruptive, or vital an event might be, using scales to assess different perspectives. For example, Reindl et al. (2021) applied what is termed CAPTION taxonomy to categorize work-related events into seven broader classifications that include areas such as humor or adversity. This manner of categorization helps in moving away from overly simplistic labels that are either positive or negative regarding such events. However, issues related to memory biases and recall inaccuracies may still persist, particularly with events that might not be memorable. Zacher and his team (2021) attempted to tackle this challenge by conducting frequent assessments over time, which aids in minimizing forgetfulness of what transpired. The timing and durations of events add layers of complexity to this analysis as well. For example, discontinuous growth models that concentrate on timelines may be necessary for determining how events drive changes, rather than simply observing natural trends (2017). Enhancements within methodologies underscore the need to maintain tools that are flexible enough for engaging in event studies while considering the context, and managing the balance between thoroughness and practicality regarding measurements.

**4.2 Cross-Dimensional Integration in EST Methodologies**

EST could be described as a combination of various ideas coming from different disciplines. These fields include areas like organizational psychology, theories about personality, and frameworks surrounding crisis management, among others. This method becomes quite complex when additional ideas and frameworks are introduced into the equation. There were attempts made by researchers like Reindl and some of the others (2021), aiming to blend EST with something that has been called the CAPTION taxonomy. This taxonomy, which arises from personality psychology, has been used to group and categorize various work scenarios and events that happen in many organizations. Such blending of concepts has led to an expanded understanding of organizational research, offering a wider viewpoint on how different situations might be interpreted or perceived among individuals. Furthermore, Zacher and collaborators (2021) made efforts to link EST with various transition theories. They particularly focused on the impact of major events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which altered individual work performances significantly. These types of events have shown that major changes, like lockdowns imposed nationally, have the ability to affect individual behavior and personal responses (Morgeson et al., 2015). Similarly, research carried out by Bliese and his colleagues (2017) worked on connecting EST with developmental theories that describe growth. This study pointed out how resilience might change or evolve depending on several different factors. The approach adopted by them emphasizes that merging multiple disciplines together can improve prediction-making capabilities, and it makes it clear how EST has the potential to link larger events with individual behaviors. This helps in understanding how a multitude of different elements interact within real-world contexts more effectively.

**5. Critical Evaluation and Comparative Analysis**

**5.1 Strengths**

Event system theory (EST) looks at gaps that have been overlooked in traditional theories, particularly those that are more focused on static variables. EST sees events as key triggers for change in both organizations and individuals, which is quite different from other theories that focus on traits or external factors that are more stable. EST highlights how novel, disruptive, and critical events reshape trajectories (Morgeson et al., 2015). For example, research about leadership emergence (Liu et al., 2023) and entrepreneurial shifts (Seibert et al., 2021) shows how things like participating in activities or sudden shocks in the workplace can make people rethink their roles or their identity. This fits well with EST's focus on the timing and the setting of events, especially important in times of crisis, like during the COVID-19 pandemic. During this time, major shifts in how people worked, like moving to telecommuting (Hu & Subramony, 2022), forced organizations to make quick changes to their HR strategies (Zacher & Rudolph, 2022). EST’s importance can be seen in how often it has been cited in academic studies, ranking high in Chinese management research, and it has been applied to various fields like innovation (Li et al., 2024), policy development (Chen & Yuan, 2021), and social enterprises (Yao, 2023).

**5.2 Limitations**

Even though EST has its strengths, there are challenges that it faces when it comes to how event attributes are handled. Quantifying things like disruptiveness or how critical an event is, is something that’s still very subjective. For instance, in the case of studies about telecommuting during the COVID-19 pandemic, event novelty and criticality were measured through people’s own views, or what they felt, rather than using any clear or objective metrics (Hu & Subramony, 2022). The same issue arises in research on entrepreneurial passion, where it was difficult to separate the individual effects of novelty, disruption, and criticality (Li et al., 2024). There is also the limitation that EST doesn’t really look into cultural or cross-industry differences that much. Take the studies on policy entrepreneurship in China (Chen & Yuan, 2021) and social enterprises (Yao, 2023) as an example, where specific responses to events are noted, but there is no clear comparison with what happens in Western settings. This lack of a broad cultural approach limits EST’s ability to be applied universally. The flexibility of institutions and the capacity of workforces - which are major factors in the performance of multinational corporations during de-globalization (Peretz & Morley, 2021) - vary a lot between different regions, which adds another level of complexity to the EST framework.

**5.3 Comparison with Other Theories**

EST is seen to be complementing traditional theories like Schneider’s (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model, but it does go off in different directions. The ASA model is all about how person-organization fit stays stable, focusing on aligning individuals through their traits that don’t really change much. EST, however, explains how events—something that happens in the moment—can change the way people see fit, like how telecommuters had to adjust their work-family balance during times of crisis (Hu & Subramony, 2022). Similarly, EST offers something new in leadership theories, as it talks about leadership emerging because of events, rather than focusing on personal traits, which is what transformational leadership looks at when it talks about stable behaviors. When comparing EST to resource-based views, it has a better understanding of how significant events (like pandemics) shake up the dependencies of resources, such as in how social enterprises find new opportunities (Yao,2023). But EST also shares some overlap with career construction theory when it comes to explaining entrepreneurial transitions, as it shows how major events impact identity and aspirations (Seibert et al., 2021). EST’s approach, unlike contingency theories, which mainly focus on fitting into the environment, emphasizes adaptability driven by events, offering a more detailed way to look at crisis management (Zacher & Rudolph, 2022).

**6. Future Research Directions**

The theory of Event Systems, or EST, has come out as a way of looking at how organizations work, but it is still not used much in modern times. Some areas in research seem important and stand out, and these areas offer chances for better understanding, more precise methods, and bringing more use in real-world situations.

**6.1 Theoretical Extensions**

Bringing the changes driven by digital transformations into the EST framework is vital. AI-driven events, such as when something unusual happens in decisions made by algorithms or when systems suddenly fail in real-time, this calls into question the old ways of thinking about event importance and newness. A good example is how AI-enhanced data analytics can create events on their own by predicting anomalies. This is something that requires models that are new, to understand how automated event detection changes the way organizations respond to things (Ravichandran, 2022). Another important thing to consider is the relationship between micro and macro levels. Individual responses to AI-related events in organizations, like when feedback comes from algorithms on performance, could change how teams adapt to things. Research should look into how different levels of event importance - such as novelty, disruption, and criticality - appear differently in situations where humans and AI are working together. This is especially true when machine learning models on their own trigger operational events, something that is becoming more common and important (Morgeson et al., 2015).

**6.2 Methodological Innovations**

Big data analytics and IoT structures are now being used in ways that allow things to be tracked more than ever before, such as events flowing through organizations. There is a possibility that future studies might take advantage of real-time business intelligence systems to better understand how things like disruptions in supply chains spread through decision-making systems powered by AI, leading to repeated feedback loops (Ravichandran, 2022). It seems that there has not been much research done on how EST principles hold up across different cultures, which means more studies comparing critical event thresholds in different types of governance could be needed.

**6.3 Practical Implications**

Creating AI-enhanced tools for managing events could help leaders to predict how events might develop using analytics based on predictions. Studies related to military leadership (Owen et al., 2015), which have shown how patterns from past events can inform how crises are managed, may be adapted to how risks are handled in businesses. Also, policy frameworks that deal with systemic risks need to be updated so that they can address AI-driven event systems, especially when it comes to setting up protocols for auditing ethical AI regarding events that trigger themselves.

**7. Conclusion**

Event system theory (EST) has changed the way management research is thought about. The focus now is not just on static parts of an organization but on dynamic processes driven by events. This theory gives a framework for understanding the broader changes. This framework is able to connect both the small and large picture by showing how smaller events can move across different levels of hierarchy, leading to changes in both the behavior of individuals and how norms in institutions are shaped.

But while EST has added value, there are still things left to fix. One of the problems is how methods are used in studying it. For example, people might depend too much on self-reported event perceptions, which can cause mixing up of the true characteristics of events with how individuals interpret them. By combining EST with things like AI-driven systems to detect events and real-time network analysis within organizations (Ravichandran, 2022), it might be possible to measure the strength of events in a clearer way, while also tracking how they spread across space and time. Additionally, studies across different cultures are needed because, as shown by studies like that of Chen and Yuan (2021) on policy in China, different institutional settings can affect how events are experienced and their effects. In the future, it might be important to look at how the features of events relate to each other; for example, exploring whether novelty makes disruption stronger in cases like adopting new technology (Li et al., 2024).

The complexity of modern organizational systems keeps evolving, and because of this, different kinds of methodologies need to be adapted. It can be said that researchers should integrate EST frameworks with other frameworks from different disciplines. This kind of integration can help in conducting studies and analyses in a better manner, or perhaps a more thorough manner. As for the practitioners, they might want to use the principles of EST for the creation of governance systems that are more agile and adaptable. These systems, ideally, could rely on real-time event simulations which will allow for the anticipation of various risks or opportunities. Looking at the broader picture, EST could have transformative potential in connecting the different silos of disciplines and offering a unified way, or at least a language, for analyzing how individual events or things come together and bring about systemic changes within organizations. The capacity for bridging different areas could lead to systemic shifts in understanding the overall organizational dynamics.
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