CALL FOR PAPERS
Ann Feyerherm
Program Chair
Pepperdine University

Summer in Anaheim, California—what could be better? I want to personally invite you to the Academy of Management 2008 annual meeting and encourage you to submit a paper or symposium. Besides what I'm sure will be a fabulous program, there are a wealth of activities in the area: Disneyland, the beach, fine restaurants, and Angels games, to name a few. However, none of the experience will happen without your participation! The deadline for submissions of papers to the ODC division is January 15, 2008, 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time.

"The Questions We Ask" is the theme of this year's Academy of Management meetings. This year's theme was born out of a belief that our answers are only as good as our questions and that there is some uneasiness about why our knowledge doesn't find its way into practice. Hence, the focus on questions. Provide papers and symposia that ask questions that help define the frontiers of knowledge, about what puzzles practitioners, challenges our ways of knowing, asks ourselves how we build knowledge and confronts the unknown. ODC division members have asked quite provocative questions over the years so we think this will be quite a natural topic for us.

We invite colleagues to submit papers and symposia that explore and build on this theme. In addition, submissions related to traditional ODC Division themes (change processes within organizations, active attempts to intervene in organization systems to improve their effectiveness and scholarly studies of such interventions; the roles of change agents, action research describing collaborative interventions; how organizations are managing the complexity of environmental and social demands; strategic capabilities for change; role of self awareness and reflection in practice) are also encouraged.. So please ensure that you fully participate in this exciting opportunity to share your questions and discoveries with colleagues by

SCHOLARSHIP OF INDIVIDUAL, ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE: A LOOK BACK, AND AHEAD
Sandy Kristin Piderit
Case Western Reserve University

I contribute this review of my first decade of organizational scholarship to my ODC colleagues as an outgoing Two-Year Representative-at-Large on the ODC Executive Committee.

Table of Contents

submitting multiple papers and symposia. You will help define not only the next generation of organization development theories and innovative change practices, but further enable new questions and potential for theory and practice. For additional details on the conference theme and other Academy issues, please go to http://meetings.aomonline.org/2008.

Contributions

ODC colleagues can contribute to the main program by submitting papers and symposia to the ODC division (the deadline for all academy symposia is past). Caucus proposals are another way to participate and are due by March 1, 2008 to avarma@luc.edu.

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 generally have a better chance of acceptance. It is important to remember that a symposium may be submitted to up to three divisions or interest groups, and no more. The deadline for both paper and symposia submissions to the ODC Division is January 15, 2007 EST.

All submissions are electronic. Authors should refer to the Academy website (http://submissions/aomonline.org/2008). The website is open for submissions beginning November 1, 2007. Your submissions will be acknowledged upon receipt by the Academy and then forwarded to the ODC Division. You can register the submission prior to uploading the submission and we strongly recommend you do not wait until the last minute to submit! For authors who do not have internet access or are unable to submit via the Academy submission website, please contact Jimmy Le at (914) 923-2673.

The Rule of Three

The Academy of Management strongly enforces a "rule of three." 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 and have their own rule of three). 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/2008.

Division Awards

Five externally-sponsored division recognition awards, some with honorariums (see ODC web site at http://division.aomonline.org/odc/ for details) will be given for the best paper in each of the following categories: Interactive paper, The Rupert F. Chisholm award for linking theory to practice, action research, student authored, and overall best paper. Papers authored by students (separately or as a group of students) and papers that deal with action research should be clearly identified as such at the time of submission in the title page. This is critical in consideration for the awards. In addition, the division also has best reviewer awards. All award win-ners will be recognized at the ODC Business Meeting.

Reviewers

We 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 continues in its centralized reviewer system in which all reviewers must register. Even though you have reviewed in the past, you must sign up on the Academy website as a reviewer. Please visit http://review.aomonline.org to sign up and choose areas in which you would like to review. You will also have the option to review for other divisions or interest groups. Try to limit your groups to only three since each division will want to assign multiple papers. The review period will run from January 15 to February 13, 2008. If you have trouble signing up as a reviewer, please contact Ann Feyerherm at aomodc@pepperdine.edu or the technical online support at http://review.aomonline.org/help.asp.

I look forward to receiving your submissions and seeing you in Anaheim at the Academy meetings August 8-13, 2008. If you have any questions about submissions or reviewing, please contact me at aomodc@pepperdine.edu.

(From Piderit, page 1)

A key question for our field over the last decade has been whether passionate attention to managerial challenges can be matched with increasingly rigorous scholarship on individual, organizational, and social change. This question has been of special relevance to me during my early academic career, since I have been a member of the OB department at Case Western Reserve University (CASE) for nine years. This department has been historically well known within the organization development community as a center for passionate work on organizational and social change. The department also has a reputation for rigorous work on leadership, learning, and individual behavior in organizations. I offer my reflections on this question.

The intersection of individual, organizational, and social change: Taking on the challenges of partnering to address global problems

In graduate school, I was convinced that the key to understanding organizational change to challenge old views of individuals as either leaders or resistors of change efforts, but as human beings undergoing individual change processes—seeking to resolve ambivalent responses to proposed changes in their work organizations (Piderit, 2000). In my first year or two at CASE, I was exposed to very different views. In essence, I was challenged to go beyond a view of individuals as the key to change. My departmental colleagues' scholarship was, by choice, focused on much more complex organizational and social dynamics, aimed at of addressing global problems like poverty, interreligious strife, and the destruction of non-renewable natural resources. I admired their passion, but it seemed that taking on such complexities myself would be impossibly hard.

Eventually, I joined my colleagues in their work to understand and reinforce desirable social changes. My initial experiences at CASE convinced me that it was both feasible and essential for organizational scholars to tackle global problems through the lenses of organizational development and social change. Deepened understanding of such cooperative efforts was urgently needed, because some essential changes in our world cannot be carried out through individual or organizational change alone. No single leader and no one company can solve global problems such as world hunger, disease epidemics, or widespread unemployment in a fragile economic region. For these reasons, I entered into collaborative study of organizational efforts to partner for social change, and especially of efforts to cooperate across the public, nonprofit, and corporate sectors in transformative ways.

Key ideas about this new domain of study are offered in A Handbook of Transformative Cooperation: New Designs and Dynamics (Piderit, Fry, and Cooperrider, 2007). In this work, we seek to understand and bolster the effectiveness of unlikely and fragile efforts toward cross-sectoral partnership. In the book, we frame those efforts as "transformative cooperation," initially defined as the outcome of a process of social interaction "that generates a new threshold of cooperative capability and takes people to a higher stage of moral development while serving to build a more sustainable world future." More recently, I have advanced a model of that process of social interaction (Piderit, 2007) which explains the elements of actions and of emotional context that reinforce patterns of conflict across organizational and social boundaries, or patterns of cooperation that can transcend those boundaries.

I retain an interest in the roles of individuals and relationships in these efforts toward transformative cooperation. How was an unlikely partnership developed between a petroleum company and an international nongovernmental organization to develop an economically challenged region in a socially responsible way? How could a cross-sectoral collaboration to improve health education and behavior be supported? My colleagues and I repeatedly rejected the notion that individual leaders, no matter how extraordinary, could drive these efforts at social change. We worked to develop the notion of leadership as a cooperative process, occurring within learning networks, in which many people might participate in roles that transcend the old divisions between "leaders" and "followers" (Piderit and Poonamallee, 2005).

At the level of corporations, the emerging story of business transformation for sustainability and social responsibility also captured my attention. In Glavas and Piderit (2007) we offer an integrated view of scholarship on social responsibility and environmental sustainability both as social movements and as business pursuits. We develop propositions about the consequences of an integrated pursuit of different dimensions of global corporate citizenship for employees within the organization. While this work does not examine partnerships across organizational boundaries, it does address the challenges of removing barriers to change within organizations.

Social change toward gender equity in employment: Scholarship on women's career advancement and leadership

While in graduate school, I had also studied the role of individuals in creating conditions for gender equity. I examined different explanations for women's slow advancement in business (See Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, and Dutton, 1998; Bilimoria and Piderit, 1994; Piderit and Ashford, 2003). During my first decade at CASE, my continued research and my personal experiences convinced me that neither individual nor organizational change alone was going to result in gender equity for male and female managers.

My colleagues and I discovered that conversations within an organization about inequities are complicated and often norms make discussion of perceived inequities impossible, or extremely risky. This dynamic is illustrated in a case study of a regional bank (Piderit, Brenner, Godwin, Bilimoria and O'Neill, 2007) revealing how women's views of their prospects for managerial advancement vary in a company that is "not there yet" in terms of gender equity. This case study shows that women do not see straightforward paths to corporate leadership in that particular bank. Fortunately, the publication of *The Handbook of Women in Business and Management* (2007), which I co-edited with Diana Bilimoria, offers other more hopeful scholarship. This work gives me confidence that more straightforward paths for career advancement will open up for me and other female scholars of organizations, for female managers, and for my daughter when she eventually enters the workforce.

Possibilities for organizational scholarship and social change: Rigorous work pursued with vigorous passion

Can individual, organizational, and social change scholarship be passionately committed to impact on management practice, and at the same time, be executed at a high level of academic rigor? I have concluded that it can. My colleagues at CASE, and my colleagues in the Academy's division of Organization Development and Change, who will continue to wrestle with how individual, organizational and societal change can be carried out, are the source of my hope for our field and for our common future.

I invite you to join us in focusing your own work, with both academic rigor and vigorous passion for the human condition, on addressing organizational challenges, pursuing opportunities for reinventing organizations, and solving global problems.

References

Ashford, S.J., Rothbard, N.P., Piderit, S.K., & Dutton, J. E. (1998). Out on a limb: The role of context and impression management in issue selling. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43*(1), 23-57.

Bilimoria, D. & Piderit, S.K. (1994). Board committee membership: Effects of sex-based bias. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(6), 1453-77.

Bilimoria, D., & Piderit, S.K. (Eds.) (2007). *The handbook on women in business and management.* Williston, VT: Edward Elgar Publishers.

Glavas, A., & Piderit, S,K. (2007). *How does doing good matter? Dimensions of global corporate citizenship and their consequences within organizations.* (Working paper). Cleveland, OH: Author.

Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalent attitudes toward organizational change: A multidimensional view. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 783-794.

Piderit, S.K. (2007). *Transforming conflict into partnership: changing patterns of interaction within and across organizational and social boundaries.* (Working paper). Cleveland, OH: Author.

Piderit, S.K., & Ashford, S.J. (2003). Breaking silence: Tactical choices women managers make in speaking up about gender-equity issues. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1477-1502.

Piderit, S.K., Brenner, N., Godwin, L., Bilimoria, D., & O'Neill, D.A. (2007). *Blinkers in women's views of managerial advancement: Conforming to norms of undiscussability in a gender-blind organization.* (Working paper). Cleveland, OH: Author.

Piderit, S.K., Fry, R.E, & Cooperrider, D.L. (Eds.) (2007). *A handbook of transformative cooperation: New designs and dynamics.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Piderit, S,K., & Poonamallee, L. (2005). *Catalyzing a learning network to support breastfeeding: Creating space for community partnerships to develop.* (Working paper). Cleveland, OH: Author.

HAUNTED BY THE PAST: EFFECTS OF POOR CHANGE MANAGEMENT HISTORY ON EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND TURNOVER

Prashant Bordia
University of South Australia, Australia

Simon L.D. Restubog
The University of Queensland, Australia

Nerina L. Jimmieson
The University of Queensland, Australia

Bernd E. Irmer
Queensland University of Technology, Australia

2007 Award for Best Competitive Paper

Change management research has largely ignored the effects of organizational change history in shaping employee attitudes and behavior (Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001). In this paper, we examine the effects of previous history of poor change management on organization- and change-related employee attitudes and turnover. We argue that inept change management will undermine employee faith in the organization's ability to look after employee interests and therefore lead to low trust in the organization. Lack of trust will result in low job satisfaction and turnover intentions and finally exit from the organization. At the level of organizational change, past mismanagement of change will result in cynicism towards organizational change, which, in turn, would lead to lack of openness to future change efforts in the organization. We use schema theory to explain the effects of previous change experiences on subsequent attitudes and behavior. A schema is "a prototypical abstraction of a complex concept, one that gradually develops from past experience, and subsequently guides the way new information is organized" (Rousseau, 2001, p. 513). Thus, schemas are mental representations of previous experience. They act as frames of reference through which future events are viewed. For example, previous experiences of fairness (Van den Bos et al., 2005) or psychological contract breach (Robinson & Morrison, 2000) are stored in schemas and affect future judgments of fairness or the likelihood that contract breach will be detected. Similarly, we argue that previous experiences of poor change management (referred to as poor change management history or PCMH), are captured in a schema (PCMH-schema). This schema, in turn, will be negatively related to employee attitudes towards the organization in gen-

eral (trust, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions) and towards change management in particular (cynicism and lack of openness to change). Finally, according to the unfolding model of turnover (Lee & Mitchell, 1994), employees may leave an organization for a variety of reasons; including experiences in the organization that make them re-evaluate their membership. We argue that PCMH will be one such shock that, through PCMH-schema, will lead to voluntary turnover.

Two empirical studies were conducted to test these predictions. In Study 1, we developed a measure of PCMH-schema and tested the relationship between PCMH, PCMH-schema, trust in the organization, and cynicism about organizational change. In Study 2, we tested all the predictions, including the effects of PCMH-schema on voluntary turnover.

Study 1 was conducted in a property and development firm in the Philippines that was merging with another firm. In preparation for the merger, the organization was evaluating and re-defining job positions. Previous history of change management was collected from two organizational representatives from the human resources department. They reported that parts of the organization had undergone change in the past, but the change was poorly managed. To measure PCMH, we asked these representatives to identify employees that had experienced poor change management (coded as 1) and those that did not (coded as 0). Next, we conducted a survey of the entire organization. A total of 155 employees returned completed surveys (response rate of 47.69%). The survey contained the following measures: 1) We developed an 8 item measure of PCMH-schema (e.g., "In my experience, past change initiatives have failed to achieve their intended purpose"). To validate this measure, we compared the PCMH-schema scores of the two groups identified by the organizational representatives. The group identified as having experienced poor change management had higher scores on the PCMH-schema measure as compared to the comparison group; 2) Trust in the organization was measured using a 7-item measure taken from Robinson (1996); 3) Organizational change cynicism was measured using the 8-item scale developed by Wanous, Reichers, and Austin (2000). We conducted a path analysis to test the predictions. As predicted PCMH-schema was negatively related to trust and positively related to cynicism. Moreover, PCMH-schema mediated the

relationship between actual PCMH and trust and cynicism.

Study 2 was conducted in an educational institution in the Philippines undergoing restructuring that involved revision of the curricula, merging of academic units, reduction in numbers of academic staff, and relocation to another building. Following the procedure in Study 1, we obtained information on change history from two representatives of the organization who also classified employees into two groups: those that had experienced PCMH, coded as 1 and those that did not, coded as 0. The representatives noted that in previous change implementation, there had been no consultation with staff and the management had acted in an autocratic manner. This had even led to lawsuits brought upon by disaffected staff. Next, we conducted a survey that was responded to by 124 staff members (response rate of 62%). In addition to the constructs from Study 1, we measured: 1) job satisfaction using a 3-item scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983); 2) turnover intentions using a 4-item measure (Fried, Tiegs, Naughton, & Ashworth, 1996); and 3) openness to change using a 4-item measure from Wanberg and Banas (2001). Finally, two years after the survey, we collected data on staff turnover. Once again, we ran a path analysis to test the hypothesized relationships. The results supported our predictions. PCMH-schema was negatively related to trust and positively related to cynicism. Moreover, PCMH-schema mediated between actual PCMH on the one hand and trust and cynicism on the other. Trust was positively related to job satisfaction and negatively to turnover intentions. Cynicism was negatively related to openness to change. We also ran logistic regression to test for the antecedents of turnover. PCMH-schema was the only significant predictor of turnover (turnover intentions was a marginal predictor).

The results of the two studies strongly highlight the lasting and detrimental effects of poor change management. Poor change management can kick-start a vicious cycle where these experiences, carried forward in mental frameworks, lead to negative attitudes towards the organization and change management in particular. These negative attitudes would hold back employees from participating in future change initiatives, jeopardizing the change and further reinforcing the attitudes until the employee may choose to exit from the organization.

References

Cammann,C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P., Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York: John Wiley.

Fried, Y., Tiegs, R., Naughton, T., & Ashforth, B. (1996). Managers' reactions to corporate acquisition: A test of an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 401-427.

Lee, T., & Mitchell, T. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review, 19,* 51-89.

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.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 574-599.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 525-546.

Rousseau, D. M. 2001. Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74,* 511-541.

Van den Bos, K., Burrows, J. W., Umphress, E., Folger, R., Lavelle, J. J., Eaglestone, J., & Gee, J. (2005). Prior experiences as temporal frames of reference in social justice: The influence of previous fairness experiences on reactions to new and old supervisors. *Social Justice Research, 18,* 99-120.

Wanberg, C., & Banas, J. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 132-142.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. 2000. Cynicism about organizational change: Measurement, antecedents, and correlates. *Group & Organization Management, 25,* 132-153.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Burke, W.W. (2007). *Organization change: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Coghlan, David & Rashford, Nicolas S. (2006). *Organizational Change and Strategy: An Interlevel Dynamics Approach.* New York: Routledge.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Joerg Sydow, Professor of Management at the Free University of Berlin and International Visiting Fellow of the Advanced Institute of Management Research (AIM) in London, has been appointed to the scientific advisory board of the Soziologisches Forschungsinstitut Goettingen (SOFI), Germany.

ANNOUNCING THE SUSAN G. COHEN DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD FOR ORGANIZATION DESIGN, EFFECTIVENESS, AND CHANGE

The Center for Effective Organizations (CEO) announces the Susan G. Cohen Research Award for Organization Design, Effectiveness, and Change. This award is offered in remembrance of Dr. Cohen, who was a research scientist at CEO, in the Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, from 1988-2006.

The purpose of this award is to provide $2,500 in research funding to a doctoral student whose research work is compatible with the work that captivated Dr. Cohen throughout her career and will make a contribution to both academic theory and management practice. The award is to be used to support the completion of dissertation research.

For more information about the award, and instructions on how to apply, please visit the following website: http://ceo-marshall.usc.edu/cohen-award. Application deadline: January 28, 2008.

CALL FOR PAPERS
International Conference and Doctoral Consortium
Lyon, France, April 21-23, 2008

This conference will be held in Lyon, France and is organized in partnership with the ISEOR and the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management (USA). 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.

The two first days of the conference will be devoted to presentations of papers and doctoral students and the third day will include a celebration of the 30th anniversary of the review Sciences de Gestion/ Management Sciences/ Ciencias de Gestión as well as the 33rd anniversary of the ISEOR research center. Communications of members of the three scientific committees of the review (English speaking, Spanish speaking, and French speaking) will be presented during this event. The deadline for completed manuscripts is January 17, 2008. For additional information, please visit the following website: http://www.iseor.com/upload/ODC_2008/Call%20for%20papers.pdf.

REPORT ON THE 2006 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM IN LYON, FRANCE
Peter Sorenson
Benedictine University

The 2006 International Conference and Doctoral Consortium of the ODC Division was on April 24-25, 2006. The conference and doctoral consortium gathered 240 participants at ISEOR, University of Lyon 3, a leading research center in Europe in the field of OD and change. One hundred eighty-three papers were presented in parallel tracks that focused on topics such as OD and cultures, OD and corporate restructuring, methodologies to lead OD processes, OD and organizational learning, and OD & corporate social responsibility. Participants came from 16 different countries:

Australia, Belgium, Cameron, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, and the United States. Participants were affiliated with 44 different universities and several major corporations.

The meeting was co-chaired by Henri Savall (Director of ISEOR) and Peter Sorensen (Benedictine University), and the Scientific Committee consisted of 122 professors of management, who revised the submitted papers in English, Spanish or French. Five plenary sessions with simultaneous translations enabled discussions on the following themes: Added value of completing a Ph.D in OD while in a professional career, examples of cumulative collaborative research in OD between universities and companies, the case of the socio-economic approach to management, examples of OD and change interventions in various companies, links between research and education on ODC, and the exploration of a transatlantic doctoral consortium in ODC. Ian Palmer represented the executive committee of the ODC Division and presented to the participants the mission statement of the division and its value-added component to scholars and to doctoral students.

An 869-page paper proceedings has been published, which includes a selection of 64 communications. The full version of the proceedings (over 1,700 pages) is also available in a CD-ROM version (see www.iseor.com).

Participants were enthusiastic to discover the sights of Lyon, France with its numerous Roman and Renaissance buildings. Lyon is also the capital of gastronomy, and a gala dinner was organized the fist day of the conference. A wine and cheese party was offered on the second day by Benedictine University. Many participants asked to renew the experience in Lyon within two years.

2007 ODC ENDOWMENT FUND REPORT
Glenn Varney
Bowling Green State University

In August 2006, the AOM-ODC Division Board approved the establishment of an Endowment Fund with a mission to: 1) Encourage scientific inquiry in Organization Development and Change through sponsored research at the regional, national, and international levels; 2) Assist in program and course development in Organization Development and Change

at universities and schools both domestically and internationally; 3) Develop innovative educational processes, teaching methods, and instructional technologies in Organization Development and Change; and 4) Understand and define Organization Development and Change competencies for academic programs.

Twelve proposals were received, and five $1000 awards were granted to the following individuals: Robert Routhleaux (Hamline University), "Rebuilding and Maintaining Internal Communication and Morale After Organizational Crisis;" Deborah O'Neill and Emily Sharp (Bowling Green State University and HCR ManorCare), "Hit or Miss? Assessing the Fit Between Learning Outcomes in ODC Graduate Programs and Organizational Requirements for ODC Practitioners;" Mitchel Lee Marks and Michael Meeks (San Francisco State University), "Should Organization Development be taught at the undergraduate level?" Jon Colman (Case Western Reserve University), "Decision makers reactions to change: the co-evolution of two organizational forms;" and Keely Jones (University of Georgia), "Nonprofit Organization Development through the institutionalization of service learning."

The award winners will report their research and results at the 2008 AOM Conference.

A call for 2008 ODCEF proposals has been issued to all AOM-ODC Division members, ODN members, and ODI members. For more details, see the following website: division.aomonline.org/odc/odce.pdf.

We are pleased with the support and participation of our members in this milestone initiative for the AOM-ODC Division. For additional information, please contact any of the following sponsors: Eric Goodman (Westwood University), Robert Marshak (American University), Raymond Saner (University of Basel, Switzerland), Peter Sorensen (Benedictine University), Larry Starr (University of Pennsylvania), and Glenn Varney (Bowling Green State University).

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS OF POTENTIAL ODC BOARD MEMBERS
Sandy Kristin Piderit
Case Western Reserve University

In this season of giving, to whom could you give the gift of an opportunity to serve on the ODC board? Yes, nominations are gifts—to those nominated, as well as

to the 2600 members of the division. As an outgoing two-year representative, I can tell you that board service has not been a duty—it has been truly a pleasure, with plenty of intellectual benefits.

Those benefits come in the form of time spent with brilliant minds from across the full span of scholars of organization development and change, both nationally and internationally—such is the caliber of our division's membership who step forward to serve us all. What a gift it will be to the division members nominated and elected, to serve with Michael Manning, Frank Barrett, Ann Feyerherm, Ronald Fry, Inger G. Stensaker, Karen Jansen, Ryan Quinn, Quy Huy, Tim Goodly, Jude Olson, Andre Avramchuk, Eric Goodman, Gavin Schwarz, and Wayne Boss.

Alas, my term is over, and I must leave this stellar group behind. Elections will be held in April 2008 for new board members. I wholeheartedly encourage you to contact any of the ODC board members to make a nomination.

Or perhaps you want to give yourself a gift? Self-nominations are also welcomed. Express your interest in supporting the division and developing your own career at the same time, by running for election to the ODC board!

Board members welcome nominations of candidates for election before the end of January, 2008.

ENGAGING DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN THE ODC DIVISION: THREE GOOD REASONS TO TRY HARDER
Jose DelaCerda
ITESO University
Guadalajara, Mexico
Doctoral Student Representative

Whenever I am asked about my two-year experience as student rep in the Organizational Development and Change (ODC) division of the Academy of Management, I always say this was my second doctoral education. And I really mean it. During these two years I learned how to be a better reader, reviewer, presenter, and hopefully, writer of academic papers. I also had valuable, intellectually challenging, eye-opening, perspective-taking encounters with great scholars and practitioners in our division. In addition, I met interesting professionals and generous people from all

divisions and from many countries of the world. Some of these acquaintanceships have led to meaningful opportunities for collaboration, as we have subsequently shared work projects.

During my time as doctoral student rep in the ODC Division, I did my best to meet and talk to most ODC doctoral students attending the yearly meetings, and I found no complaint that the activities were a waste of time. All of them agreed, in one way or another, that belonging to the Academy and attending its meetings, professional development workshops, consortiums or colloquiums, and other activities had been very significant for their learning processes.

Thinking about the valuable resources available to students who participated in the ODC Division, I want to make three propositions to encourage doctoral students to incorporate the Academy of Management's activities and services in their doctorate's formative process.

Proposition 1: The more any doctoral student participates in ODC Division activities at the Academy of Management, the more she/he improves her/his capabilities to read and write rigorous and interesting papers and dissertations.

Proposition 2: The more any doctoral student participates in ODC Division activities at the Academy of Management, the more she/he expands her/his academic and professional perspectives.

Proposition 3: The more any doctoral student participates in ODC Division activities at the Academy of Management, the more she/he improves her/his emotional-cultural intelligence and networking capabilities.

Scientific scholarship requires conversation and interaction within scientific communities (Kuhn, 1970). Learning to write scholarly prose is a core competence of scientific scholarship (Huff, 1999; Rudestam & Newton, 2001). The Academy in general and the ODC Division in particular offer a number of challenging opportunities to improve doctoral students' abilities to write good papers and dissertations.

Doctoral students can register as paper reviewers for the ODC or other preferred divisions. Reviewing papers offers an incomparable opportunity to learn academic rigor. The reviewer is challenged to justify his/her evaluation and to give feedback on somebody else's work. There is no way this can be done superficially.

Doctoral students also have the chance to propose papers in different categories: divisional, interactive and visual. As the Academy states, papers represent the majority of the submissions and form the most scholarly sessions in the program. Learning starts with the reading of writing guidelines and submission requirements (http://meeting.aomonline.org/2007/). Getting a paper accepted requires students to engage in scholarly conversation with professors and peers and make a number of decisions and tasks that form and test doctoral abilities (Huff, 1999).

In addition, during the meetings, students are offered sessions and special events that suggest ways to improve the process and content of doctoral dissertations. This year, for instance, the ODC Doctoral Student Consortium was co-organized with two other divisions: Organization & Management Theory (OMT) and Management & Organizational Consulting (MOC). This was a magnificent opportunity to listen to great scholars, compare research questions and inquiries, expose methods to different perspectives, reorganize ideas, discover new research references and sources, and meet colleagues and peers from all over the world. In my experience, attending the Doctoral Consortium helped to ease my dissertation pains knowing that, in the end, we are all just humans pursuing our paths to knowledge according to the old saying: "crossing the river by feeling the stones."

Doctoral students might be tempted to construct their dissertations individually but scientific knowledge of organizations is a social construction. This is especially true for organization development knowledge according to Kurt Lewin's core idea that the best way to understand a social system is by trying to change it. It is hard to conceive of any type of organizational scholarship in isolation from the social interaction where organizational phenomena are shaped.

Participating in the Academy, the ODC and other divisions' activities, doctoral students can explore the soundness and rationality of their dissertation's assumptions, beliefs and motives. During the meetings, there are numerous opportunities for conversation to examine and expose interpretive frameworks related to our research questions. Mutual perspective taking among individuals inquiring similar research questions allows for the exchange, evaluation, modification and integration of interpretive schemes (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995). In my experience, attending PDWs (Professional Development Workshops) and paper sessions related to the topic of my doctoral research

helped me to appreciate the abundance of narratives, theoretical approaches, research methods, referred research articles, and new developments associated with organizational survival and strategic adaptation in multiple industries and across nations.

The thing that surprised me the most while I was initiating my doctoral dissertation is that, no matter what question or problem definition you have in your mind, there is always someone in the world, usually many, thinking about that same issue, doing intelligent research and creating interesting propositions related to that specific idea or concern you thought was original. Just taking a look at the annual AOM program whets the appetite for knowing. One word of caution: never go to the meetings unplanned; choose a path and build your personal agenda. There are just too many interesting options to invest time in all of them, but in order to sharpen our inquiries and expand our perspectives during the meetings, so we have to consistently select the sessions most closely related to the central research topic of our dissertations rather than jumping from one topic to another.

Professional success is not only about being good at what you do but also about being good at selling it and convincing others of its value. Participation in the Academy and the ODC division helps doctoral students to improve their cross-cultural awareness and expand their social network. The Academy is the perfect place to internationalize. I believe that no PhD student should miss the experience of being intellectually confronted by the internationalization of organizational knowledge. One aspect of student participation in the ODC division that should be of great interest to all members is how authentically global our field is becoming. As an example, just take a look at the list of non-U.S. universities represented in the doctoral consortium in Philadelphia: Hec Geneva, University of Kent at Canterbury, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Norwegian School of Economics, HEC Montreal, Universite du Paris, Stockholm School of Economics, Universitate Bocconi, Indian Institute of Management at Bangalore, Oxford University, University of Toronto, University of Technology at Sydney, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School, National University of Singapore, London Business School, University of St. Gallen, The Bundeswehr University Munich, EM LYON, INSEAD, University of Sydney, Freie Universitaet Berlin, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Strathclyde Business School.

In conclusion, the ODC division of the Academy of Management offers extremely valuable opportunities for doctoral students to improve their scientific and professional scholarship. There are at least three very good reasons for schools and faculty to encourage students to participate in the Academy's activities as much as possible: a) they learn to write better papers and dissertations (scholarly writing); b) they expand their academic and professional perspectives; and c) they improve their cultural awareness and social networking. In my experience of two years as doctoral student rep, the learning opportunities available in the Academy's activities in general, and in the ODC activities in particular, can constitute a second doctoral education.

References

Boland, R.J. & Tenkasi, R.V. (1995). Perspective making and perspective taking in communities of knowing. *Organization Science, 6*(4), 350-372.

Huff, A.S. (1999). *Writing for scholarly publication.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rudestam, K.E. & Newton, R.R. (2001). *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

FROM THE DIALECTIC TO THE DIALOGIC: A NEW EPISTEMOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR STUDYING CHANGE PARADOX—A SUMMARY

Latha Poonamallee
Case Western Reserve University
Rupert F. Chisholm Best Theory to Practice Paper

Inevitability of paradox in organizational has been addressed by many scholars (Cameron & Quinn, 1988; Czarniawaka, 1997; Van de Ven & Poole (1988). While resolving or avoiding the paradox are two of the more common approaches to dealing with paradox, as Fiol (2002) points out, these strategies push scholars towards privileging one polarity versus the other and she argues for capitalizing on the paradox; i.e. utilizing the inherent tensions to one's advantage rather than ignoring or resolving them. In this paper, I join this discourse and advocate the

dialogic approach, an alternate view of dealing with the paradox of change. 'Dialogics' is a term primarily associated with Mikhail Bhaktin (1895-1975). According to Bhaktin (1986), the entire scope of human life is a dialogic process whereby we find meaning through interaction. Dialogics is the study of the way meaning is constructed out of contending languages within any culture because there is a constant cultural tendency to try to unify languages within an official or unitary language, which is determined by the endlessly changing conditions of the society, which generates new languages and new relations between them. Originally a linguistic device, dialogics has been appropriated and put to use by scholars from multiple disciplines. For example, in the field of organizational studies, recent work of David Boje (2005) illustrates different concepts from Bhaktin's dialogic to study organizations. Even though there seems to be some overlap between Hegelian/ Marxist concept of dialectic and Bhaktin's dialogic, especially because both the words share a common root and are assumed by many scholars to be similar, Bhatkin categorically writes that dialectic is monologic and not dialogic.

The primary difference between dialectic and the dialogic is that while the dialectic approach is predicated upon the need to arrive at a synthesis through conflict, the dialogic approach permits an ever emerging and renegotiated reality through dialogue between multiple approaches/voices (polyphony). While the dialectic is a movement through a process of thesis-anti-thesis-synthesis in which the synthesis becomes the thesis for the next cycle, dialogics assumes simultaneity and interaction. In contrast, I argue that a dialogic approach to organizational paradoxes would allow us to see the interplay between apparently contradictory polarities and thus help us deal with a few of the major polarized conceptions of change.

I build on Van de Ven and Poole's (1988) essay on the paradoxical requirements for a theory of organizational change and offer a new epistemological framework for the study of change from the dialogic perspective. They suggest that a theory of change in social structure should meet four paradoxical and interdependent requirements: (1) action-structure paradox (2) internal and external sources of change, (3) stability and change, and (4) time as the key historical accounting system. They allege that most social theorists have failed in synthesizing all these

four requirements and suggest methods through which these requirements may be fulfilled by a theory. I also add two more paradoxical requirements, that of (5) accounting for both outcome and process and (6) conflict-cooperation. I also bring in a process view to this framework by exploring the dynamic between conflict and cooperation because the existing scholarship is polarized between Marxist conflict oriented sociologists and the Positive Scholarship oriented thinkers who expound the value of cooperation in change.

This paper is based on a comparative case study (Yin, 1984) and utilized principles of constant comparison from the grounded theory method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and that of first person research (Bradbury & Reason, 2001; Marshall, 2001) from the action research tradition while developing a framework for holistic ontology (Poonamallee, 2006). My sample consists of three different social experiments in India that serve as useful contrasts on multiple structural and theoretical dimensions. I deliberately chose sites that share a post colonial context and experiments of collective action towards social change. I also evaluated the three sites and categorized two of them as more effective and the third one as less effective. Based on my analysis of the three sites, I arrived at the following propositions.

Even though scholars like Adler, Goldoftas & Levine (1999) and Feldman (2004) have attempted to reframe continuity, routines, stability, inertia, the traditional pariahs in the change discourse as sources of change, if change and continuity are conceived as two polarities, most change scholars study change at the expense of learning about continuity. In fact radical transformation, i.e. a fundamental change is construed as leaving behind all notions of continuity. On the contrary, my data suggests that interplay between change and continuity is a source of generative capacities for transformation. This interplay is characterized by critical reflection. In this section, I propose that: An organization's generative capacity for change rests on its interplay between change and continuity and this interplay is characterized by critical reflection.

Another polarized, dualistic debate that abounds in change discourse is the agency-structure debate. While predominantly one-sided focus on homogenizing institutional analysis does not capture the power of agency, those who study agency do not give much credence to the structural conditions that might be

constraints to agency. Drawing from my data, I propose that: An organization's generative capacity rests on the interplay between agency and structure and this interplay is characterized by a dynamic between facilitative rules, polysemic resources, personal and social actions.

Cooperation-Conflict is the third key polarized set of conceptions of change as seen in these cases. From Hegel to Marx and later day critical thinkers, many have celebrated conflict as essential to social transformation. In contrast, radical humanists and interpretive thinkers have celebrated the spirit of cooperation as a critical component of social change. My data suggests that for effective transformation, both the mechanisms need to coexist and I propose that: Generative capacities of organizations lie in the interplay between cooperation and conflict and this interplay is characterized by boundary setting.

Van de Ven & Poole (1988) point out that historically the change literature while has polarized into two schools in the study of sources of change, developmentalism and accumulation theories, i.e. internal versus external sources of change. Taking the dialogic perspective, I propose that: An organization's generative capacity rests on the interplay between internal and external sources of change and it is characterized by mutual transformation.

I have used time as an analytical framework within each case, especially to organize the narratives as well as position the micro-histories of each case within the macro history of the larger context. While I have not extended it to a systematic between-the-cases analysis for addressing the various paradoxes, my analysis throws light on the relationship between long term histories, both micro and macro, and everyday routines. I have employed a critical-historical and socio-ecological frameworks to locate the cases and position their micro-histories within the macro-history of the country as a whole. I propose that: An organization's generative capacity rests on the interplay between long term view of change and everyday routines and this interplay is characterized by mindfulness.

As mentioned earlier, I added a paradoxical element to Van de Ven & Poole's (1989) model: outcome versus process orientation in studying change and propose that: An organization's generative capacity rests on the interplay between process and outcome orientation and this interplay is characterized by mutual guidance.

CHANGE RECIPIENTS' BELIEFS AND JUSTICE: THE MODERATING ROLE OF LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE

Steven Brown
Auburn University
Best Doctoral Student Paper Award

This conceptual paper is an effort to further understand the nature of organizational change in terms of its relationships with procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, and leader-member exchange. The constructs of procedural, distributive, and interactional justice are examined as predictors relating to each of the five dimensions, described below, that compose the Organizational Change Recipients' Beliefs Scale (OCRBS). Leader-member exchange (LMX) is investigated as a moderator for the various relationships between the change and justice dimensions.

This conceptual study hopes to provide a better foundation of understanding regarding how employee perceptions of fairness relate to change efforts, and how leaders as change agents, could serve as influencing factors in making change efforts more successful. Fairness, change readiness, and LMX all produce practical benefits in terms of organizational outcomes. Discovering how all three constructs are related can help maximize those potential outcomes.

The Organizational Change Recipient's Belief Scale

The organizational change recipients' belief scale (Armenakis, Bernerth, Pitts, & Walker, 2006) is one model that takes into account multiple, interrelated dimensions, conceptualizing change beliefs as a collection of thoughts and intentions, not just an understanding of, and a belief in, the change effort (Bernerth, 2004). I selected it for the purposes of this conceptual paper due to its size and theoretical basis, plus it is both new and under review for publication. It has also demonstrated high reliability (.90 to .94) in past usage, but requires more study.

The scale matches up with the Armenakis (1999) model of readiness, dividing into five components: efficacy, principal support, discrepancy, appropriateness, and valence. These five dimensions represent beliefs of employees who are change recipients; representing how well employees, as change targets, will embrace an organizational change, both in terms of readiness and adoption of the change effort.

Efficacy. During organizational change, high efficacy decreases the perceptions of difficulty and increase efforts, improving the chance for successful change (Armenakis et al., 1999), while low efficacy represents the self-perception of incapability and deficiency, and an over magnification of difficulty level (Meichenbaum, 1977), leading to self-fulfilling ineffectiveness (Bandura, 1982).

Principal support. During the uncertainty of organizational changes LMX may directly impact job functions, employees often experience emotional arousal and look to coworkers and leaders for meaning, as well as for the proper reaction to the change (Mossholder, Settoon, Armenakis, & Harris, 2000). Some studies suggest that organizational change efforts are more successful when employees feel supported (Schalk, Campbell, & Freese, 1998). Employees who receive supervisory support and encouragement are more likely to act voluntarily in supporting organizational change goals (Organ, 1988; VanYperen, Van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). Thus, principal support indicates a commitment by leaders to making the change happen successfully. Trust in leaders can sometimes compensate somewhat for the lack of information and uncertainty that often go hand in hand with organizational change, thereby reducing speculation and unwarranted reservations (Weber & Weber, 2001). Employees who trust their managers often feel congruence with managerial values and react more positively to changes (Martin, 1998).

Discrepancy and appropriateness. Change agents must convince change targets that there is a need for change, illuminating the gap between how things are and how they could be if a particular change is made. This aspect of the change message is actually composed of the two joint components called discrepancy and appropriateness. The discrepancy component reveals the necessity of a change, focusing on problems with the current method of operation. The appropriateness component relates to the correctness of the proposed change. Even when employees do not agree with the specific change proposed, they are more supportive of the change effort when they trust the leader responsible for making the change happen (Hultman, 1998).

Valence. Valence represents the appraisal process through which employees examine a proposed change effort, seeking out the potential personal gains and losses of organizational benefits that will emerge for them as a result of successful change. Unless benefits are seen early on as a result of the change effort, employees may anticipate significant losses, and may come to question the legitimacy of the changes and the intentions of management, jeopardizing the employment relationship (Korsgaard et al., 2002).

Justice Perceptions and Organizational Change

An atmosphere where trustful communication and collaboration takes place between change agent and change targets can be useful for achieving organizational change goals (Bocchino, 1993). In relation to justice, the effectiveness of the change message depends upon its legitimacy, which is related to both the message and the messenger, with managers often serving in the role of change messengers. As such, the message (the planned change itself) is closely linked to the messenger (Gestner & Day, 1997) as well as the concept of procedural justice (Bies, 1987).

Since previous studies relating to procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice have shown various relationships in conjunction with different aspects of organizational change, the primary purpose of this study will be to examine the impact of justice constructs on the OCRBS dimensions. Therefore, the first eight hypotheses offered specify the relationships between procedural justice and each of the five OCRBS dimensions (all positive relationships except for discrepancy), the positive relationships of efficacy and principal support to distributive justice), and the positive relationships of principal support to interactional justice.

Leader-Member Exchange as a Moderator

When employees perceive fairness and benevolence in leaders, they infer commitment from their leaders, often reciprocating commitment, and high quality exchanges take place (Erdogan et al., 2006). Existing research indicates that during periods of organizational change employee perceptions of procedural justice are closely associated with existing trust in decision makers (Korsgaard, Sapienza, Turnley & Diddams, 1996).

Therefore, hypotheses are offered regarding the moderating role of LMX on the relationships described in the previous hypotheses between organizational justice and the OCRBS dimensions, with the higher the LMX, the stronger the positive correlation.

Conclusion

This conceptual study helps provide greater insight into the relationships of three types of justice and

organizational change while simultaneously examining the moderating effect of LMX. Greater understanding of the relationship of justice beliefs and change recipient beliefs may provide more theoretical insight into the justice constructs. By studying justice constructs in relation to the five OCRBS dimensions, more insight into the five dimensions of change, as they have been defined, thus strengthening the theoretical understanding of OCRBS model.

In practical terms, further application of this conceptual groundwork within an empirical study may provide a greater understanding of the relationship of justice to organizational outcomes related to change efforts. By examining how different kinds of fairness relate to different change beliefs, organizations can develop strategies that strengthen organizational outcomes and the success of change efforts themselves by ensuring both providing fairness and communicating it. Another purpose is to provide insight into whether or not using managers who have high LMX exchanges as change agents can have a stronger influence in developing employees' change beliefs. While, at this stage in my research, this is a conceptual paper, it will hopefully assist future researchers in their efforts to utilize the OCRBS within their own research, perhaps in conjunction in with further research in justice and LMX.

References

Available upon request

MANAGING MULTIPLE CHANGE PROCESSES: CHALLENGES AND INTERVENTION TECHNIQUES

Christine B. Meyer
Inger G. Stensaker
Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration
Winner of the ODC Special Call for Papers on Strategic Change Implementation Research

Rapidly changing environments demand that organizations generate equally fast responses in order to survive and prosper. In the last decades, the rate of globalization and technological innovation has continued to increase, and organizations often have to implement a number of strategic and organizational changes at the same time or over a relatively short time frame. Pettigrew and Whipp (1991, 20) describe one

of the main challenges in change management as "...the ability to manage a series of interrelated and emergent changes (often in parallel and in sequence)". We argue that there is a need for a new intervention framework which explicitly takes into account the challenges of managing multiple change processes over time in organizations. In this paper we examine the challenges in pursuing multiple and interrelated changes over time and the implications for change management.

Based on a study of the Norwegian financial sector, which has gone through dramatic changes in the last fifteen years we present five techniques for change management which take into account the need to balance (1) change and daily operations and (2) current and future change.

Episodic and Continuous Change

Existing research on change tends to view organizational change either from the perspective of planned, large-scale change occurring episodically (Anderson and Tushman, 1990) or from the perspective of change as a continuous organizational phenomenon, and then often with a focus on smaller scale incremental changes in routines and practices (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997; Dunphy, 1996; Orlikowski, 1996; Weick and Quinn, 1999). When change occurs episodically, then relative stability is the "normal" situation and the key challenge is to mobilize the organization and create an understanding for the need to change (Lewin, 1951). The challenges related to continuous change on the other hand, are tied to reflecting about the direction the organization is heading towards (Weick and Quinn, 1999). While episodic versus continuous change situations involve different challenges which call for different intervention techniques, many organizations face situations where they pursue a number of changes in parallel – some radical and frame-breaking, while others remain more limited in scope and degree. Recently, several researchers have attempted to bridge insights from episodic perspectives with more continuous perspectives (Langley and Denis, 2006), but current knowledge about how to manage multiple changes in organizations remains limited.

Organizations pursue multiple changes when they implement a number of changes at the same time or when they initiate new changes before previous changes have been completed. The changes can be large-scale or incremental, of an episodic or continuous nature, they can be more or less related, but they

will nevertheless likely affect each other. This perspective is conducive with a situated view of change (Langley and Denis, 2006; Orlikowski, 1996) which integrates the episodic and continuous conceptions of change by viewing organizations as "in a constant process of becoming, but that major deliberate change interventions disturb existing patterns of evolution, stimulating further continuous change" (Langley and Denis, 2006:142). Hence when organizations pursue planned change, major interventions must be integrated into an ongoing and evolving pattern of interactions.

Challenges in Multiple Change Processes

Our findings indicate that organizations that pursue multiple changes face two main challenges which differ substantially from the challenges addressed in the literature on episodic and continuous change management. Key challenges in multiple change processes are not tied to mobilizing the organization for change, nor are they related to reflecting on the direction of the firm. Instead the challenges in multiple challenges have to do with running daily operations while continuously implementing new changes and completing change initiatives as well as producing visible change results. Because new changes are continuously launched, the focus tends to be on new initiatives rather than existing ones, and some employees question the effects of making so many changes.

Adverse effect on daily operations

One of the challenges in multiple change processes is that the organization's resources are continuously stretched in two directions. Because change is not a limited activity in the organization and change does not happen in isolation, balancing change-related tasks with daily operations is a crucial matter. The question of how resources should be allocated in a long-term perspective to secure realization of continuous change projects, and without negatively affecting daily operations, therefore becomes even more important in a context of multiple changes.

When large-scale changes are implemented, internal matters dominate and customers, suppliers, and alliance partners receive less attention. Strategic business opportunities may also suffer from an internal focus. Large-scale changes lead to a number of internal decisions and activities. New organisational solutions have to be decided, positions must be allocated, product programs must be adjusted, routines and policies must be revised, employees need training,

and so on. Moreover, internal politicking, network building, and jockeying for positions escalate sharply during change processes. When organizations pursue multiple changes this becomes a "normal" activity. In the organizations we studied, the adverse effect on daily operations manifested itself particularly at the middle management level. In a context of continuous change projects, middle managers were described as preoccupied with future changes instead of daily operations, employees, and customers. Hence, when middle management gets tied up in trying to influence decision makers and are involved in internal power struggles, it is not only the external focus that is diverted, but managerial resources that should be allocated to implementing change and to supporting employees in this process are also wasted.

Unsuccessful implementation of change

When organizations implement a series of overlapping changes, many change initiatives fail to produce the expected results. Management tend to shift their attention to new projects before the current ones are completed. Oftentimes, top managers seem to be far ahead of the employees, and employees experience this as a problem because they are not provided with the necessary time and management support to implement the changes properly. Moreover, employees may also deliberately choose to allocate their resources to daily operations instead of implementing change. This reaction to change is particularly a problem when employees experience that change projects are disrupted time after time.

Techniques for Managing Multiple Changes

In this section we describe how managers respond to and handle the two challenges described above. Based upon interview data from a study of the Norwegian financial sector, we have identified five change management techniques: emphasizing organizational memory and forgetting; thinking in the present and the future tense; creating flexible change routines; selectively including people; and alternating temporary and permanent human resources. We concentrate on describing each of the techniques below and refer to the full paper for empirical illustrations and evidence.

Emphasizing organizational memory and forgetting. Actively drawing on organizational memory means to be attentive to the history and previous change projects in the organization. This is particularly important when an organization pursues many overlapping and

interlinked changes, as managers and employees tend to question the logic between different change projects. The purpose of securing the organizational memory is to avoid that new managers, perhaps with no past history in the organization, introduce changes which do not take into account the changes that have been implemented in the past and/or which dominate the focus of current change projects. Hence, purposefully drawing on organizational memory creates clearer linkages between past and present change projects. Moreover, it can contribute in clarifying what were the results and effects of previous change processes.

Organizational forgetting implies that organizational members are told explicitly which routines and tasks can be left behind and forgotten. The purpose is to avoid that new tasks are just added on to a full work load and that the individual's priority of tasks takes place in an ad hoc manner which risks being in conflict with the organization's overall goals.

Thinking in the present and the future tense. This technique stresses the importance of keeping full attention on current change projects, while simultaneously thinking about future projects. Current projects have to be completed before letting other priorities take over. To avoid disruption of change processes, managers need to consider how the content of future change projects relates to current change projects. This implies deliberately linking new projects onto current projects and making sure that any conflicting purposes and implications are carefully explained. Without clear linkages, employees are more apt to refrain from implementing current changes and instead allocate their attention to daily operations or simply move on to newer change projects.

Employees however, should not always have to think both about the current and the future. We found that successful managers protected their subordinates and provided pockets of time, where they were allowed to focus only on daily operations, and more incremental improvements in routines and practices, but without any responsibilities for implementing planned change.

Managers also need to be aware of the way in which current change processes might affect future changes. Individuals remember how they have been treated in change processes, and attitudes and reactions to change are often based on previous experience with change. If the employees are treated fairly and with respect, then they are more likely to welcome change in the future. On the other hand, if the employees are worn out from previous processes, and have bad experiences from previous change processes, then they are not likely to be positive towards a new change process.

Developing flexible change routines. Multiple changes require routines for streamlining change processes over time. Typical issues included in such routines are how to cooperate with the unions, how to communicate with employees, whom to involve, and how to conduct downsizing. In organizations with extensive change experience, we found that such routines were well developed. Process routines can contribute in balancing between a focus on change and daily operations because routinized processes creates more tacit knowledge than non-routine processes, which can become a source of competitive advantage.

However, managers also need to be aware of the potential danger of being too focused on routines. Hence there is a need to strike a balance between routines and flexibility. Different change goals and content sometimes require different approaches with other routines. The change processes and routines for implementing business process engineering may for example be fundamentally different from those related to downsizing. Within the same type of change there must also be a certain flexibility to adjust to different cultures and entities within the same organization.

Selectively including people. Although involvement is important and necessary, extensive involvement in multiple changes over time increases the pressure on employees and intensifies the tradeoff between change and daily operations. In our study, managers and employees argued for the need to be more selective in involving organizational members in the process. By distinguishing more clearly between different purposes for involvement, managers selectively included organizational members in the change processes. This involved thinking carefully about when organizational members should be involved, what they should be involved in and how organizational members could be involved most effectively. Selective inclusion, if accepted and agreed upon by employees, can contribute in limiting potential adverse effects on daily operations.

Alternating temporary and permanent human resourcing. Capacity for making multiple changes can, at least temporarily, be increased by hiring more people. External content and process consultants can

be brought in to facilitate changes. We found that managers who successfully pursued multiple changes relied primarily on internal resources, as they needed to develop internal competencies on change. They also brought in external and temporary employees, but instead of hiring process consultants and change experts, they hired temporary help to perform daily operations. This practice gives employees at lower levels time to adapt to changing practises, such as learning new programs and systems. By hiring temporary employees, the organization can also reduce the time needed to implement change, which is important to complete the current change before new changes are introduced. A third reason for hiring temporary help for daily operations, rather than implementing change, is that change agents need to know the business. In addition, managers in our study argued that it was viewed as important that change agents were themselves affected by the results of the changes as this would ensure a fair process. We therefore observed that while managers protected their employees in terms of involvement, they also made deliberate attempts to use people in operative functions to plan and implement changes.

Conclusion

In this paper we have argued that organizations that pursue multiple interrelated changes face implementation challenges which require new ways of thinking about change management. Existing change theories are often separated into episodic versus continuous models, reflecting different perspectives and prescriptions for change. In line with several recent change researchers, we argue that this separation is not always fruitful as many organizations implement a number of changes in parallel and over time—some are of an episodic nature, others more continuous. The relevant question then becomes how to manage multiple changes. Based on our study of the Norwegian financial sector, which has experienced continuous overlapping large-scale changes in the last fifteen years, we show that the challenges related to managing multiple changes are different from those that are often presented in change literature. Our findings indicate that key challenges in organizations that pursue multiple changes include (1) continuous adverse effects on daily operations and (2) too little focus on change results. This results in managers who focus more on position for future changes than attending to daily operations and subordinates and employees who perceive that change is futile as

they see few results from continuous large-scale changes.

Successful managers attended to these challenges by applying five change management techniques: emphasizing organizational memory and forgetting; thinking in the present and the future tense; creating flexible change routines; selectively including people; and alternating temporary and permanent human resources. In contrast to most change management prescriptions, this implies that managers need to protect subordinates from too much involvement in change related activities. They also need to facilitate the trade-off between change and daily operations and thereby secure a long-term capacity for change in the organization and among the individuals in the organization.

References

Anderson, P. & Tushman, M.L. (1990). Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35,* 604-633.

Brown, S.L. and Eisenhardt, K.M. (1997). The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*(1), 1-34.

Dunphy, D. (1996). Organizational change in corporate setting. *Human Relations, 49*(5), 541-52

Langley, A. & Denis, J.L. (2006). Neglected dimensions of organizational change: Towards a situated view. In R. Lines, I. G. Stensaker & A. Langley (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Organizational Change and Learning* (pp. 413-425). Bergen, Norway: Fagbokforlaget.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York: Harper & Row.

Orlikowski, W.J. (1996). Improvising organizational transformation overtime: A situated change perspective. *Information Systems Research, 7*(1), 63-92.

Pettigrew, A.M. & Whipp, R. (1991). *Managing change for competitive success.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Weick, K.E. & Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 361-386.

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.)
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____