



Organization Development and Change

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Winter 2006

Published by the ODC Division

CALL FOR PAPERS AND SYMPOSIA

Michael Manning
Program Chair
New Mexico State University

Clearly 2006 is the time to be in Atlanta – this next year’s venue for the Academy of Management Meetings. Although it seems like we just returned from the sun, sand, and surf of Hawaii, planning for the Atlanta meetings has already started. And it is not too early to start thinking about your participation in the Atlanta AOM Meetings. The deadline for submitting papers and symposia to the ODC Division is Monday, January 9th, 2006, 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

Knowledge, Action, and the Public Concern is the Academy of Management’s conference theme for 2006. This year’s theme explores the linkages among organizational knowledge, managerial action and the major issues that face people in the global and knowledge economy. The following three questions are posed:

- What are our success stories and what actions can we confidently advocate?
- What are likely to be our next success stories?
- What do our scientific theories, empirical research and recommendations for evidence-based actions inform us about the larger issues of public concern?

We invite colleagues to submit papers and symposia that address this conference theme. In addition, submissions related to traditional ODC Division themes (change processes within organizations, with or without assistance by change agents; active attempts to intervene in organizations to improve their effectiveness, and scholarly studies of such interventions; the roles of change agents; and problems of self awareness, responsibility, and the political consequences of OD theory and practice) are also encouraged. So please ensure that you fully participate in this exciting opportunity through multiple papers and symposia that help define not only the next generation of organization development theories and innovative change practices, but further enable new potentialities for management theory and practice. For additional details on the

(See Manning, page 2)

BUILDING ODC AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE FROM THE RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

Richard W. Woodman
Texas A&M University

The challenge faced by the field in terms of contributing important research in the organizational sciences is a difficult one. I certainly have no simple, prescriptive set of actions to offer. I would like to suggest actions in three areas that might be useful (and certainly wouldn’t leave us any worse off than we are now in that they carry little risk).

First, it is critical to create and support forums that focus on new theory, research ideas, and application of (See Woodman, page 3)

Table of Contents

Michael Manning, Call for Papers and Symposia	1
Richard W. Woodman, Building ODC as an Academic Discipline from the Research Perspective	1
ODC Division Executive Committee	2
ODC Division Professional Development Workshops	4
International Doctoral Consortium, Lyon, France	5
Jessica Steur & Raphael Wittek, The Governance of Transition Processes in an Organization: A Cognitive Mapping Approach	5
Chris Huxham & Paul Hibbert, More or Less Than Give and Take: Manifested Attitudes to Inter-Partner Learning in Collaboration	7
Eric Neilsen, Using Attachment Theory to Compare Traditional Action Research and Appreciative Inquiry	9
Kira Reed & Narasimhan Srinivasan, Responding to a Changing Environment: Adapting Human and Social Capital to Impact Performance	11
Matthew Ford & Bertie Greer, Using Change Process Profiles to Study Implementation: An Empirical Demonstration	13
Inga Carboni, Change From Below: The Case of the Voice of the Faithful	15
Feedback to Editor	17

ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2005-2006

George Roth, Division Chairperson
MIT

Phone: 617/253-8407 Fax: 617/252-1425
Email: groth@mit.edu

Ram Tenkasi, Division Chairperson Elect
Benedictine University

Phone: 630/829-6212 Fax: 630/829-6211
Email: tenkasi@email.msn.com

Michael Manning, Program Chair

New Mexico State University
Phone: 505/646-2532 Fax: 505/646-1371
Email: mmanning@nmsu.edu

Frank J. Barrett, Pre-Conference Chair and PDW Chair

Naval Postgraduate School
Phone: 831/656-2328
Email: fbarrett@nps.navy.mil

*Ann Feyerherm, Division Representative and Chair of the
Nominating Committee*

Pepperdine University
Phone: 310/568-5598 Fax: 310/568-2312
Email: ann.feyerherm@pepperdine.edu

Anat Lechner, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)

New York University
Phone: 212/998-0263 Fax: 212/585-0270
Email: alechner@stern.nyu.edu

Sandy Piderit, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)

Case Western Reserve University
Phone: 216/368-4642 Fax: 216/368-6228
Email: piderit@case.edu

Ian Palmer, International Representative-at-Large (2-year term)

University of Technology, Sydney
Phone: +61 2 9514 3926 Fax: +61 2 9514 3513
Email: ian.palmer@uts.edu.au

Linda Sharkey, Executive Scholar-Practitioner

GE Commercial Finance
Phone: 203/796-1091 Fax: 203/796-1318
Email: Linda.Sharkey@ge.com

Jose DelaCerde, Student Representative

Benedictine University
Phone: +52 33 3669 3537 Fax: +52 33 3669 3469
Email: josedlac@iteso.mx

Eric A. Goodman, Web Page Master

Kaplan University
Phone: 303/617-2899
Email: egoodman@kaplan.edu

Gavin Schwarz, Secretary/Treasurer

University of New South Wales
Phone: +61 2 9385 7278
Email: g.schwarz@unsw.edu.au

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor

University of Colorado
Phone: 303/492-8488 Fax: 303/494-1771
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(From Manning, page 1)

conference theme and other Academy issues please go to <http://meetings.aomonline.org/2006>.

Contributions

ODC colleagues can contribute to the main program by submitting: 1) Papers and Symposia to the ODC division, and 2) Symposia to the All Academy Theme Sessions.

1. Paper and symposia submissions to the ODC division are most welcome. Papers can only be submitted to one division and we would like to see more of them coming to the ODC division. While symposium proposals can be submitted exclusively to the ODC division, traditionally, symposia that request sponsorship from multiple divisions stand a better chance of acceptance. The deadline for both paper and symposia submissions to the ODC division is January 9th, 2006, 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

The ODC Division requires electronic submissions. Authors should submit papers and symposia to the academy website (<http://submissions.aomonline.org/2006>) by January 9th, 2006. The academy website is open for submissions beginning November 1, 2005. Your submission will be acknowledged upon receipt by the Academy and then forwarded to the ODC Division. For hard copy submissions or electronic submissions via diskette for those who do not have internet access please see the appropriate Submission Procedures on the AOM web site listed above.

2. All Academy Symposia are symposia sessions that directly address the theme of the conference "Knowledge, Action and the Public Concern." They do not have to include multiple divisions, but do have to appeal broadly to the Academy and the year's theme. If you have an idea for an All-Academy Session, please submit it directly to the All-Academy Symposia Chair, Terry Mitchell (trm@u.washington.edu) by November 15, 2005. The submission should include a brief description of the session's content and format, plus the participants. If you get a positive response, you have till Jan. 16, 2006 to submit the full proposal. Symposia proposals that broadly address the theme and submitted to the ODC division as regular symposia by January 9th, 2006, may also be nominated for the all academy symposia.

Rule of Three

The Academy of Management strongly enforces a rule of three. In other words an individual cannot be

involved in more than three main program submissions or appear in any role in more than three sessions (PDWs are excluded). The rule of three applies to papers and symposia submitted to the ODC division and All Academy symposia submissions. For an elaboration of the rule of three (including exceptions), please visit <http://meetings.aomonline.org/2006>.

Division Awards

Five externally-sponsored division recognition awards, some with honorariums (see ODC web site at <http://www.aom.pace.edu/odc> for details) will be given for the best paper in the following categories. These include the competitive paper award, student paper award, interactive paper award, The Rupert F. Chisholm linking theory-to-practice paper award, and the action research paper award. Papers authored by students (separately or with other students) and/or about action research should be clearly identified as such at the time of submission (please note in the title page and also the email that accompanies the paper, that the paper should be considered for the student and/or action research awards). In addition the Division also has best reviewer awards. All award winners will be recognized at the ODC business meeting.

We also need Reviewers!!! A core value of the division is engaging and involving the member community in division activities. One of the best and easiest ways to get involved in this process is by participating in the paper and symposia reviews. We welcome and encourage our members to serve as reviewers. This year the academy has developed a centralized reviewer system in which all reviewers must register. Even though you have reviewed in the past you must also sign up on the Academy site to be a reviewer. The Academy (and the ODC Division) will be recruiting reviewers. Please visit <http://program.aomonline.org/reviewers> to sign up and choose up to five areas of expertise (i.e. keywords) you want to review for. You will also have the option to review for other divisions or interest groups. The review period will run from January 9th (Submission Deadline) to February 7th (Review Deadline). If you have any confusion about registering as a reviewer, please get in touch with Michael Manning (odc@nmsu.edu).

I look forward to receiving your submissions and seeing you in Atlanta, Georgia, August, 2006! If you have any questions or feedback, please contact me at odc@nmsu.edu.

(From Woodman, page 1)

cutting-edge theory and research. For example, in 2001, Andrew Pettigrew, Kim Cameron, Herminia Ibarra, and I edited a special issue of the *Academy of Management Journal* devoted to organizational change and development. In addition to providing a forum for ten published articles dealing with organizational change, we suggested (in our introduction to the research forum) that change research needed more (and better) research that focused on a) multiple contexts and multiple levels of analysis, b) time and process, c) linking processes of change to change outcomes, d) analyses of the sequencing of actions and pace of change, e) international comparative research, and f) bridging the gaps between scholarship and practice. At the 2004 Academy meeting Bill Pasmore and I made a similar plea for cutting-edge research and new ideas when we addressed the ODC division. We suggested that more research was needed on understanding cultural change, creating ethical organizations, overcoming the mediocrity that plagues some industries and organizations, enhancing organizational creativity and innovation, managing whole system change, and creating energy, caring, and loyalty in organizations not characterized by those attributes, among a number of other topics. The point of all of this for me is, I think, that it is not just a function of having more members of the ODC division do more research and writing. Rather, we need more research and writing that tackles the really difficult and challenging issues facing organizations. The low hanging fruit is gone. Theory in the organizational sciences exists in a competitive arena. Ideas that have value will persist over time, attracting attention and resources. Theory and explanation that creates little value will tend to disappear in the long run. To make a contribution to the organizational sciences, people in our field must be working on good, provocative problems and ideas. I would like to see more of our resources and energy devoted to encouraging quality, cutting-edge contributions.

As a related idea, and as an example of a forum, I would love to see members of the ODC division more actively involved with the scholarly journals in the organizational change arena. In particular, I would urge our members to make greater use of the tremendous potential represented by the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, which holds a special niche in the social and organizational change literatures. When I became editor of JABS, I was quite disappointed to discover how few members of the ODC

division actually have subscriptions to the journal, regularly attempt to publish there, and participate in the review process for the journal. My sense is that, at one time, JABS had a much higher profile than it does today among our membership. We have already taken steps to improve this situation. A significant number of the members of the new editorial board are Academy members. Also, we are going to utilize a lot of “guest” reviewers allowing opportunities for more individuals, particularly emerging scholars, to participate. In addition, the editorial team from JABS offered a professional development workshop, devoted to writing for both theory and practice, at the Academy meeting in Honolulu last August. Our goal of enhancing the scholarly presence of JABS in the field also dovetails nicely with the desire of the ODC division to strengthen ODC as an academic discipline.

There is nothing wrong at all with publishing in practitioner and “interface” journals. However, the standing of any field as an academic discipline is a direct function of scholarly publication which, in turn, depends upon research quality. It is not possible to attain and maintain the academic reputation that we desire for our field unless our members produce valuable theory, conduct valid research, and publish in the leading journals in the organizational sciences. As such, renewed efforts to encourage our membership to aggressively pursue publishing in AMJ and AMR as well as other scholarly outlets are needed.

Finally, I would draw your attention to a point made by Freedman, Sorensen, Saner, and Varney in the short paper introducing this meeting labeled “Building ODC as an Academic Discipline.” Their first observation was with regard to the interdisciplinary nature of the field. I think this characteristic of our discipline holds another key to enhancing the academic reputation of ODC. We should not just exclusively focus on increasing graduate programs devoted narrowly to our field, but need strategies and initiatives that link to work centered in OB, HRM, strategy, and so on. Students in our Ph.D. program at Texas A & M University, for example, do not “major” in OD or even organizational change, but rather specialize in OB, OT, HRM, or strategy. Frankly, that’s where the jobs are; that is, the vast preponderance of position listings for new Ph.D.s will be in these areas. However, I have had a number of students do their dissertations on organizational change topics and many of them continue to be quite active in ODC. Job openings often list organizational change and/or OD as a subsidiary teaching area. We

need to broaden our focus on what it means to “educate” graduate students in change and development. We need to work on developing a niche in many doctoral programs in terms of participation, course offerings, offering interesting research agendas, and so on.

In sum, I would argue that we need more forums for presenting and publishing scholarly change work, better support for those that already exist (like JABS), and strategic positioning in and alliances with the other disciplines in the organizational sciences.

ODC DIVISION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

The “Knowledge, Action and the Public Concern” is the theme for the 2006 AOM conference. Please utilize this opportunity to submit creative and challenging PDWs that explore how our field of ODC can shape this year’s theme.

PDWs are a platform for colleagues to share knowledge and expertise and foster the development of workshop participants. Coordinated by the Academy’s many divisions, interest groups, and theme committees, PDW sessions are different from regular academy sessions in that they can have a longer time frame and use a more interactive/participative format.

Note that PDW space is limited, so PDW proposals that are co-sponsored by several divisions or interest groups are encouraged as we can share room allocations. If you are interested in submitting a proposal for a PDW session to be sponsored by the ODC division please make sure that all proposals include:

1. The Workshop Title
2. Full description of the workshop and activities
3. Time requirements of the workshop
4. Submitter (contact person) and Presenter(s) information, including name, affiliation, address, phone, fax, and e-mail for each person
5. Division/Interest group sponsors being solicited and why

Please send submissions and any questions you may have to Frank Barrett email: fbarrett@nps.edu. The due date for all submissions is November 14, 2005.

INTERNATIONAL DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM: LYON, FRANCE

This workshop is organized in partnership with the ODC Division & ISEOR and will be held on April 24-25, 2006. A major purpose is to develop relationships across the Atlantic to share knowledge and experience in the field of research in Organization Development and Change. The consortium will explore a variety of themes:

- Comparing research methods in the field of ODC
- Comparing the Doctoral Curricula in the field of ODC in the US and in Europe
- Preparing a Ph.D. when in active life
- Research on organization change and evaluation methods of the results

Format: The consortium will consist of two kinds of presentations: Papers, conferences and testimonies proposed by academics aimed at presenting the various and complementary approaches applied to OD and change in different cultural settings; and workshops, where doctoral students and executive doctoral students are invited to present the progress of their research project in order to debate and exchange.

Venue: ISEOR Research Center, University of Lyon 3, which is the pilot research center of the doctoral program in Socio-Economic Approach to the management of change and to organization development. Up to now 85 doctoral theses have been defended at ISEOR by students from various countries all over the world, not to mention over 50 doctoral researches now underway.

Lyon, France is ideally located at the heart of Europe and is an academic powerhouse in the field of management (see www.lyon-france.com).

Participation: AOM-ODC members and/or other North American academics, doctoral students and executive doctoral students are expected. We also expect invite the members of the US network of universities in ODC field, at least 100 European doctoral students will present their project, and 40 European directors of research and academics have expressed their intention to participate.

Submissions format and deadlines: Please send an abstract (4,500 characters maximum) before December 30th, 2005. Full papers (15 pages or 30,000 characters maximum) are expected by January 31st, 2006. For additional information, see www.iseor.com.

THE GOVERNANCE OF TRANSITION PROCESSES IN AN ORGANIZATION: A COGNITIVE MAPPING APPROACH

Jessica Steur

Rafael Wittek

University of Groningen

2005 Best Competitive Paper

A major purpose of organizational governance and control is to prevent the emergence of problems, which could be detrimental for the realization of organizational goals. However, all governance strategies can fail. We suggest that the failure of managerial governance strategies becomes more likely in situations of organizational change, and that a social dilemma perspective forms a useful starting point for an analysis of such problems. We distinguish between four types of problems as they result from interdependence between organizational members.

First, in coordination problems, both parties strive for the same goal and need each other to attain it. Second, bargaining problems are structured around the division of resources between two or more parties. Here, both actors have a common interest to avoid conflict. Third, social dilemma problems like the prisoner's dilemma game and the trust game, where it is rational for each party to defect, though both would be better off if they would cooperate. Fourth, in pure competition or zero-sum problems, the interests of both parties are completely opposed; i.e. one party can only obtain positive utilities at the expenses of the other party.

The four types of problems differ with regard to their severity and – as a consequence – the difficulty or ease with which they can be resolved. The coordination game represents the 'simplest' problem, since the cooperative outcome is preferred by both. Bargaining problems are more difficult to solve, but they are still less problematic than social dilemmas. Whereas bargaining parties are better off if they cooperate – they just need to determine the "right" division of the resources, defection is the dominant strategy in social dilemmas. Finally, the most severe types of problems arise in pure competition situations, because the gain of one exchange partner is equivalent to the loss of the other exchange partner.

Periods of restructuring are particularly likely for such problems to emerge, because of the increased uncertainty and ambiguity that they cause. We assume that uncertainty about potential choices of other actors will be highest in the early stages of a transition process and

gradually decrease as the change process proceeds. The early stage of a change is the phase when new rules have to be introduced and implemented, when new interdependencies are established, and new functions are specified. In the course of the transition, these uncertainties will gradually decline, because employees will gradually become acquainted with the new situation, and the trustworthiness of their new exchange partners, and management will gradually come to know about the unintended consequences of earlier change interventions. Managers will proactively attempt to prevent the occurrence of potential problems by altering the payoff structures for the involved actors in such a way that their interests become aligned. A likely side effect of this strong incentive to solve social dilemmas will be that multiple solutions will emerge and be implemented. As a result, new coordination problems will emerge.

In sum, we hypothesize that during the process of organizational change there will be a decrease in the relative frequency of social dilemma and pure competition problems through time, whereas the number of coordination problems is likely to increase.

Data, Method, Results

For a first explorative test of this general hypothesis we therefore opted for a case-study approach. We selected a Dutch bank that was currently going through a major reorganization. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eighteen site managers and regional directors of the bank, including a high-ranking member of the workers' council and the HR-manager. We used a cognitive mapping approach in order to detect the different types of problems in the transcribed interviews. Cognitive mapping is a form of text analysis that reconstructs causal attributions as they are made by respondents. In order to discover different types of game structures in the text, we build on the procedure as Anthony et al. (1994) developed it: for each causal statement, we determined whether the concept variables affect the utility of an actor negatively or positively. For example, take the following statement of a respondent: "...the introduction of the new system of functions would certainly increase the efficiency of the bank, but people at the teller were afraid that they would lose their jobs." This statement would be mapped by extracting three concept variables (new functions, efficiency, job loss), and two positive causal attributions (new functions → efficiency, new functions → job loss). It also refers to two categories of actors (bank, employees at the

teller), the so-called "utility nodes." Since the bank would benefit from efficiency, and employees at the teller would be worse off if they lose their job, there would be a positive line connecting the concept variable "efficiency" with the utility node "bank," and a positive line connecting the concept variable "job loss" and the utility node "employees at the teller." Which actor is negatively or positively affected by a concept variable is sometimes mentioned explicitly by the respondent, but often also had to be inferred from the text.

To explore the hypothesis that problem severity increases in the course of organizational change, we constructed the ordinal variable "problem severity" (coded "1" for positive coordination games, "2" for negative coordination games, "3" for bargaining games "4" for social dilemmas, and "5" for pure competition games). Starting from mid 2000 and ending in the beginning of 2003, five periods of half a year each were used to classify when each problem occurred.

We identified 174 problem structures. Almost 60% of the 174 problems can be classified as coordination games. "Negative" and "positive" coordination games are equally represented. 32% of the problems are social dilemmas. 3% were bargaining games, and 4% were pure competition games. 102 games could be located in time. The remaining problems could not be placed within the chronology. A correlational analysis indicates a negative association between the ordinal variable 'problem severity', and the variable "time" (Spearman's rho = -.179, p<.10, n=95). This result supports our general hypothesis that problem severity decreases through time. That is, social dilemmas and pure competition games become less likely in later phases of the reorganization process, while coordination problems are likely to increase.

Our study advances previous research by introducing a social dilemma approach for the study of problems during planned organizational change, and provides a theory-driven structural method for analyzing texts.

References

Anthony, D. L., Heckathorn, D. D. & Maser, S. M. (1994). Rational rhetoric in politics: The debate over ratifying the U.S. Constitution. *Rationality and Society*, 6(4), 489–518

MORE OR LESS THAN GIVE AND TAKE: MANIFESTED ATTITUDES TO INTER-PARTNER LEARNING IN COLLABORATION

Chris Huxham
Paul Hibbert

University of Strathclyde

2005 Rupe Chisholm Best Practice Paper

Collaboration between organizations is an important area of organizational study addressing a wide range of inter-organizational management forms in both private and public sector settings (e.g.: Gray, 1989; Pangarkar, 2003). We address this area within the framework of the theory of collaborative advantage (Huxham and Vangen, 2005), constructed around the development of conceptualizations of aspects of collaboration which provide conceptual handles for reflective practice (Huxham & Beech, 2003).

Within this context, we examine attitudes to inter-partner learning – that is, the passing or development of knowledge between partners. “Knowledge” may be related to understanding, insight, skills, expertise and so on, and can be considered to have both personal and collective aspects (Tsoukas & Vladimirou, 2002). We are therefore mindful of the extent to which knowledge and knowing are socially constructed in practice (Brown & Duguid, 2001); however, the classification of learning outcomes into categories of “knowledge transfer” (Reagans & McEvily, 2003) and “knowledge creation” (Breu & Hemingway, 2002) is common.

Discussion of these possible outcomes often includes thoughts about the manner and degree to which learning is considered. Extant research (for example: March (1991), Oliver (2001), Yan & Child (2002)) suggests a “spectrum” of attitudes to learning, ranging across:

- the selfish acquisition of knowledge, thus exploiting the partner;
- the sharing of knowledge, in a relatively controlled fashion, thus exchanging with partners;
- the sharing of knowledge in a broad, open manner amongst a range of partners, thus exploring innovative solutions collaboratively;

- the sidelining of any consideration of learning thus formally excluding, although it may be an emerging outcome.

In this paper we seek to challenge and explore attitudes to learning in collaboration. In our action research (Eden & Huxham (1996)) in partnership development programmes we observed all four of the attitudes to learning introduced earlier, but found each to be more complex than the picture previously presented suggests. Notably, in the settings in which we gathered data, learning did not seem to be an issue that practitioners considered overtly. Other researchers have also reported that learning is not a central issue for collaborating organizations (Tsang, 2002), despite the value of learning outcomes for collaborations (Hartley & Allison, 2002) being acknowledged. In terms of the attitudes identified earlier, this lack of concern about learning from or with partners is closest to the sidelining attitude. It may be characterized as: “learning from or with partners is not something we think about.” “We” in this case refers to members of one or more of the organizations involved in the collaboration. Our research indicated a number of stances, described in Table 1, which were enacted within this category .

Table 1: Sidelining Attitudes – Some Examples

Sidelining stance	"learning from or with partners is not something we think about ...
Time conscious	... because the opportunity cost is too high"
Using	... because our focus is on other objectives"
Tangibility	... unless it can be expressed in tangible outcomes"

Interestingly, our data also highlighted the difficulty of establishing clear distinctions between selfish and sharing attitudes in practice. Considered together it is clear that not all “I don’t give” attitudes are motivated by purely selfish, competitive aims and that not all “I give” attitudes are motivated by purely selfless, co-operative considerations. Our data also indicated that the distinction between sharing and selfish motivations to receiving knowledge is equally fuzzy. Examples are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Selfish and Sharing Learning Attitudes – Some Examples

Basic attitudes to giving and receiving	
Selfish	"I take from you without giving to you"
Sharing - exchanging	"I take from you and I give to you; you take from me and give to me"
Sharing - exploring	"I take from you and I give to you; you take from me and give to me – and we learn together to create knowledge"
Stances on giving knowledge to a partner	
Starving - protective	"I don't trust you, therefore I don't give to you"
Starving - legalistic	"I don't trust you, therefore I bind you not to take from me"
Starving - independent	"I want to maintain my independent position, so I don't give to you"
Unilateral sharing	"I enjoy sharing, therefore I do give to you (even though I may be unwise to do so)"
Instrumental	"when it suits me to do so, I give to you"
Force-feeding	"when I need you to have understanding, I give to you"
Parenting	"when I deem it to be good for you, I give to you"
Stances on receiving knowledge from partners	
Limited ability	"I don't have the requisite skill, therefore I don't take from you"
Emergently selfish	"I didn't intend to take from you, but since I now have the knowledge I will use it"
Careless	"I didn't intend to take from you, but since I now have the knowledge I will use it unthinkingly (without considering the consequences for you)"
Discretionary	"I take what you give only if I choose to"
Refusing	I don't trust you, therefore I don't take what you give"

No doubt, similar analysis of other collaborations would reveal many more slants on the basic attitudes. The range of attitudes to learning observed in this research challenge simple notions for explaining knowledge transfer, such as “absorptive capacity” (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). We suggest that the way partners interact is influenced by the combinations of stances to learning in play between them. In terms of its envisaged use, this conceptualization is consistent with the theory of collaborative advantage; used in a reflective practice mode (Huxham & Beech, 2003), the framework provides a basis for exploring attitudes to learning of oneself and ones own organization and of partners.

References

- Brown, J., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social practice perspective. *Organization Science*, 12, 198-213.
- Breu, K., & Hemingway, C. (2002). Collaborative processes and knowledge creation in communities-of-practice. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11, 147-153.
- Cappellin, R. (2004). International knowledge and innovation networks for European integration, cohesion and enlargement. *International Social Science Journal*, June, 207-226.
- Cohen, W.M., & Levinthal, D.A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128-153.
- Eden, C., & Huxham, C. (1996). Action research for management research. *British Journal of Management*, 7, 75-86.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multi-party problems*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hartley, J., & Allison, M. (2002). Good, better, best? Inter-organizational learning in a network of local authorities. *Public Management Review* 4, 101-118.
- Huxham, C., & Beech, N. (2003). Contrary prescriptions: Recognizing good practice tensions in management. *Organization Studies*, 24, 69-94.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. London: Routledge.
- March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Studies*, 22, 467-489.

- Pangarkar, N. (2003). Determinants of alliance duration in uncertain environments: The case of the biotechnology sector. *Long Range Planning*, 36, 269-284.
- Reagans, R. & McEvily, B. (2003). Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion & range. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 240-267.
- Tsang, E.W.K. (2002). Acquiring knowledge by foreign partners from international joint ventures in a transition economy: Learning-by-doing and learning myopia. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 835-854.
- Tsoukas, H. & Vladimirou, E. (2002). What is Organizational Knowledge? *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 973-993.
- Yan, Y. & Child, J. (2002). An analysis of strategic determinants, learning and decision-making in Sino-British joint ventures. *British Journal of Management*, 13, 109-122.

USING ATTACHMENT THEORY TO COMPARE TRADITIONAL ACTION RESEARCH AND APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY

Eric H. Neilsen

Case Western Reserve University
2005 Best Action Research Paper

Proponents of appreciative inquiry (AI) argue that traditional action research focuses on problem solving and deficit based thinking while appreciative inquiry takes a strength based approach that is more generative. We agree that AI is a powerful technique but argue that traditional action research and its problem solving orientation have been unduly criticized. The real issue is not whether a given situation is framed as a problem or an opportunity but whether whatever framework is used bestirs the actors involved to collaborate at their best.

Drawing on attachment theory from the field of child development (Bowlby, 1969), we argue that what determines a person's response to action research is the nature of one's attachment to the organization when the invitation to participate occurs. Participants respond positively when their attachments are secure and negatively when not. AI hedges its bets by first inviting actors to remember moments of secure organizational attachment. This puts more of them into a secure

relationship before they are asked to address gaps between current and desired states that might raise anxiety.

Attachment Theory

Attachment theory posits an evolutionarily adaptive bond between mother (primary caregiver) and child (Bowlby, 1969). Children who remain in close proximity to their mothers and who behave in ways that induce the latter's help are more likely to survive than those who do not. The bond begins with an emphasis on physical proximity, but soon involves a psychological component as the child develops a mental model of how the mother will respond to particular behaviors. A mother's continuous support and sensitivity will enable her to educate the child both emotionally and cognitively. If she provides only physical support, the child may develop poor affective competence (Fosha, 2000).

Fosha (2000) recapitulated the field's research findings in terms of combinations of two dimensions: 1) the capacity, or lack thereof, to have good access to one's feelings, and 2) the capacity, or lack thereof, to act adaptively in the face of negative feelings. Secure-autonomous caregivers (feeling and dealing while relating) can process painful affects without resorting to defensive strategies. In turn, the child internalizes the skills necessary to develop his/her own affective competence. Insecure-preoccupied caregivers (feeling but not dealing) are unable to modulate either their own or their child's affect, and the child who is not being helped might even be asked to take care of the caregiver. Consequently, it becomes preoccupied with the parent's emotional state and is unable to act adaptively in emotionally difficult situations. Insecure-dismissing caregivers (dealing but not feeling) maintain their composure by defensively minimizing the importance of relationships (Fosha, 2000: 52), refusing to engage emotionally with either themselves or the other. Consequently, the child feels abandoned and internalizes the caregiver's way of coping. While capable of dealing adaptively, it becomes numb to feeling emotion. Unresolved-disorganized caregivers (not feeling and not dealing) lose both contact and coherence. "Momentarily paralyzed in a dissociative state, they become unable to parent. Their fear is transmitted to the child... who is left completely unprotected in the face of helpless parental abdication" (Fosha, 2000: 53). Consequently, it adapts a disorganized way of both feeling and dealing itself.

Toward a Theory of Organizational Attachment

Attachment theory to date has focused on bonds between individuals. We argue that adults hold attachments to their employing organizations that parallel the four infant-caregiver bonds. For example, Neilsen (1978, 1984) described an interview feedback program conducted in two outpatient departments of a medical center. The answers to questions about one's current job, role relationships, and formal organization were themed, disguised to hide individual identities, and fed back separately to each department as a springboard for dialogue around future development activities.

Four different kinds of responses to the data were evident in the feedback sessions. Neilsen explained them as manifestations of different combinations of two values, 1) candor about one's organizational experience, or the lack thereof, and 2) willingness to take responsibility for one's own behavior, or alternatively, to give it to others. However, he offered little by way of a theory of how these values might have developed. We suggest that attachment theory fills that lacuna. Candor echoes Fosha's capacity to feel dimension, and taking responsibility for one's own behavior echoes her ability to deal dimension. The four responses to feedback, in turn, recapitulate Fosha's four attachment styles transmuted into adult organization life. Specifically, some participants responded with sincere interest in the process, and inquiry into the data, reflecting a secure capacity both to feel and to deal. They expressed surprise at viewpoints they had not heard of before, but also tried to broaden their understanding of the causes. Another group mouthed platitudes about the process while attacking imagined quoters. They were characterized as valuing self responsibility but being **closed** about their organizational experience. Arguably, this response also reflected an insecure-dismissing attachment to the organization, where individuals had been socialized into repressing their emotional worlds and pursuing self interest calculatively. A third group expressed outrage toward the process while denying the messages in the data. They were characterized as valuing candor but also preferring to give responsibility for their actions to others. They can also be seen as having been socialized into insecure-preoccupied attachments to the organization, where vigilant attention to their leaders' emotional state hindered the ability to act autonomously. Finally, a fourth group of clients expressed apathy about the process and skepticism toward the data, and were characterized as valuing neither candor nor self

responsibility. They likewise could be seen as having developed a fearful adult response to management, masking feelings and giving up autonomy so as to ward off uncaring and unconstructive supervision.

Exploring the Differences between Traditional Action Research and Appreciative Inquiry

Traditional action research emphasizes cognitive analysis. People engage in it through the lenses of their prevailing organizational attachments. Those with dismissing attachments will pursue calculative self interest at the expense of others' sensitivities. Those with preoccupied attachments will be overly attentive to their superiors' moods and interpretations while suppressing their own viewpoints. Those with fearful attachments will avoid commitment to the project in the first place. Finally, those with secure attachments will engage wholeheartedly, enhancing learning and development in both themselves and the organization. In turn, the quality of the results in traditional action research hinges on those participants who already have secure attachments, on this group's organizational resources, and on their capacity to create secure relational spaces for their colleagues around project activities that will induce the latter to develop more secure organizational attachments themselves.

Appreciative inquiry, on the other hand, starts with interviews that rekindle participants' most positive organizational experiences. In essence, they are asked to remember and re-experience secure organizational attachments. The subsequent juxtaposition of new designs, based on these positive experiences, against current realities, leads to the identification of gaps that may represent "problems to be solved." However, because the broaching of such gaps has been preceded by appreciative interviewing and analysis, more participants have moved, at least temporarily, into a secure space. And just as with infants in secure relationships with their caregivers, such emotional security raises tolerance for dealing with threatening material and fosters spontaneous, exploratory, and generative organization development.

References

- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment*. London: Penguin.
- Fosha, D. (2000). *The transforming power of affect*. New York: Basic Books.
- Neilsen, E. H. (1984). *Becoming an OD practitioner*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

RESPONDING TO A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT: ADAPTING HUMAN AND SOCIAL CAPITAL TO IMPACT PERFORMANCE

Kira Kristal Reed
Syracuse University
Narasimhan Srinivasan
University of Connecticut
2005 Best Interactive Paper

We use the dynamic resource-based view to build our theoretical foundation because it emphasizes the role of adaptable resources in creating sustainable superior financial performance, thus allowing us to better identify specific resources that meet this criterion. We focus on human capital and social capital resources, as both have been directly linked to performance in prior literature (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997; Florin, Lubatkin, & Schulze, 2003; Hitt, Bierman, Shimizu, & Kochhar, 2001; Pennings, Lee & Witteloostuijn, 1998; Youndt, Subramaniam, & Snell, 2004). Moreover, these resources are pliable, with both static and dynamic components, thus providing managers with discretion over how to deploy them when adaptation is needed.

Human Capital

Human capital (HC) involves both knowledge stocks (e.g., hiring of educated individuals) and knowledge flows (e.g., developing high levels of codified and tacit knowledge about a specific business and its particular market conditions (Pennings, Lee, & van Witteloostuijn, 1998). Thus, HC is multi-dimensional, encompassing both tangible and intangible aspects, and static and dynamic aspects. While it is important to hire competent individuals from the start, it is the intangible, flexible component of HC, namely skill development that organizations have sought to understand and to enhance through the use of human resource practices.

During environmental or industry change, HC may become inert as employees' skills become outdated. Thus, a high level of HC at one point in time may be ineffective at another point in time if the environment changes rapidly and HC does not keep pace. Instead of using training to develop the requisite skills (internal HC development), firms may find it easier and timelier to adapt HC by hiring new people (external HC acquisition) who already possess the requisite skills for the new setting. Thus, organizations can increase the flexibility of HC to prepare for change either through its hiring practices or its training and development

practices. Therefore, we expect that in a changing environment,

H1: In a changing environment, increasing levels of Human Capital will have a positive influence on financial performance.

Social Capital

Broadly defined, social capital (SC) is an asset that resides in social relationships and networks (Burt, 1992; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). As noted above, SC can exist either between employees and external actors (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997; Pennings, Lee, & Witteloostuijn, 1998; Stewart, 1997), or among employees (Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). An important premise of SC is that "networks of relationships constitute a valuable resource for the conduct of social affairs" (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998: 243). Another important premise is that more is better than less. In other words, the higher the number of relationships comprised of high-status (competent and credible) participants, the more valuable the relationship.

In addition to learning in groups of their peers, employees also learn from customers and suppliers who provide them with external information to which they would not have otherwise had access. Bontis (1996) discusses customer capital as one aspect of what he calls "relational capital," or the capital that encompasses all external relationships. These external social connections can provide rich information about best practices, customer needs, competitors' moves, and much more which could not be learned solely through internal connections. Therefore, we argue that the information shared among employees is different than that shared between employees and customers, and thus, has a distinct value for the firm.

However, similar to HC, both internal and external SC may become inert and ultimately dampen organizational change. Consistently working with the same group of co-workers can stagnate creativity and possibly lead to groupthink (if the group is cohesive and receives little outside information). Basic turnover, or the departure of some employees from the organization, may result in the destabilization of the group or result in gaps in the flow of knowledge. We expect that the pliability of these resources will enhance performance. Therefore, we hypothesize that

H2: In a changing environment, increasing levels of Social Capital (both internal and external) will have a positive influence on financial performance.

Dynamic Link Between Human and Social Capital

While positing that HC is associated with performance, recent extensions of social capital theory (e.g., Coleman, 1988; Loury, 1987; Putnam, 1993; Schiff, 1992) suggest that the inimitable value of HC can be enhanced by “the good will that is engendered by the fabric of social relations and that can be mobilized to facilitate action” (Adler & Kwon, 2002: 17). Through complex social interaction employees learn on their own and with each other. It is through this learning and sharing of knowledge that firms can become more efficient, provide better quality service, become more innovative, and more agile (Coleman, 1998; Fine & Hax, 1985; Garvin, 1993; Stewart, 1997; Youndt, Snell, Dean, & Lepak, 1996).

However, even if firms are able to maintain flexibility in their ISC and ESC and adapt these resources to a changing environment, the value of these resources is constrained by the fact they are linked to HC. Relationships cannot be used to exchange valuable resources, new information, or tacit know-how unless competent employees form the relationships; otherwise, what is shared is useless. Additionally, when no prior relationship exists, parties may use cues related to each other’s HC to engender trust. Therefore, it may be insufficient for a firm to maintain a competitive advantage by solely adapting its HC, ISC, or ESC independently. In fact, it may be impossible to adapt ISC and ESC specifically, without similarly changing HC. Thus, the knowledge and know-how contained in these resources or capital are intertwined and co-dependent. Therefore, we propose that

H3: In a changing environment, increasing both human and social capital (internal and external) simultaneously will have a synergistic effect on financial performance.

Context and Findings

The personal banking sector has undergone regulatory, competitive, and technological changes over the past decade. Specifically, we surveyed managers of 135 personal banks in New England about the changes they have experienced in their general and competitive environments in the previous three years, as well as whether or not they have improved their human and social capital. We then collected objective financial performance data from the FDIC for a three-year period (1998 to 2000) in an effort to correspond with the perceptual data collected from managers. Our results are promising while at the same time thought

provoking regarding our limited understanding of firms’ use of specific resources during times of adaptation. Specifically, we find that banks that improved their human capital (i.e. skills and abilities of their employees), internal social capital (i.e., the ways in which their employees interact with each other), and their external social capital (i.e., the frequency with which their employees interact with clients), saw an improvement in their performance. However, firms that may have improved only one component had mixed results, suggesting that resource allocation changes must be planned and implemented in a coherent way. We also conclude that social capital is more valuable when the quality of the individuals comprising the relationships is considered. In other words, relationships comprised of highly competent individuals have more advantageous performance effects suggesting that social capital and human capital are best assessed concurrently.

References

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S-K. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40.
- Bontis, N. (1996). Intellectual capital: An exploratory study that develops measures and models. *Management Decision*, 36(2), 63-76.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1998). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120.
- Edvinsson, L., & Malone, M. S. (1997). *Intellectual capital: Realizing your company’s true value by finding its hidden brain power*. New York: Harper Business.
- Fine, C. H., & Hax, A. C. (1985). Manufacturing strategy: A methodology and an illustration. *Interfaces*, 156, 28-46.
- Florin, J., Lubatkin, M., & Schulze, W. (2003). A social capital model of high growth ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(3), 374-384.
- Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review* (July-August), 78-91.
- Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R. (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 13-28.
- Leana, C. R., & Van Buren, H. J., III. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment

- practices. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 538-555.
- Loury, G. C. (1987). Why should we care about group inequality. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 5, 249-271.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Pennings, J. M., Lee, K., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (1998). Human capital, social capital, and firm dissolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 424-440.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *American Prospect*, 13, 35-42.
- Schiff, M. (1992). Social capital, labor mobility, and welfare. *Rational Society*, 4, 157-175.
- Stewart, T. A. (1997). Brain power: Who owns it...How they profit from it. *Fortune*, 135, 5, 104-110.
- Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 464-478.
- Youndt, M. A., Snell, S. A., Dean, J. W., Jr. & Lepak, D. P. (1996). Human resource management, manufacturing strategy, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 836-866.
- Youndt, M.A., Subramaniam, M., & Snell, S.A. (2004). Intellectual capital profiles: An examination of investments and returns. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(2), 335-361.

USING CHANGE PROCESS PROFILES TO STUDY IMPLEMENTATION: AN EMPIRICAL DEMONSTRATION

Matthew W. Ford

Bertie M. Greer

Northern Kentucky University

2005 Best Visual Paper

The purpose of this study is to propose and demonstrate profile analysis as a means to advance empirical change process research. We empirically investigate the process of planned change and profiles of change process variables as organizations progress through the implementation process.

Understanding the process of planned change and the elements necessary for successful implementation is

an essential undertaking for managers. However, theory development and empirical study of planned change and its implementation requires further attention (Robertson et al 1993; Huy 2001; Gersick 1994; Pettigrew, Woodman & Cameron, 2001). Planned change refers to a premeditated, agent-facilitated intervention intended to modify organizational functioning for a more favorable outcome (Lippit, Watson, and Westley 1958).

Although planned change has been viewed from a variety of conceptual perspectives (e.g., Huy 2001, Levy 1986), few models of planned change have been studied using empirical research designs. Profiles and profile analysis seems an intriguing concept in the context of empirical change process research. Dictionary definitions of a profile denote a side view, views of something in contour, a short sketch, a graph summarizing relevant data, or a side or sectional elevation (Guralink, 1982: 1134). In the context of organizational studies, a profile represents a set of organizational factors that, when placed side-by-side in a standardized arrangement, can be measured and holistically viewed to comprehend the relative strength of individual factors and patterns in the overall set of factors.

To demonstrate how the profile concept can be applied in empirical change process research, we offer an example using Lewin's (1951) three-stage model of change. In Lewin's (1951) view, the process of change could be efficiently divided into three phases. Unfreezing is the first phase and involved questioning the organization's current state and, if a more desirable state is desired, then equilibrium needs to be destabilized before old behavior is discarded. The second phase, movement, is a state of flux, where new behavior is modified and new approaches are developed to replace old work patterns. Refreezing constitutes the final phase and requires activities to institutionalize the new behaviors and attitudes, and to stabilize the organization at a new equilibrium.

Although Lewin's (1951) framework remains broadly embraced (e.g., Schein, 1996; Burnes, 2004), some scholars have questioned the validity of static, sequential implications of the three stage model (e.g., Kanter et al., 1992; Dawson, 1994), suggesting value in empirically validating the model using formal methods. One application of profile analysis is in the investigation of temporal effects of change process. The sequence implied by Lewin's (1951) three stage model suggests that activities related to unfreezing, for example, should be observed before activities related to movement and

refreezing. Lewin (1947) noted, for example, that equilibrium needed to be destabilized before old behavior could be discarded. Refreezing activities to stabilize the organization at the new equilibrium require new behaviors to be established first.

Measuring activities related to each of the three stages of Lewin's (1951) model at various points during a planned change's implementation provide some information on the extent to which a progression or sequence exists. For example, change processes measured periodically during implementation should display increasing levels of late-stage activities as precedents have been satisfied. Therefore, we posit that: H1: As implementation progresses, change process profiles will display higher levels of movement and refreezing activities.

Another application of profile analysis in empirical change process research is in evaluating the relevance of particular change process stages, or the significance of particular change process profile patterns. One interesting question, for example, is whether all stages of Lewin's (1951) model are equally important to the achievement of effective change, or whether some matter more than others.

If samples were available of organizations realizing different degrees of success from their implementation projects, then profiles of the activities used by the high and low performers could be compared to assess the relevance of particular stages or to look for certain patterns. Since Lewin's (1951) theory suggests no bias towards any particular stage, it might be expected that successful organizations execute each stage with more intensity than lower performers. Therefore we posit that: H2: Change process profiles associated with higher implementation success will display elevated levels of unfreezing, movement, and refreezing activities than the change process profiles associated with lower levels of success.

Our sample data for this study were obtained from managers participating in a change management seminar sponsored by a large industrial coalition. As part of the seminar, respondents completed a questionnaire that included the items used in this study. We secured 107 useable questionnaires from 43 organizations. The primary unit of analysis in this study was an individual's assessment of the organization's change management processes in light of a specific planned change.

To operationalize Lewin's (1951) conceptual change process model, we sought factors that could adequately reflect each phase of the unfreezing → movement → refreezing sequence. To obtain the change process factors, we studied conceptualizations of change proposed by Nadler and Tushman (1980), Tichy (1983), Burke and Litwin (1992), and Kotter (1995, 1996). The change process factors selected are: goal-setting, behavior modification, feedback and management control (overall governance). In addition to the change process variables, a factor related to implementation outcomes was included. A number of measures served as context and control variables for the study: Percent Completion, Change Scope, Organization Size, Previous Implementation Success, and Experimenting Tendency.

Results suggest that profiles of organizations change during implementation, and that organizations realizing successful change outcomes display a change process profile that reflects higher systematic use of activities in each stage than lower performers. Our findings suggest that there is indeed a general sequence that is observable and in fact measurable in empirical study. Overall, we found support for H2 suggesting that change profiles of organizations with higher implementation outcomes reflect higher systematic usage of all change process variables that profiles of organizations with lower rated outcomes. In addition, our findings support H1 suggesting that the typical change process profile changes as implementation progresses. This reflects an increase in systematic usage of refreezing activities.

References

- Burke, W.W., & Litwin, G.H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18, 523-545.
- Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A reappraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41, 977-1002.
- Dawson, P. (1994). *Organizational change: A processual approach*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Gersick, C. J. G. (1994). Pacing strategic change: The case of a new venture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 9-45.
- Guralink, D.B. (1982). *Webster's new world dictionary* (2nd college ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kanter, R.M., Stein, B., & Jick, T. (1992). *The challenge of change*. New York: The Free Press.

- Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper.
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. (1958). *The dynamics of planned change*. New York: Harcourt Bruce.
- Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M. (1980). A model for diagnosing organizational behavior: Applying the congruence perspective. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(2), 35-51.
- Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R.W., & Cameron, K.S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of Management Review*, 44, 697-713.
- Robertson, P., Roberts, D., & Porras, J. L. (1993). Dynamics of planned organizational change: Assessing empirical support for a theoretical model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 619-634.
- Schein, E.H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes towards model of management learning. *Systems Practice*, 9(1), 27-47.

CHANGE FROM BELOW: THE CASE OF THE VOICE OF THE FAITHFUL

Inga Carboni
Boston College
2005 Best Student Paper

Although there is a relatively large literature on structural change efforts within organizations, especially on changes involving decentralization and employee "empowerment," almost all this research assumes that these efforts are led by top management. Lower level employees are generally regarded as targets of change, which they tend to resist. The implicit assumption is that lower level employees lack both the motivation and the means to initiate such change. Yet, some employees do wish to initiate structural change in their organizations (Meyerson & Scully, 1995). Moreover, lower level employees have already demonstrated their ability to bring about changes that benefit specific subgroups within an organization, such as women. Under what conditions can lower level employees induce broader structural change? More specifically, how can lower level employees induce vertical organizations to become more horizontal?

One area of research that has examined the efforts of low power change agents to induce structural change is that of social movements. However, most studies of social movements have focused on external change agents. Relatively little work has examined the efforts of internal change agents. To extend theory on both organizational change and social movements, I examine the case of Voice of the Faithful (VOTF), a group of U.S. Catholics who seek radical change in the administrative structure of the Catholic Church. The case study was used to develop a model for how low-power intra-organizational members can induce change.

Theoretical Context

Social movements can be explained in terms of mobilizing structures, political opportunities, and framing processes (McAdam et al., 1996; Morris, 2000). Mobilizing structures refers to the collective vehicles through which individuals mobilize the resources they need to engage in collective action (McAdam et al., 1996). Mobilizing structures require power to be enacted. Within organizational change literature, it is usually assumed that change agents have the power to access these resources by virtue of their role as top management (e.g., Yukl, 1989). Political opportunities are critical junctures in which the high-power group is in an externally forced or internally derived period of crisis and is likely to be most receptive to radical change, such as moving from a vertically oriented organization to a more horizontally oriented one (Tilly, 1985). Political opportunities correspond to those brief periods of disequilibrium noted in studies on organizational change during which organizations are most receptive to radical change (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). Framing processes refers to the shared system of meanings that defines the change situation for movement members (Benford & Snow, 2000; Tilly, 1985). The frames themselves legitimate the activities and campaigns of change agents; one type of challenge they face is that of framing contests among movement opponents, bystanders, and the media (Benford & Snow, 2000). In the special case of intra-organizational change agents, maintaining a socially acceptable identity may require a unique response to framing contests.

Social movements theory suggests conditions and processes that may enable bottom-up radical change efforts. Archival sources and observations of VOTF, a group of Catholics seeking structural change within the Catholic Church, suggest that the antecedents of change from below include agentic leadership and level of organizational identification. In addition, the

process of change must include political opportunities and mobilizing structures, as well as framing processes that are unique to intra-organizational change situations. If skillfully managed, these components may result in the power necessary for radical change.

Data Analysis

The case. VOTF was founded in 2002 in response to a series of Boston Globe articles documenting the sexual abuse scandal in the Catholic Church. The group set as its target the culture and structure of the Catholic Church and, more specifically, the uncontrolled power of the bishops. VOTF is credited with the resignation of Cardinal Bernard Law, one of the most powerful members of the Church in the United States (*Newsweek Magazine*, 1/6/2003). Despite efforts by bishops to restrict VOTF growth, the group currently claims more than 25,000 members.

Agentic leadership. In social movements theory, political opportunities are usually viewed as events created (often inadvertently) by organizational elites. However, the present study suggests that change from below may occur much more spontaneously and may depend upon the unique composition of first-movers. The constellation of knowledge, skills, and abilities held by the creators of VOTF appears to have uniquely qualified it to initiate this change effort.

Level of identification. Level of identification refers to the extent to which the change agent identifies with the larger organization. Level of organizational identification is missing from social movements theory, probably because the theory is rarely applied to situations in which change is initiated from within an organization. It may be that initial identification with the organization must be high enough to inspire long-term commitment to the organization and its goals, even in the face of resistance to change.

Mobilizing structures. VOTF had immediate access to mobilizing structures, including those already established by sexual abuse survivors and the interest of the media in clergy sexual abuse scandal. To increase its power, VOTF (a) withheld critical resources from the Church and (b) formed strategic coalitions.

Political opportunity. External changes in the political environment surrounding the Catholic Church as well as internal pressures together created an opportunity for change from within. It may be that change from below can only occur under conditions of internally recognized crisis.

Framing processes. Change agents within organizations must negotiate identity with other organizational members – some more radical and some more conservative – as well as with higher-ups in the organizational structure. Negotiation strategies used by VOTF include (a) appealing to both horizontal and vertical audiences and (b) the use of symbols.

Discussion

In this study, I have identified five factors that may shed light on the conditions under which low-power intra-organizational change agents may successfully advocate for radical change. The study suggests at least two paths for future research. The first is a replication of the present analysis within an organization that has recently experienced a merger. Second, agentic leadership appeared to be critical in the case of VOTF. Future research can determine if change agents require a certain constellation of knowledge, skills, and abilities in order to crystallize into a change effort. It may be that exploring change from below will open up new avenues for change and empowerment within organizations.

References

- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (Eds.). (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, & cultural framings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyerson, D. E., & Scully, M. A. (1995). Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organization Science*, 6, 585-604.
- Morris, A. (2000). Reflections on social movement theory: Criticism and proposals. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29 (3), 445-454.
- Newsweek Magazine*. (2003, January 6). Power in the pews: Voice of the faithful, lay Catholics speaking out.
- Tilly, C. (1985). Models and realities of popular collective action. *Social Research*, 52(4), 717-747.
- Tushman, M. L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, 171-222.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.

Please address all correspondence to:

R. Wayne Boss
Academy of Management ODC Newsletter
Leeds School of Business
Campus Box 419
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309
(303) 492-8488
Email: *wayne.boss@colorado.edu*

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the OD Newsletter may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. After completing your comments, please return them to the editor at *wayne.boss@colorado.edu*.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

1. Do you have any comments that you would like to share with the Editor (comments on articles from the last issue, comments on this issue, suggestions, etc.)?

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

2. Is there any important information about you or a colleague that you would like to have appear in the next issue?

PUBLICATIONS

3. Please list below any recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague. (Indicate full citation.)
