Organization Development and Change

CALL FOR PAPERS AND SYMPOSIA

Frank J. Barrett
Program Chair
Naval Postgraduate School

Clearly 2007 is the time to be in Philadelphia – next year's venue for the Academy of Management Meetings. Although it seems like we just returned from the meeting in Atlanta, planning for the Philadelphia meeting has already started. And it is not too early to start thinking about your participation in the Philadelphia AOM Meetings. The deadline for submitting papers and symposia to the ODC Division is January 15th, 2007, 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

"Doing Well by Doing Good" is the Academy of Management's conference theme for 2007. This year's theme explores the linkages between social success and financial success. Betterment of the social-organizational world and organizational effectiveness do not need to be considered incompatible goals. Organizations investing in the improvement of the world no longer have to sacrifice the bottom line. Several streams of research have been initiated in the last decade, including positive psychology movement, positive organizational scholarship, and appreciative inquiry. Further, this is a theme that is central to the founding values of the field of ODC.

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

LESSONS LEARNED AND LESSONS LOST: A MULTI-METHOD FIELD STUDY OF VICARIOUS TEAM LEARNING BEHAVIOR

Henrik Bresman
Insead
2005 Award for Best Competitive Paper

Many teams today operate in fast-paced environments characterized by technological sophistication, knowledge-intensive tasks, and constant change. Confronted with time pressure, resource scarcity, and imperfect information, these teams are faced with an implicit choice of learning how to complete their tasks through their own experiences, or searching out others to learn

conference theme and other Academy issues please go to *http://meetings.aomonline.org/2007.*

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 15th, 2007, 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/2007*) by January 15th, 2007. The academy website is open for submissions beginning November 1, 2006. 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 Symposiums are symposia sessions that directly address the theme of the conference "Doing Well by Doing Good." 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 14, 2006. 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 until January 15, 2007 to submit the full proposal. Symposia proposals that broadly address the theme and are submitted to the ODC Division as regular symposia by January 15th, 2007, 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 any and all divisions, along with the All Academy Symposia submissions. For an elaboration of the rule of three (including exceptions), please visit *http://meetings.aomonline.org/2007*.

Division Awards

Five externally-sponsored division recognition awards, some with honorariums – [see ODC web site (*http://www.aom.pace.edu/odc* for details] will be given for the best paper in each of the following categories: 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 15th (Submission Deadline) to February 7th (Review Deadline). If you have any problems 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, 2007! If you have any questions or feedback, please contact me at *odc@nmsu.edu.*

from. In building on lessons learned by others, a team can speed up its process and improve its output. Losing out on such lessons and instead relying chiefly on the direct experience of team members, on the other hand, can lead to perilous inefficiencies and quality problems. Indeed, a team's ability to learn from the experiences of other teams has been noted as a potentially powerful source of performance (Argote, Gruenfeld, & Naquin, 2000). But what do teams actually do when they engage in this kind of learning, and how are these activities associated with team performance? This paper opens up the black box of "vicarious team learning," the activities by which a team learns key aspects of its task from the similar experiences of others outside the team.

Research at the individual (e.g., Bandura, 1989) and organizational levels (e.g., Levitt & March, 1988) has shown that vicarious learning is important. Yet existing team learning theory does not systematically address vicarious learning, instead it focuses primarily on internal (experiential) team learning processes (e.g., Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; Edmondson, 1999; Gibson & Vermeulen, 2003). There is also a rich research stream on boundary spanning in teams (e.g., Allen, 1977), but only recently have researchers begun to investigate what team members do when spanning boundaries (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Wong, 2004; Zellmer-Bruhn, 2003). As pointed out by Edmondson (2002), while engaging effectively in learning processes across boundaries has become key in organizational teams (Senge, 1990), our understanding of such processes remain limited.

Some insights may be found in work by Argote and colleagues (Argote, Ingram, Levine, & Moreland, 2000) who have argued that learning between groups within organizations can have significant performance effects (e.g., Darr, Argote, & Epple, 1995). These studies indicate the significance of vicarious learning activities among organizational subunits, but implications for the team level must be deduced from what is essentially organizational level research. Moreover, this work does not spell out the activities through which favorable learning outcomes emerge.

The purpose of the present study is to explore vicarious team learning, an important real-world phenomenon, by describing how vicarious team learning is done and examine its effect on team performance. To reach a better understanding of how teams learn, I argue that

we need to bring vicarious learning more fully into the team literature. Because of the gap in our understanding of how vicarious learning operates at the team level, this study is necessarily focused on exploration and theory development rather than confirmation and theory testing. To this end, I propose that using both qualitative and quantitative data is important.

The paper thus starts with a preliminary qualitative study – a two-year field study in a large pharmaceutical firm – of a small set of teams describing vicarious team learning behavior. Specifically, the study focuses on in-licensing teams: project teams charged with researching all aspects of a molecule discovered by an external source, typically a small biotechnology firm, with the objective of acquiring and developing the molecule into a marketable drug. A careful analysis showed that vicarious learning behavior was integral to the way the teams completed their task. Importantly, the study helps to delineate specific sub-behaviors within the context of vicarious team learning. These activities provide the basis for the scale measuring vicarious team learning behavior in a second study, using survey research.

The second study tests two hypotheses: that vicarious team learning behavior is distinct from other team learning constructs in the literature, and that it is positively associated with performance. Sources of vicarious experiences and processes by which they are applied are also explored. The data used to test the hypotheses come from the drug licensing departments of six large pharmaceutical firms. This is the same setting as that of the first study, but the studies are separate. Access was largely negotiated through the members of the Healthcare division of the Licensing Executive Society (LES), and the final sample size was 43 teams.

The key measurement instruments were a team questionnaire and an external performance rater questionnaire. Most key measures included in the questionnaires were developed with the Likert scaling technique (with scale item responses running from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 7 = "strongly agree"). The analysis involves three key steps. First, I assess the adequacy of the measures with psychometric analysis. Second, I use common factor analysis to assess the uniqueness of vicarious learning behavior compared to established measures of learning behavior (e.g., Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Edmondson, 1999) (Hypothesis 1). Third, I analyze the relationship between vicarious

team learning behavior and performance using random effects linear regression models (Hypothesis 2). The analysis finds support for both hypotheses. Sources of vicarious experiences and processes by which they are applied are also explored.

In all, this research shows the usefulness of vicarious learning as a means to understand team learning processes and their performance effects – particularly in environments characterized by constant change. Importantly, this is an exploratory study. As such, the paper lays out a research agenda establishing concrete next steps toward understanding vicarious learning more fully as an integral part of how teams learn.

References

Allen, T.J. (1977). *Managing the flow of technology.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ancona, D.G., & Caldwell, D.F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 634-665.

Argote, L., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Naquin, C. (2000). Group learning in organizations. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 369-411). New York: Erlbaum.

Argote, L., Ingram, P., Levine, J. M., & Moreland, R. L. (2000). Knowledge transfer in organizations: Learning from the experiences of others. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82,* 1-8.

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development* (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social learning and personality development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities of practice. *Organization Science, 2,* 40-57.

Bunderson, J. S., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2003). Management team learning orientation and business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 552-560.

Darr, E. D., Argote, L., & Epple, D. (1995). The acquisition, transfer, and depreciation of knowledge in service organizations. *Management Science, 41,* 1750-1762.

Davis, T. R. V., & Luthans, F. (1980). A social learning approach to organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 5,* 281-290.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 350-383.

Edmondson, A. C. (2002). The local and variegated nature of learning in organizations: A group-level perspective. *Organization Science, 13,* 128-146.

Gibson, C., & Vermeulen, F. (2003). A healthy divide: Subgroups as a stimulus for team learning behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48,* 202-239.

Kane, A., Argote, L., & Levine, J. M. (2005). Knowledge transfer between groups via personnel rotation: Effects of social identity and knowledge quality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 96,* 56-71.

Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. In W. R. Scott & J. F. Short (Eds.), *Annual Review of Sociology: Vol. 4* (pp. 319-340). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Manz, C. C. & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1981). Vicarious learning: The influence of modeling on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 6,* 105-113.

Pitcher, B. L., Hamblin, R. L., & Miller, J. L. L. (1978). The diffusion of collective violence. *American Sociological Review, 43,* 23-35.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17,* 27-43.

Wong, S.-S. (2004). Distal and local group learning: Performance trade-offs and tensions. *Organization Science, 15,* 645-656.

Zellmer-Bruhn, M. (2003). Interruptive events and team knowledge acquisition.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Susan G. Cohen passed away on August 4, 2006, after a long and valiant fight against cancer. In 1988 Susan joined the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California. She co-authored four books and authored numerous articles and book chapters about teams and teamwork, employee involvement and empowerment, and human resource strategies. Her recent work has appeared in *Human Relations, Organizational Dynamics, Journal of Management,* and *Personnel Psychology.*

THE THIRD ORGANIZATION STUDIES SUMMER WORKSHOP
"Organization Studies as Applied Science: The Generation and Use of Academic Knowledge About Organizations"
June 7-9, 2007
Crete, Greece

The Organization Studies Summer Workshop is an annual activity, launched in June 2005, to facilitate high-quality scholarship in organization studies. Its primary aim is to advance cutting-edge research on important topics in the field by bringing together in a Greek island, in early summer, a small and competitively selected group of scholars, who will have the opportunity to interact and share insights in a stimulating and scenic environment. The Third OS Summer Workshop will take place at Grecotel Rithymna Beach Hotel, Rethymnon, Crete, between 7-9 June 2007. The Workshop will be limited to about 50 papers to ensure in-depth discussion. We welcome both theoretical and empirical papers that demonstrate rigorous analyses and approaches. Papers could consider, but are not restricted to, the following topics on the generation and use of academic knowledge about organizations:

1. Epistemological issues concerning what counts as valid knowledge (including aspects such as truth, objectivity vs. subjectivity, etc.);

2. Methodological issues about how valid knowledge is generated;

3. Praxeological issues about how valid knowledge is used in practice;

4. Sociological issues regarding the social settings in which academic knowledge is produced and the forms that knowledge traffic between academics and practitioners takes;

5. Critical issues regarding the political nature of knowledge and the various interests that are served during the process of knowledge production and application (including aspects such as power, dependency, legitimacy, etc.);

6. Learning in terms of teaching management students; how and why understanding the relationship between knowledge production and consumption might inform our teaching practices.

The Workshop will be followed by a Special Issue of Organization Studies on this topic, which will be published in 2009.

Interested participants must submit to the Editor-in-Chief (*OSeditor@alba.edu.gr*), an abstract of no more than 1000 words for their proposed contribution, plus a brief biographical note by January 31, 2007. The submission must be made via email and it must be a Word attachment. It should contain authors' names, institutional affiliations, and email and postal addresses, while the subject matter line of the email should indicate the title of the Workshop. Authors will be notified of acceptance or otherwise by February 28th, 2007. Papers should be submitted to the Editor-in-Chief by May 15, 2007 and will be uploaded on the journal's web site.

Conveners: Paula Jarzabkowski, Aston Business School and AIM, UK. Susan Mohrman, University of Southern California, USA. Amd Andreas Georg Scherer, University of Zurich, Switzerland.

Keynote Speakers: Helga Nowotny (Wissenschaft-szentrum Wien, Austria), co-author of Rethinking Science, Sara L. Rynes (University of Iowa, USA), Editor of the Academy of Management Journal, and Richard Whitley (University of Manchester, UK), author of The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences.

To see a more detailed Call for Papers, please visit: *www.egosnet.org/os*.

ACADEMY ANNOUNCEMENT
Mentoring Best Practices
Award Nominations

The Mentoring Committee is currently inviting applicants for the Mentoring Best Practices Award. This annual award is given in odd years to the person(s) or institution(s) who develop and implement a program or activity that promotes mentoring within the Academy. The purpose of this award is to recognize and encourage institutional initiatives that provide developmental support to Academy members at all levels (students, junior faculty, senior faculty, postdoctoral fellows, practitioners). While we believe that one-to-one mentoring is very important, we are not seeking nominations for individuals who have acted as mentors. Several divisions offer "Best Mentor" awards for that type of activity. Examples of potential candidates for this award include, but are not limited to, research incubators or formal mentoring programs.

Criteria for selection include: creation and implementation of institutional initiatives that provide developmental support to Academy members at any level (students, junior faculty, senior faculty, postdoctoral fellows, practitioners); development of effective methods, structures, or designs for mentoring programs; implementation and direction of mentoring activities in an effective manner; and/or notable contribution to the practice of mentoring.

Submissions must be received by March 30, 2007. Self-nominated proposals are encouraged. Nominations should include a four-page (maximum) description of the initiative along with any supporting exhibits. The nominations will be judged by a committee composed of members of the Academy of Management Mentoring Committee. The recipient of the award will be notified by May 30, 2007.

Please send nominations to: C. Douglas Johnson, Georgia Southern University, Department of Management, Marketing and Logistics, P.O. Box 8154, Statesboro, GA 30460; email: *cdjohnson@georgiasouthern.edu;* phone: (912)486-7287.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE
26th International Congress of Applied Psychology

Raymond Saner
Centre for Socio Eco-Nomic Development

The 26th International Congress of Applied Psychology was held in Athens between July 16 and 21, 2006. The Congress meets every fourth year, and is hosted by a consortium of professional bodies, led by the International Association of Applied Psychology. It is an event of great importance to the world-wide community of applied behavioral scientists.

IACP 2006 included a symposium on the topic of Capacity Building for Social Development. The symposium was supported by two Divisions of the Association: (1) Work & Organizational Psychology and (2) Psychology in Societal Change & Development. The symposium was put together by an international network of OD scholar-practitioners. Four members of ODC participated in the event. Gary N. Mclean, Raymond Saner and Lichia Yiu presented papers and Kenneth Murrell acted as discussant.

The topic of the symposium is very relevant to the ongoing discussions within the division about the need to broaden the scope of OD and the concern shared by ODC members to make ODC more internationally relevant (see Richard W. Woodman, ODC newsletter, Winter 2006).

Developing countries are characterized by a political and socio-economic context in which a historically determined state of extreme poverty, economic disparity and social inequality, affecting large proportions of the population, require priority attention and effective mobilization of resources. However, the effort is with dependencies on the more developed countries. The dependencies are not merely in the realms of technology and finance. They extend to the needs of developing the human capital as well, requiring purposeful education and training facilities in every sector of endeavour.

Capacity building has been recognized in recent times as a prime objective in most development interventions. However, the term has an omnibus usage and refers to development at various system levels – the individual, the group, the organization, the community. Quite logically, capacity building must include the training and development of development professionals themselves, the people who undertake the tasks of development interventions through a variety of projects and programs.

How can applied psychologists and behavioral scientists contribute to this monumental task? The highly inclusive discipline of Organizational Development appears well equipped to address the needs of such capacity development. Indeed, many development programs world-wide have already incorporated OD principles and practices into their intervention strategies. It must be admitted that the scope for developing the field of OD itself is vast. In particular, the need in developing countries appears significant, as most of the premises and "tool kits" have came from a Western world view and socio-economic context.

The symposium addressed the questions frequently encountered in capacity building challenges in most developing countries. For instance:

What may be a "model" curriculum for OD in an education-training program? At the undergraduate/entry level? At the graduate/professional level? What may be the special/unique needs of training OD facilitators in the development context? For development administration? For NGOs? What may be newer, more recent perspectives to OD that could be of significance to development programs? How do we achieve a more effective integration of OD with the operational domains of Human Resource Management, other management systems, and/or community organization and program development? How do we go beyond the effectiveness of a single organizational entity to trans-organizational effectiveness in multiple stakeholder contexts?

Symposium presentations: Vijay Padaki convened the symposium and chaired it. He and Rupande Padaki prepared an overview of the challenges in capacity building in developing countries. Robert Kolodny examined the relevance of a Gestalt perspective in OD skills for social development. Raymond Saner provided the geopolitical context, highlighting the influence of international agencies and multilateral institutions on the development agenda. The grass roots implications of these global trends were examined by Gary McLean through case studies from several developing countries, suggesting the tasks in curriculum development for OD facilitators. Lichia Saner-Yiu extended the basic principles in OD to change tasks in large, complex systems, illustrated with a case study from China. Kenneth Murrell, the invited discussant, attempted a meta-analysis of the presentations, suggesting future directions in curriculum development and training strategies.

Background of Panelists: Vijay and Rupande Padaki are co-founders of The P&P Group, a management resource centre, based in Bangalore. Raymond Saner and Lichia Saner-Yiu are co-founders of the Centre for Socio Eco-Nomic Development, based in Geneva. Robert Kolodny is the principal of Robert Kolodny & Associates, international organization and management development consultants, based in New York City. Gary McLean is a professor of Human Resource Development and Adult Education at the University of Minnesota, and President of McLean Global Consulting, Inc. Kenneth L. Murrell is a Professor of Management and MIS at the University of West Florida in Pensacola, Florida.

TECHNOLOGICAL DISCONTINUITIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL ADAPTATION: EXPLORING THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY

Ricardo G. Flores
University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
2005 Award for Best Interactive Paper

Technology has been at the center of organizational theory from its inception (Thompson & Bates, 1957). A key idea developed in early research was that organizations rationally seek to isolate their core technologies from environmental instability as a way of functioning efficiently and effectively (Thompson, 1967). However, the question of how, and if, organizations cope with fundamental change in those core technologies was not completely developed in those early works, and remains something of a mystery in the present day (Tushman & Smith, 2002).

Recent research has shown that incumbent organizations are negatively and profoundly affected by technological discontinuities. Technological discontinuities are rare and unpredictable events generally linked to scientific advances (Tushman & Murmann, 1998). Studies have revealed that incumbents suffer acute performance deterioration and occasionally disappearance (Tripsas, 1997). Due to these strong negative effects for most of the firms in an industry and for the stakeholders of these endangered firms, it is important to widen our understanding of this phenomenon.

Research Questions & Arguments

Past research examining organizational responses to technological discontinuities has focused on two distinct but interconnected questions. First, it has sought to explain why incumbents are frequently unable to adapt to discontinuities. Second, it has sought to identify organizational characteristics that positively affect this ability. Two overarching arguments are apparent in this prior work. First, many scholars have argued that organizations suffer from learning deficiencies that prevent them from engaging in necessary exploration, and thus hinder their ability to produce radical innovations. This tendency may occur because they apply "rational" investment strategies (Cohen, 1995) which prevent them from committing the necessary resources to innovation. It may also occur because of competency traps (Leonard-Barton, 1992; March, 1991), or because of the cognitive limitation of firms' socially-embedded decision-makers (Abrahamson, 1991). Second, others scholars have noted that incumbent firms often do create radically new technologies, but they fail to successfully commercialize them for a variety of reasons. This has been argued to occur because of political resistance to technological change within the organization (Buchanan & Badham, 1999), because of firms' prior commitments to existing customers and suppliers (Christensen, 1997), or because of other inertial forces within the organization (Ruef, 1997). Some recent research has suggested possible ways that firms can overcome learning deficiencies and inertial tendencies in the face of technological change. Tushman & O'Reilly (1997), for example, propose that "ambidextrous" organizations, which are firms structurally divided according to technological innovation objectives, have an adaptive advantage over other firms.

This paper aims to provide additional insight into these important questions by examining how organizational identity may affect firms' ability to adapt to technological discontinuities. Previous research has indicated that organizational identity is highly consequential in processes of organizational adaptation and change, and particularly important in crisis situations (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). I build upon these prior works to develop three propositions about how organizational identity may affect firms' success or failure in the face of technological change. I suggest that organizational identity can become tightly linked with the particular technology, to the extent that the technology becomes self-referential for the organization (Selznick, 1957 [1984]). Under such circumstances, organizational efforts to adopt new technologies or discard old ones may activate identity defense mechanisms (Brown &

Starkey, 2000), which render an organization inert in response to technological change. In contrast, however, I also suggest that organizations' chances of successful adaptation may be increased when organizational identity is meaningfully tied to more than one self-referential technology, thereby creating a "robust identity" (Padgett & Ansell, 1993). I further suggest that firms' ability to successfully adapt to technological discontinuities may be enhanced when they have identities which are linked to higher ideals and social values, and which are detached from particular technologies altogether (Buenstorf & Murmann, 2005). Technological change should not invoke identity defense mechanisms in firms with such identities. Further, the "value-infused" nature of such identities may serve as a resource that make firms particularly resilient in the face of technological crises.

Potential Implications

Technological change poses an important problem for organizations. Understanding the factors that facilitate and impede organizational adaptation to technological discontinuities is an important task for organizational research. This paper may usefully complement previous research that has sought to identify these factors. Organizations with limited identities centered on specific, self-referential technologies, may be at a significant disadvantage when confronted with technological change. In contrast, organizational identity may be a resource promoting successful adaptation when it is linked with multiple technologies, or when it transcends technology altogether. Moving beyond these specific arguments, the large literature on organizational identity and change may make important contributions to the literature on technological innovation and change. Future research should further explore these potential contributions.

References

Abrahamson, E. (1991). Managerial fads and fashions: The diffusion and rejection of innovations. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 586-612.

Albert, S. & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, Volume 7* (pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brown, A. D. & Starkey, K. (2000). Organizational Identity and Learning: A psychodynamic perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 102-120.

Buchanan, D. & Badham, R. (1999). *Power, politics and organizational change: Winning the turf game.* New York: Sage.

Buenstorf, G. & Murmann, P. (2005). Ernst Abbe's scientific management: Theoretical insights from a nineteenth-century dynamic capability approach. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 14*(4), 543-578.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The Innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail.* New York: Harper Business.

Cohen, W. (1995). Empirical studies of innovative activity. In P. Stoneman (Ed.), *Handbook of the economics of innovation and technological change.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Dutton, J. E. & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 517-554.

Elsbach, K. D. & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Member's response to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week ratings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 442-476.

Leonard-Barton, D. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*(Special Issue): 111-126.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2,* 71-87.

Padgett, J. F. & Ansell, C. K. (1993). Robust action and the rise of the Medici, 1400-1434. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*(6), 1215-1319.

Ruef, M. (1997). Assessing organizational fitness on a dynamic landscape: An empirical test of the relative inertia thesis. *Strategic Management Journal, 18,* 837-853.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration: A sociological interpretation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Thompson, J. D. & Bates, F. L. (1957). Technology, organization and administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 1*(2): 325-343.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tripsas, M. (1997). Unraveling the process of creative destruction: Complementary assets and incumbent survival in the typesetter industry. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(Summer Special Issue): 119-142.

Tushman, M. L. & O'Reilly, C. A. (1997). *Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Tushman, M. L. & Murmann, J. P. (1998). Dominant designs, technology cycles and organizational out-

comes. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 20,* 231-266.

Tushman, M. L. & Smith, W. (2002). Organizational Technology. In J. A. C. Baum (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to organizations* (pp. 386-414). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

SOCIAL INFLUENCE EFFECTS ON COMMITMENT TO CHANGE AND IMPLEMENTATION BEHAVIORS

Lisa Jones Christensen
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
2005 Award for Best Student Paper

This paper attempts to explain discretionary implementation behaviors during times of organizational change. A growing body of organizational change research suggests that many innovative products, practices, and services fail to deliver expected results (Klein, 2001; Orlikowski, 2000; Pfeffer, 2000; White, 1996); such disappointments may be the result of implementation failure, rather than a result of program or technical failure (Klein et al., 2001; Repenning, 2002). Specifically, implementation failure occurs when organizations "fail to gain employees' skilled, consistent, and committed program (or product) use" (Klein et al., 2001).

The paper focuses on the commitment component of the definition of implementation – and works from there to understand the antecedents to, and the implementation consequences of, commitment to change. Here, commitment to change is considered as part of a sensemaking process whereby individuals evaluate reasons for and against supporting a change and then use social information to judge and act on those reasons. Thus, one can study the phenomenon of change-related behaviors by selecting an organizational change and 1) identifying the individual-level reasons people select for and against supporting the initiative; 2) identifying how social network ties and communication patterns affect these reasons; and 3) relating the reasons and the network information to commitment and implementation behaviors. In this research, I utilize this approach and focus on how reasons for and against supporting an organizational change affect commitment to the change and change-related behaviors – in particular as a result of social interactions. Drawing on Behavioral Reasons Theory (BRT) (Westaby, 2002) enables this use of employee-generated reasons in my analysis.

Behavioral Reasons Theory provides a theoretical link between employee-generated reasons and behavioral intentions and outcomes. It suggests that understanding the specific reasons people use to explain "why" they form their behavioral intentions is necessary to fully understand specific motives (Westaby & Fishbein, 1996). In using tenets of BRT, I postulate that when a change initiative is introduced, people likely consider (or reconsider) the various reasons that either support or do not support endorsing the initiative. This consideration likely involves watching and interacting with others in order to fully decide how to act.

BRT and other related research suggests the importance of employee-generated reasons in evaluating a change initiative. Thus, it makes sense to ask whether there are predictable categories of reasons for and against an organizational change. To answer this, I turn to the socialization literature for organizing categories for employee-generated reasons. This literature suggests that employees who are in a time of transition seek job-relevant information (informational) and socialization-relevant information (normative) (Morrison, 1993; Shah, 1998). I therefore suggest that these two meta-categories of information-seeking behaviors can also be applied in evaluating and categorizing reasons.

Reasons and Dyadic Network Influence *During* a Change

Building on the idea that reasons have categories and that employee-generated reasons are critical components to determining success in organizational change situation, I suggest that reasons comprise one element of social comparison and social information processing at work. Specifically, I argue that after individuals have been exposed to different reasons from different sources, they next consider how to value, weight, and potentially adopt the reasons from different network sources.

In this study, the focus is on dyadic social networks. Accordingly, the emphasis is on accepting the respondent's rating of whom they find to be the most influential in relation to the particular change, and then identifying the reasons (or perceived reasons) of that person. I argue that over time, powerful individuals can exert a disproportionate amount of influence on the reasons (and thus the commitment and implementation behaviors) of others in the work environment. Essentially, over time, individual reasons for supporting a change will likely be affected by the reasons of the person who that individual considers the most communicative,

persuasive, or otherwise most influential person in the context of this change. Therefore, I argue that reasons (and the commitment and behaviors that flow from reasons) change as a result of the sensemaking and social information processing that accompany an organizational change.

Given this background, I incorporate a discussion of time and argue that the "time two" reasons of the person given the highest influence rating by the respondent will significantly predict the "time two" reasons of the respondent, even controlling for "time one" reasons of the respondent. Such a statement does not address the symmetry of the influence relationship, nor does it fully capture the effects of change over time. In the full paper, I address these issues and suggest that both symmetrical and asymmetrical influence is likely. I argue that the degree of symmetry in an influence relationship will be positively related to the closeness of reasons, such that the reasons of people in symmetrical relationships will be the most similar, the reasons of people in asymmetric relationships will be less similar, and the reasons of people with no relationship will be the least similar. One potential moderator of this relationship is the tendency to "self-monitor" (Pollock et al. 2000; Burkhardt, 1994). Thus, I expect that people who are high self-monitors will be more affected by the reasons of influential people in their network.

Reason Types and Commitment to Change

Thus far, I have argued for categories of reasons and I have linked similarity of reasons to dyadic influence effects. Next, I suggest that certain reasons lead to certain types of commitment to change – and thus people with similar reasons may also have similar levels of commitment to the change. Specifically, I argue that certain types of reasons solidify affective, cognitive, or mixed reactions to the change request; and that different types of reactions relate to different types of commitment to change (and, ultimately, to different behaviors related to the change). Making these connections requires introducing the commitment to change construct and linking reasons and network theory to its dimensions.

In the full paper, I introduce commitment to change using the Herscovitch and Meyer (2001) definition and then hail back to the earlier discussion of reason types (informational and normative) and the kind of data that each type provides. Ultimately, I make several claims about each type of reason and how each might be

related to all three types of commitment to change (affective, normative, and continuance).

The final section of the paper explores how commitment to change might mediate between reasons and implementation behaviors, and it suggests that different forms of commitment to change relate to different implementation behaviors associated with the change request. More specifically, I follow the research of Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) and argue that all commitment types lead to compliance behaviors related to the change, while some types of commitment to change are related to discretionary "extra" behaviors (such as cooperation and championing). Thus, I suggest that all three types of commitment to change will lead to compliance behaviors, but only affective and normative commitment to change will be positively related to discretionary behaviors.

Conclusion

In this paper, I propose that employee-generated reasons have categories; that reasons move through the organization as a function of the influence relationships in dyadic social networks; and that different reason categories trigger different types of commitment to change and thus different types of implementation behaviors. These linkages offer an explanation for situations wherein two or more employees "start out" with similar attitudes and behavioral intentions regarding a change, but later "end up" feeling and acting differently (or vice versa). This work allows scholars interested in reactions to change to consider the intra- and inter-individual processes that create commitment to change and elicit change-related implementation behaviors.

References available from the author.

CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPROVISATION: SOME CONCEPTIONS INFORMED BY UK FINANCIAL SERVICES

Steve Leybourne
Plymouth Business School
2005 Award for Rupe Chisholm
Best Theory to Practice Paper

Evidence has emerged suggesting that more progressive organizations are moving away from a slavish adherence to agreed processes and procedures. Elements of this

developing trend have been labeled organizational improvisation. An influential pre-existing condition for effective improvisation is a supportive organizational culture and climate. This paper examines various dimensions of improvisation, in order to analyze identifiable components of organizational culture and climate that may encourage or negate effective improvisation.

At the superficial level some practitioners perceive little difference between culture and climate, but the academic definitions are quite distinct. We are interested in culture from an organizational and also from a sectoral viewpoint, defined by Gordon (1991: 397) as: "…an organization-specific system of widely shared assumptions and values that give rise to typical behavior patterns."

Dealing with change in modern organizations tends towards a relaxation of processes and procedures, and allowing trusted and empowered employees to experiment with more creative, and less predictable, ways of achieving. Organizational improvisation is an example of this. There have been a number of reviews of organizational improvisation (Cunha et al., 1999: Leybourne, 2006), which have evolved from Weick's (1979) work on sensemaking, and Moorman and Miner's (1998a) work on identifying key constructs. This has resulted in the adoption and application of ideas from jazz performance (e.g. Hatch, 1999), and from improvisational theatre (e.g. Crossan, 1997). Later work used grounded theory approaches to consider temporal aspects of improvisation, and particularly pressure to achieve complex tasks to a demanding or compressed timetable (e.g. Moorman & Miner, 1998a). This work is building the foundations to allow empirical research of a more positivist nature.

Sample, Method, and Case Study Findings

The study that underpins this research and provides the primary data was located in the U.K. financial services sector. Each of the organizations was written up as a case study. Cross-case analysis was then undertaken, and themes, trends, and modes of operation were identified. There is a significant and detailed analysis of improvisational activity within the six case study organizations, which is reported in the full paper. Those six case studies are of BigBank; MutualCo; ExSociety; FinanceCo; NewCo; and DivestCo.

Comparative Findings and Discussion

The desire to manage organizational culture is at the forefront of many managers' aspirations (Ogbonna &

Harris, 1998). Organizational culture is also an important component in the management of strategic change. A useful analytical tool is to apply Schein's (1985) three levels of culture: "surface manifestations;" the afore-mentioned "values," and "basic assumptions," to the case study organizations. The full paper offers a summary of Schein's three levels of culture as applied to the six case study organizations.

Many of the practices and mechanisms used to manage change in these organizations conform to the "informally formal" description in Bacon et al. (1996: 95). Formality is provided by standards and procedures, and informality by the relative freedom of managers to execute change as they wish, including the use of improvisation. This seems to point to the need for hybrid managers. Perhaps patterns of practice which exhibit an informal formality may provide a key to resolving the tension between the need for systematic practices and consistency on one hand, and intuitive organic practices that nurture innovation and flexibility on the other.

There is overwhelming evidence of extensive use and acceptance of improvisation in the management of change within the case organizations. Chelariu et al. (2002: 141) suggest that this organizational activity is: "…a reflection of the pressures of an environment characterized by unprecedented fast change." Improvisation assists in this, and the full paper offers a detailed analysis of its use within the case study organizations. Some improvisation is however surreptitious, avoiding accountability and the scrutiny of senior managers.

Managers across all six organizations discuss movement away from agreed plans in order to execute change. Indeed, they may: "…make a conscious decision to improvise as a means of creating more flexibility of behavior and more spontaneous decision making" (Chelariu et al., 2002: 141). Crossan and Sorrenti (1997: 155) see this as: "…intuition guiding action in a spontaneous way."

Managers are however better able to support improvisation if it is bounded by a limiting framework. This is supported by the literature. Improvisation is also more effective if mechanisms exist to share successful improvisational activity (Chelariu et al., 2002), and to communicate lessons learned to relevant parts of the organization. This requires the development of organizational memory (Moorman & Miner, 1998b). All the case organizations were concerned about the capturing of good improvisational practice for future use. There

is a significant and growing level of improvisation across the six organizations, although the reasons for this activity differ. Again, a comprehensive analysis is offered in the full paper.

Within this study, the organizations achieved different degrees of competence with their improvisational effectiveness, and their cultural support for improvisational activity. Organizations with a lower level of support within their organizational culture and low improvisational effectiveness have been labeled "aspirational improvers," for their desire to improvise, moderated by lack of tangible support. FinanceCo and DivestCo fall into this category.

The second pair of organizations possesses a lower level of support within their organizational culture and a high improvisational effectiveness quotient. They appear to have management support for improvisation, but are not supportive of failure to improvise effectively. An element of surreptitiousness therefore also appears within these organizations, which comprises BigBank and MutualCo. They have been labeled "surreptitious experimenters."

The third pair of organizations possess a high level of support for improvisation within their organizational culture and a high improvisational effectiveness quotient. This group manage change effectively using innovative processes, and comprise ExSociety and NewCo. They have been labeled "confident achievers."

There is little literature on the use of improvisation within change. There is however compelling evidence that improvisation is used, and managers in all six case organizations provide overwhelming support for improvisational activities as a means of executing change.

References

Bacon N., Ackers P., Storey J, & Coates D (1996). It's a small world: Managing human resources in small businesses. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 7*(1), 82-101.

Chelariu C., Johnston W.J. & Young L. (2002). Learning to improvise, improvising to learn: A process of responding to complex environments. *Journal of Business Research, 55*(1), 141-147.

Crossan M. (1997). Improvise to Innovate, *Ivey Business Quarterly* (Autumn), pp. 36-42.

Crossan M. & Sorrenti M. (1997). Making sense of improvisation in Walsh J.P. & Huff A.S. (eds.) *Advances in Strategic Management, Vol. 14* (pp. 155-180). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cunha e M.P., Cunha da J.V. & Kamoche K. (1999). Organizational improvisation: What, when, how and why. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 299-341.

Gordon G.G. (1991). Industry determinants of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(2): 396-415.

Hatch M.J. (1999). Exploring the empty spaces of organizing: How improvisational jazz helps redescribe organizational structure. *Organization Studies, 20*(1), 75-100.

Leybourne S.A. (2006). Managing improvisation within change management: Lessons from UK Financial Services. *Service Industries Journal, 26*(1), 1-23.

Moorman C. & Miner A.S. (1998a). The convergence of planning and execution: Improvisation in new product development. *Journal of Marketing, 62*(3), 1-20.

Moorman C. & Miner A.S. (1998b). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(4), 698-723.

Ogbonna E. & Harris L.C. (1998). Managing organizational culture: Compliance or genuine change? *British Journal of Management, 9*(4), 273-288.

Schein E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weick K.E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing (2nd ed.).* Reading, MASS : Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

RADICAL STRATEGIC AND STRUCTURAL CHANGE: OCCURRENCE, ANTECEDENTS, AND CONSEQUENCES

J. Daniel Wischnevsky
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Fariborz Damanpour
Rutgers University
2005 Award for Best Visual Paper

The study examines the occurrence of radical strategic and structural changes, their antecedents, sequencing, and differential consequences for short-term performance and organizational survival. Building upon the observation that organizations can make radical changes in certain dimensions without changing others (Nickerson & Zenger, 2002), we treat these types of radical change as separate yet related events rather than as subsumed components of single transformational

events. We also assume that radical structural change deserves as much attention as radical strategic change, despite a disproportionate research focus on the latter.

Hypotheses

Radical change is defined as a transition between organizational states that differ markedly from each other, accomplished over a short period of time. Radical strategic changes are major shifts in the most critical exchanges between the organization and its environment, encompassing major changes in a firm's business focus or mix, competitive and collaborative strategy choices, and long-term goals. Radical structural changes are major shifts in the division and coordination of work, departmentalization, allocation of decision-making power, and formal communication channels. Drawing upon various streams in organizational change research, including learning theory, the punctuated equilibrium model, configurational views of organization, structural inertia theory, and the upper echelons perspective, we developed four sets of hypotheses.

First, we hypothesize that radical structural change will be undertaken more frequently than radical strategic change. Structural change primarily requires modification of internal variables, over which executives have considerable control by virtue of their legitimate authority and ability to influence reward policies. Yet strategic change also requires both the ability to influence variables external to the firm, such as customer demand, distribution channels, and suppliers – a more uncertain endeavor – and higher levels of resource commitment than structural change. Overall, executives have more control over radical structural change outcomes than over radical strategic change outcomes.

Second, we developed hypotheses on differential effects of antecedents on each type of change. We argue that strategic change influences the organization's domain and competitive approach, which critically affect profitability; thus, as a more powerful lever to influence performance, it will be preferred to radical structural change given certain antecedents. We hypothesize that top executive change, top executive team renewal, and sustained low performance will increase the likelihood of radical strategic change, but will not affect the likelihood of radical structural change.

Third, we hypothesize that, while prior radical changes are likely to reduce the likelihood of subsequent changes of the same type, prior radical strategic changes will increase the likelihood of radical structural changes, but not the reverse. Radical change involves major

risks and resource commitments; it is unlikely that changes of the same type will be undertaken close to each other. However, questions remain as to whether changes in strategy tend to precede changes in structure, or vice versa. Based on prior theory and research, we argue that strategy's directional force over structure is stronger than the reverse.

Finally, given that executives have more control over structural than strategic change, we propose that radical strategic changes will lead to stronger detrimental short-term effects than radical structural changes. However, we posit that strategic changes aiming to improve organization-environment fit will show a more positive long-term effect than structural changes.

Data and Analysis

These hypotheses were tested using a sample of 50 U.S. bank holding companies (BHCs), whose event histories we studied from 1975 to 1995 or until the firms no longer operated independently. This is an attractive setting to study radical organizational change. During the period studied, BHCs implemented major strategic and structural changes. These changes helped transform many BHCs from single-state, commercial banking firms into geographically diversified financial super-markets offering a broad mix of services beyond traditional banking.

We coded Radical Structural Change and Radical Strategic Change from BHCs' annual reports to shareholders and 10-K reports. Examples of radical structural changes include multiple actions involving the creation, elimination, reorganization, and consolidation of major organizational units; major changes in the responsibility of and in the resources available to top managers; and major changes in centralization, differentiation, integration and coordination among units. Examples of radical strategic changes include major shifts in the emphasis given to major market or service segments; substantive entry into (or exit from) product class, market, or business activity; and major changes in long-term competitive approaches and policies. We observed 111 radical structural changes and 46 radical strategic changes.

Sources for other variables included the aforementioned reports, the Survey of Current Business (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 1998), Standard & Poor's Compustat PC Plus database, and the Annual Statistical Digest (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 1975-1995). We used event history analysis methods for testing hypotheses related to

antecedents of radical change and effects of radical change on organizational survival. Hypotheses related to effects of radical changes on short-term performance were tested with pooled time-series cross-sectional analysis.

Findings

We found that it was significantly more likely that a BHC would undertake radical structural than strategic change. This is consistent with our argument that radical strategic change, being riskier and requiring higher resource commitments than radical structural change, would be implemented only under limited circumstances. This result implies that research that treats relatively contemporaneous radical changes in various attributes as a single transformational event might be omitting from its analysis the occurrence of important radical changes in a dimension (e.g., structure) that may lack correlates in others (e.g., strategy).

As hypothesized, radical strategic change was facilitated by a new top executive and by sustained low performance, but contrary to expectations, not by top executive team renewal. None of these three antecedents directly influenced radical structural change. Also, we found that prior strategic change did significantly increase structural change, while prior structural change had no significant influence on strategic change. These results further highlight the importance of distinguishing between strategic and structural change and indicate that factors often cited as antecedents of radical change indeed affect the undertaking of radical strategic changes, but are generally not direct predictors of structural ones.

We found that the primary trigger for radical structural change is radical strategic change. The other antecedents played only an indirect role: they triggered strategic change that preceded structural change. It is important to note that this conclusion would not be reached from a perspective that considered changes in multiple organizational dimensions as components of a single revolutionary event. Thus, a renewed impetus to study the sequence and dynamics of change (Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001) seems appropriate.

Our hypothesis that radical strategic changes would lead to more detrimental effects on short-term financial performance than radical structural changes was supported one year after the occurrence of the respective changes, but the effect dissipated after two years. In addition, we essentially found that neither type of change had a significant effect on organizational survival.

Conclusion

This study departed from two dominant approaches in empirical studies of radical organizational change – one that treats relatively contemporaneous changes in various core aspects of organizations as a single event and another that focuses on changes in specific dimensions without examining relationships to other changes. The findings suggest that to further our understanding of the particular conditions that facilitate the undertaking of organizational change, as well as to understand the impact of organizational change on firms' performance and survival, theoretical representations should take into consideration differences among diverse types of change.

References

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (1975-1995). *Annual Statistical Digest.* Washington, DC: Author.

Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce. (1998). *Survey of Current Business, 78* (7).

Nickerson, J. A., & Zenger, T. R. (2002). Being efficiently fickle: A dynamic theory of organizational choice. *Organization Science, 13,* 547-566.

Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W., & Cameron, K. S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of Management Journal, 44,* 697-713.

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.)

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____