



ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT ODC NEWSLETTER

Organization Development and Change Division

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Summer 2012

Published by the ODC Division

WELCOME TO THE ODC PROGRAM IN BOSTON

Jeffrey D. Ford
Ohio State University
Program Chair

The Organization Development and Change (ODC) Division has an outstanding line-up of sessions this year, both for the professional development workshops (PDWs) Friday and Saturday, August 3-4, and for the scholarly program on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, August 5-7. This year's theme is "The Informal Economy," and most of the ODC sessions will be held at the Sheraton Boston Hotel.

PDW Program

The PDW program includes traditional favorites and innovative newcomers. Among the traditional favorites on Friday are high-impact exercises for teaching or consulting on organization change and publishing qualitative research in premier academic journals (pre-registration required), both of which have been very popular.

Friday finds sessions on coaching leaders to become transformational using the MBTI, methods for making diversity productive for innovation teams, post-merger integration research, teaching and practice (pre-registration required), and how motivation can be further developed for both formal and informal economy. Other sessions focus on action research, an interactive OD tool for not-for-profits, moving toward the global by improving local resources (pre-registration required), and aligning individual and organizational perspectives in change processes.

Saturday brings another great set of sessions, including tapping strategic engagement for organization success through the use of the brewing metaphor, using the OC3 model for leveraging organization culture to leverage change (pre-registration required), and creating a new agenda for research on resistance and organization change.

(see Ford, page 2)

STRATEGIZING IN THE ODC DIVISION

Inger G. Stensaker
Division Chairperson

During my five years on the ODC Executive Board we have been doing a lot of strategizing, particularly at the mid-year meetings in February/March, when we get together to plan both the annual conference and the more long-term development of the division. My first mid-year meeting was in beautiful where the Division Chair Mike Manning had carved out a good chunk of time on the agenda for strategy. With a background in strategic change, the many opportunities for strategizing with the ODC board have been exciting, interesting and at times also a bit frustrating. Since in 2008 we have had a numerous energetic and heated discussions about future strategy, current identity and image, and whether the division needs to change altogether. One specific

(see Stensaker, page 6)

Table of Contents

Jeffrey D. Ford, Welcome to the ODC Program in Boston	1
Inger G. Stensaker, Strategizing in the ODC Division	1
ODC Division Executive Committee 2011-2012	2
Jim Ludema, ODC Division Doctoral Student Consortium	9
Call For Papers: ODC Division Research Award	10
The Fourth International Conference & Doctoral Consortium on Organization Development & Change	11
Quy Nguyen Huy, William W. Maddux, & Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks, Why Managing Organizational Change in East Asia May Be Different From Managing Change in North America	12
David Coghlan & A.B. (Rami) Shani, Assessing Quality in Action Research Within Organization Development	16
Faaiza Rashid, Authorized Peer Pressure: Effective Real-Time Accountability in Cross-Disciplinary Teams	22
Raymond Saner & Lichia Yiu, Known Unknowns of Mainstream ODC: Need to Move Beyond Current "Borders"	27
Feedback to the Editor	31

**ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE 2011-2012**

Inger G. Stensaker, Division Chairperson
Norwegian School of Economics and Business
Phone: +47-55959669 Fax: +47-55959870
Email: inger.stensaker@nhh.no

James D. Ludema, Division Chair Elect
Benedictine University
Phone: (630)829-6229 Fax: (630)829-6211
Email: jludema@ben.edu

Jeffrey Ford, Program Chair
Ohio State University
Phone: (614)292-4563
Email: ford.1@osu.edu

Sonja Sackmann, PDW Chair
University Bw Munich, Gallen, Switzerland
Phone: + 41-71-223 4919
Email: ssackmann@hispeed.ch

David Grant, Representative-at-Large (5-year term)
University of Sydney
Phone: +61 2 9351 7871
Email: david.grant@sydney.edu.au

Danielle Zandee, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
Nyenrode Business Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Phone: +31 346 291 424
Email: d.zandee@nyenrode.nl

Clifford Oswick, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
City University London
Phone: + 44 (0)20 7040 8362
Email: cliff.oswick.1@city.ac.uk

Quy Nguyen Huy, International Representative-at-Large
INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France
Phone: +33 1 60 72 44 98 Fax: +33 1 60 74 55 57
Email: quy.huy@insead.edu

Jon Coleman, Executive Scholar-Practitioner (2-year term)
Ford Motor Company/University of Michigan—Dearborn
Email: jcolema4@ford.com

Kate Parrot, Student Representative
MIT Sloan School of Management
Email: kparrot@mit.edu

Gavin Schwarz, Secretary/Treasurer
University of New South Wales
Phone: +61 2 9385 7278 Fax: +61 2 9662 8531
Email: g.schwarz@unsw.edu.au

Andre Avramchuk, Director of Communications
Fielding Graduate University
Phone: (626)381-6956
Email: arttooz@aol.com

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor
University of Colorado
Phone: (303)492-8488 Fax: (303)494-1771
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(from Ford, page 1)

Please note that since some of these sessions require pre-registration, if you are interested in attending them please be sure to register early as once they are full, they will be closed.

We will also be hosting our Doctoral Consortium on Friday and Saturday. This is a highly interactive set of sessions in which doctoral students engage in reviewing work-in-progress with the authors of those works and small group sessions where students discuss with distinguished authors the ins and outs of research and publishing. Students also have an opportunity to obtain feedback from distinguished authors on the research they, the students, are doing, including their dissertations. Prior students have reported that attending the ODC Doctoral Consortium has been invaluable.

Scholarly Program

This year the scholarly program begins on Sunday, August 5 with Discussion Paper Sessions. Each division within the Academy has discussion paper sessions with the number of sessions being determined by the number of papers submitted. This year we have two discussion sessions, one on leadership and change and the other on catalysts and identity. In addition to these, there are a number of discussion paper sessions hosted by other divisions that will be of interest to ODC members, so please check out the sessions of other divisions.

On Monday, the scholarly program continues paper and symposia sessions on a wide range of change-related topics from a variety of perspectives. This year, 120 papers were submitted, of which 60 were accepted for a 50% acceptance rate. This compares with 57 acceptances from 113 submissions in 2011 (50% acceptance) and 69 acceptances from 157 submissions in 2010 (44% acceptance).

Similarly, this year 41 symposia were submitted of which 19 were accepted for a 46% acceptance rate. This compares with 28 submissions and 17 acceptances in 2011 (a 61% acceptance rate) and 37 submissions and 23 acceptances in 2010 (a 62% acceptance rate). The lower number of symposia acceptances stems from the allocation formula used by the Academy which is based on the percent of total submissions to the academy that come from ODC. As a percentage, we were down this year.

If we want more sessions at future Academy meetings, we will need to dramatically increase the total number of submissions to ODC.

ODC Kick-Off Session and Distinguished Speaker

This year, our kick-off session is a Showcase Symposia on Monday morning, 8:00-9:30 am in the Republic B Ballroom. The session features a distinguished panel of leading change scholars: Michael Beer, Warner Burke, Edgar Schein, and Dale Zand who will address “Influential Research and Practice in ODC Dynamics.” This is one of our four showcase symposia and is co-sponsored by the and MC divisions. It promises to be a great beginning to the day.

Another exciting highlight you will want to make sure to attend is the ODC Distinguished Speaker, Andrew Pettigrew, Professor of Strategy and Organisation, Said Business School, University of Oxford. Andrew will draw on his extensive research base and collaboration with scholars around the world in his address on “Intervening in Organisations and Large Systems.” This session will be held Monday 3:00-4:30 pm in the Republic B Ballroom.

Showcase Symposia

Most symposia are co-sponsored with other divisions and provide a good opportunity for meeting and engaging in dialogue with members of other divisions within the Academy. In addition to our kick-off symposia, ODC has three other Showcase Symposia:

- Changing Change: Exploring the Life Embedded in Organizational Change, Monday, August 6, 1:15-2:45 pm, Sheraton, Ballroom B
- Research in Organization Change and Development: Trajectories and Insights of ROCD Volume 20 Authors, Tuesday, August 7, 8:00-9:30 am, Sheraton, Republic B
- Where Are All the New Management and Organization Theories? Tuesday, August 7, 1:15-2:45 pm, Sheraton, Independence East

Best Paper Awards

Among the many excellent papers that were submitted, the following were selected as this year’s award-winning papers:

Best Division Paper: Marguerite Schneider (NJIT) and Curt Lindberg (Complexity Partners), “Leadership in a Complex Adaptive System: Insights from Positive Deviance”

Rupert F. Chisholm Best Theory-to-Practice Paper: Martin McCracken (U. of Ulster), Hadyn Robert Bennett (U. of Ulster), and Paula Marie O’Kane (U. of Otago), “Competing Perceptions: Contrasting Employee Experiences of Change in a Public Sector Agency”

Best Student Paper: Wade P. Smith (U. of Colorado at Boulder), “Blurring and Building Boundaries: Changing Logics and Institutional Work in the United States Army”

Best Paper Based on a Dissertation: Katherine Heynoski (Battelle for Kids), “Change as the Loss and Reinvention of Control”

Susan G. Cohen Doctoral Research Award: Faaiza Rashid (Harvard University), “Authorized Peer Pressure: Effective Real-time Accountability in Cross-disciplinary Teams”

Dexter Award Nominee: Every year, the Academy of Management grants the highly-prestigious Carolyn Dexter Award to the paper that best meets the objective of internationalizing the Academy. This year, the ODC nominee for this award is “Exploring and Reconfiguring a Firm’s Competence Base: A Process Model of Strategic Renewal,” written by Andrea Lipparini (U. of Bologna), Emanuela Prandelli (Bocconi U.), and Gianmario Verona (Bocconi U.).

Thank You!

This year’s ODC program would not be possible without help from a lot of people. Special thanks go to Jim Behm of Ohio State who provided invaluable assistance in putting together and coordinating the 2011 program. Thanks also to the AoM staff and especially Valerie Concepcion and Jimmy Lee for another year of outstanding service. Thanks to the members of the ODC Board who were always virtually close and quick to provide valuable and thoughtful advice.

Finally, I want to thank all of you who volunteered as reviewers and session chairs. The division depends on your willingness to dedicate your time and effort to work with us to create this excellent

academic program. Specifically, I would like to thank the following 247 people: Kwame J.A. Agyemang, Eastern Kentucky U.; Meera Alagaraja, U. of Louisville; Jeffrey Alstete, Iona College; John Matthew Amis, U. of Memphis; Ian Andrew, U. of Southampton; Benjamin O. Arah, Bowie State U.; Stewart L. Arnold, Nanyang Technological U.; Noah Askin, U. of Chicago; Tomas Backström, Mälardalen U.; Susan Faye Baechler, US Army Program Executive Office for Aviation; Mila N. Baker, New York U.; Diane Bandow, Troy U.; Peter Bemski, Regis U.; Robin Berenson, Ross School of Management, Franklin U.; Stephanie Berger, Concordia U.; Melvin Blumberg, Pennsylvania State U., Harrisburg; Garth Britton, Southern Cross U., Australia; William Bart Brock, Benedictine U.; Charla Ann Brown, Westminster College; Jodine M. Burchell, Walden U.; Weylin Burlingame, Weatherhead School of Management; Paula Burns, Northern Alberta Institute of Technology; Richard Grant Bush, Lawrence Technological U.; Julio Cesar Canedo Soto, U. of Texas, San Antonio; Charles G. Capps, Lipscomb U.; Helen Carlson, organizational consultant; Marilyn Jane Carter, Benedictine U.; Angela Joy Carter, U. of Sheffield; William Carter, U. of North Texas; Warner Castillo, Northcentral U.; Maurice Cayer, U. of New Haven; Joseph R. Cerami, Texas A&M U.; Shou-Wei Michael Chen, Taipei Chengshih U. of Science and Technology; Holly H. Chiu, Rutgers U.; Chee-Leong Chong, SIM U.; Samia Chreim, U. of Ottawa; Kenneth U. Chukwuba, Walden U.; Allan H. Church, PepsiCo, Inc; David Coghlan, Trinity College Dublin; José Osvaldo De Sordi, UNINOVE; Daphne Deporres, Colorado Technical U.; Karin Derksen, VU U. Amsterdam; Hemang Desai, Hemang; Boram Do, Boston College; Erin Duggins, Aspire Consulting Services; Terri Egan, Pepperdine U.; Denise Eggersman, Capella U.; Rida Elias, Richard Ivey School of Business; Ilse Ennsfellner, Ennsfellner Consulting; Joyce S. Falkenberg, U. of Agder; Martha S. Feldman, U. of California, Irvine; Ann E. Feyerherm, Pepperdine U.; Stephen P. Fitzgerald, Trident U. International; Scott Frasard, Cardinal Health; Stephanie Fraser-Beekman, Capella U.; Julia Susan Frink, Tarleton State U.; Ronald Fry, Case Western Reserve U.; Connie Fuller, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Mary Ann Gaal, Franklin Pierce U.; Christopher Bernard Gargoline, U. of Phoenix; Christopher Garrabrant, North Central College; Gemma George,

Capella U.; Carmine P. Gibaldi, Harvard U.; Antonia Girardi, Murdoch U.; Kathryn Goldman Schuyler, Alliant International U.; Kenneth B. Goldsmith, Chattanooga State Technical Community College; Marie Gould, American Public U.; George B. Graen, U. of Illinois, C-U (retired); Bianca A. C. Groen, U. of Twente; Christina Guenther, Max Planck Institute of Economics; Wolfgang H. Guettel, Johannes Kepler U. Linz; Linda Joyce Gunn, Western Governors U.; Gerald T. Hannah, consultant; Robert O. Harris, Benedictine U.; Cheryl A. Harrison, Manhattan College; Jean Hartley, U. of Warwick; Fabian Hattke, Hamburg U.; Thomas C. Head, Roosevelt U.; Margaret Ellen Heffernan, RMIT U.; Katherine Heynoski, Battelle for Kids; Malcolm John Higgs, Southampton U.; Gina Hinrichs, Capella U.; Debra P. Hockenberry, U. of Mary Washington; Renuka Hodigere, Case Western Reserve U.; J. Duane Hoover, Texas Tech U.; Henry Allan Hornstein, Algoma U.; Gerald Hunt, Ryerson U.; Taj Olayinka Ishola, smec; Gabriele Jacobs, Erasmus U. Rotterdam; Anne Jacqueminet, HEC Paris-IAE Lyon 3; Runtian Jing, U. of Electronic Science and Technology of China; Dr. Maureen Rose Johnston, Lawrence Technological U.; Raymond S. Jones, Citadel School of Business Administration; Baek-Kyoo Joo, Winona State U.; Maria Jorina, The Ohio State U.; Young Un Kim, U. of New South Wales; Si-Hyun Kim, U. of Texas at El Paso; Robyn Michele King, U. of Northwestern Ohio; Mari Kira, Aalto U. School of Science; William A. Kleintop, Moravian College; Linda Klonsky, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Jussi V. Koivisto, Helsinki School of Economics; Ljiljana M. Kontic, Faculty of Legal and Business Studies; Rita Kowalski, Work Life Consulting LLC; Daniel R. Kowalski, Kowalski Consulting and Management LLC; Michelle Kowalsky, U. of Hawaii-Manoa; Donna Ladkin, Cranfield U.; Eric Lamm, San Francisco State U.; Knut Stefan Garrit Lange, U. of Surrey; Jeanann Larson, Children's Medical Center - Dallas; Mark J. Law, U. Of Nebraska Medical Center; Melanie Elizabeth Lawler, Colorado Technical U.; Lionel Layerle, Sariba; Valerie Lehmann, ESG-UQAM; Christophe Lejeune, Strasbourg U.; Runhui Lin, Nankai U.; Roland E. Livingston, Daniel Webster College; David K. Livingston, United Healthcare Community Plan; Reut Livne-Tarandach, Boston College; Kenneth E. Long, Colorado Technical U.; Jiafang Lu, Hong

Kong Institute of Education; Kieran John Patrick Macinerney, U. of Cologne; Jeanne D. Maes, U. of South Alabama; Finn Majlergaard, Gugin; Delia Mcmanus Mannen, ESADE; Tracy M. Maylett, DecisionWise; Matthew Mccaffrey, Angers U.; Martin Mccracken, U. of Ulster; Bradley Mendelowitz, U. of the Witwatersrand; Klaus K. Meyer, MT Consulting; B. Michael, Sacramento State U.; Ivana Milosevic, U. of Nebraska; Kristian Mjoen, NTNU; Obiaukor-Princess Princess M. Mokolo, Argosy U. Atlanta; Bjorn Erik Mork, U. of Oslo; Elaine Mosconi, U. Laval; Kurt Motamedi, Pepperdine U.; Mark Mullaly, Interthink Consulting Incorporated; Mendi Mullett, Analytics Informatics Institute; Gayla Sharyn Napier, Fielding Graduate U.; Stuart Napshin, Kennesaw State U.; Jean E. Neumann, Tavistock Institute; Pedro Neves, Nova U., Lisbon; Aristarchus A. Nikoi, Liberty U.; Janice Lynn Nilsen, Benedictine U.; Warren O. Nilsson, U. of Cape Town; Ken Nishikawa, Konan U.; Frank Novakowski, Davenport U.; Luke Novelli, Leadership Development Resources Global; Julie Nuter, DePaul U.; Robert O'Neal, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Alice A. Obermiller, U. of Chicago; Paula Offutt, Argosy U.; Phyllis R. Okrepkie, National American U.; William Okrepkie, Kaplan U.; Margaret T. Orr, Bank Street College of Education; Leslie Overmyer-Day, Booz Allen Hamilton; Gregory Robert Park, Dublin City U.; Alina Payne, U. of California, San Diego; Maury Peiperl, IMD; Latha Poonamallee, Michigan Technological U.; Tracy Porter, Cleveland State U.; Phanish Puranam, London Business School; John Peter Puthenveetil, Benedictine U.; Andreeas Pazi Raharso, Hay Group; Gary Rees, Portsmouth Business School; Bonnie Richley, Case Western Reserve U.; Kelly Riesenmy, Independent Consultant; Florian Rittiner, ETH Zurich; Gary D. Robinson, Capella U.; Robson Sør Rocha, Aarhus Business School; Helen Marie Rodgers, U. of Leeds; Jacqui Rhoda Rogers, U. of Plymouth; Samuel L. Rohr, U. of Saint Francis; Glenn B. Rothberg, Intrepid Group; Wasiko Rothmann, European U. Viadrina; Tom J. Sanders, U. of Montevallo; Richa Saxena, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad; Melissa Scardaville, ICF International; Gert Jan Schuiling, VU U. Amsterdam; Gavin M. Schwarz, U. of New South Wales; Sydney Scott, U. Canada West; Patturaja Selvaraj, Indian Institute of Management Indore; Thomas Senaji, Kenya Methodist U.; Natalie Senf,

European U. Viadrina; Zachary Sheaffer, Ariel U. Centre; Jiseon Shin, U. of Maryland, College Park; Unsal Sigri, Turkish Military Academy; Clive Smallman, U. of Western Sydney; Michael Scott Smith, U. of Phoenix Online-SAS; Mickey B. Smith, Oklahoma State U.; Catherine Laura Smith, Independent; Peter Sorensen, Benedictine U.; David Philip Spicer, U. of Bradford; Richard W. Stackman, U. of San Francisco; Jacqueline M. Stavros, Lawrence Technological U.; Deborah M. Steketee, Aquinas College; Inger G. Stensaker, Norwegian School of Economics; Gregory K. Stephens, Texas Christian U.; Brent Stephens, Southern New Hampshire U.; Christoph Stöckmann, U. of Duisburg-Essen; Anne Marie Stoughton, Benedictine U.; Fiona M. Sutherland, La Trobe U.; Dr. David Brian Szabla, Northeastern U.; David Brian Szabla, Northeastern U.; Leslie Thomas Szamosi, U. of Sheffield; Robert Szekely, CTU and CollegeAmerica; Nouha Taifi, U. Mohammed V; Sebastian Thomas, U. of Queensland; Robert Mcleay Thompson, Queensland U. of Technology; Tracy A. Thompson, U. of Washington, Tacoma; Stanley D. Truskie, Robert Morris U.; John Tull, Inclusive Capital; Howard Garrett Upstill, U. of New South Wales; Richard Allan Vaillancourt, Athabasca U.; Joan Ernst Van Aken, Eindhoven U. of Technology; Erik J. Van Slyke, Auburn U.; Virajanand Varma, Columbus State U.; Glenn H. Varney, Bowling Green State U.; Merlijn Venus, Erasmus U. Rotterdam; Gianmario Verona, Bocconi U.; Rica Viljoen, Da Vinci Institute for Innovation and Technology; Veena Vohra, NMIMS U.; Timo Vuori, Hanken School of Economics; Gary Wagenheim, Simon Fraser U.; Sharon Wagner, Linfield College; Nancy C. Wallis, Fielding Graduate Institute; Bob Walrave, Eindhoven U. of Technology; James D. Westaby, Columbia U.; Lachlan Whatley, Trinity Western U.; Jennifer Kori Whitener Fellows, Texas A&M U.; Ann Whyte, Melbourne Business School; Elden Wiebe, King's U. College; Ralf Wilden, U. of Technology, Sydney; Tim Williams, School of Business, UTS; Sue Williams, U. of Gloucestershire; Hope Witmer, Lebanon Valley College; Julie Wolfram Cox, Monash U.; Evan D. Wood, Taylor U.; Jacquelyn Woodard, Benedictine U.; Meghan Clover Wright, Ph. D Student; Wenchieh Wu, St. John's U.; Ping Yan, Aichi Shukutoku U.; Wei Yao, Zhejiang U.; Feirong Yuan, U. of Kansas; Xu Zhang, Dalian U. of Technology.

(from Stensaker, page 1)

reoccurring topic has been whether or not we should change the division's name and it has proven that making changes in the ODC division is not an easy task.

Few of the ideas we have tossed around over the years have been documented in a formal strategic plan. Instead we have focused on the one hand on the "doing" by quickly implementing some initiatives and on the other hand on involving our membership in our discussions. We have dedicated time in the annual meetings to probe thoughts and ideas from members which inform our board discussions about what we are currently doing and what we should be doing in the future. As much as I appreciate the focus on doing, and recognize the value of the dialogue with our membership, the fact that we have a highly international (and thus geographically dispersed) membership and a board with new members rotating in and out every year, suggests that putting some of our thoughts on paper and passing a strategic plan on to new board members might be a good idea.

The ODC Board has, similar to the in general, attempted to make our strategic thoughts and ideas more explicit by beginning to craft a strategy document. We are not aiming to carve our strategy in stone, but hoping that an explicit strategy plan will make it easier to move forward and also to change the plan (and the division) when needed. As I am rolling off the Board, I would like to take the opportunity to share my thoughts on what we have been doing the past five years and our plans for pushing our division to the forefront of organization change research.

Two years ago, our outgoing chair Ann Feyerherm summed up three key efforts the Board was emphasizing: (1) Fostering Intellectual Attractors, (2) Growth through Partnership, and (3) Creating our Brand Narrative. These three efforts were based on a combination of input from the membership (such as through the World Café), Board discussions on strategy, and the division's five-year report which was delivered in 2009. Our current strategy is still in the making and it builds on these ideas from 2010. However, we propose going one step further in pointing out *one main strategic priority* for the next three years, which is to foster high-quality research on organization change. The reason for pushing

high-quality research so explicitly has to do with two trends that we have seen over a number years which have recently been reinforced. First, the division has experienced a slower growth of new members than the overall Academy. Since 2009 the slow growth has turned into negative growth, suggesting that we are currently losing members in our division. Secondly, rightly or wrongly, our division is perceived as less research-oriented than many of the divisions we like to compare ourselves with.

We believe that creating a perfect meeting place – an academic epicenter of organization change – requires increased attention on supporting and showing off the rigorous research on change that indeed takes place in our division, while we at the same time must successfully attract new scholars on change. The ways in which we believe this best can be done is by inviting research on organizational change from various theoretical perspectives and fields, while catalyzing research on specific change issues (which we refer to as intellectual attractors) and pushing further to integrate theory and practice. We do not accept the notion that research is *either* rigorous *or* practical, but aim to emphasize even stronger, the opportunities of high-quality research based on close collaboration with practitioners. Our division is fortunate to have a relatively large number of practitioners and we want our practitioners to play a central role in identifying change issues that are currently under-researched. Our strategy for developing an inspiring meeting place for bold ideas that challenge and extend current theories on organization change is to focus on activities within three strategic areas:

- Fostering high-quality research
- Catalyzing research on key issues and thus reating intellectual attractors
- Further integrating theory and practice

Before addressing each of these, let me recount what we have already done in terms of strategizing. I will focus specifically on how we have worked to create our brand narrative, as this has been a key concern of the Board. We have made several moves to strengthen our communications with members throughout the year. For instance, we have appointed a communications director (Andre Avramchuk) and increased our communications support staff. This past year, Jim Ludema has done a tremendous job in developing a communications strategy which

sets out to rebrand our website and professionalize our electronic communication. You may have already seen our new e-mail template created by Andre, and you will be seeing our new logo and website within the next year. Thanks for your hard work and dedication to this, Jim!

In addition to developing the ODC brand through increased frequency and quality of communications, our membership has been invited to take part in crafting our brand narrative. This work was initiated by a Founders session honoring our heritage and followed by discussions about how to connect our successful past with exciting plans for the future. Two PDW sessions were dedicated to the topic on the ODC brand narrative. Thanks to all of you who shared your thoughts on future directions for the division.

As important as our reflections about who we are and who we want to become have been, we feel it is time to move on. Declining membership numbers suggest that it is not enough to engage in self-reflection, we must also reach out to those people who do important research on change, but who are currently *not* involved in the division. We therefore propose that instead of spending more time reflecting on who we are, we will focus on engaging our current membership in continuing to conduct high-quality research and reaching out to others who are interested in organizational change and invite them to collaborate on exciting research projects and activities within our division.

Fostering High-Quality Research

Ensuring and supporting high-quality and rigorous research is our first and foremost strategic priority for the next three years. Attracting new members requires relentless efforts at (re)building our academic credibility. We propose working along four axes to foster high-quality research: (a) increasing visibility of high-quality research that already exists within the division, (b) mobilizing current members and attracting new research-active members, (c) scouting for young research talents, and (d) expanding our notion of what constitutes high-quality research.

Visualizing—communicating and showing off what’s already out there: We need to make sure that we communicate ongoing research conducted by ODC members. This entails increasing and strengthening communication of high-quality and

high-impact research activities taking place within the division and elsewhere, such as through publications in journals, international conference activities. One important contribution in this work is done by Wayne Boss through the newsletter, where recent publications by ODC members are listed. Another venue for keeping up-to-date on impactful research on change is through the symposia on “Research in Organization Change and Development.” which consists of a conversation with authors in the annual book featuring some of the newest thinking within the field. We encourage more activities that increase the recognition of rigorous research on change and particularly aim to reach beyond existing membership in this communication. One targeted effort in this respect is to introduce an annual division award for the best published paper on organization change.

Mobilizing existing members and attracting new research-active members: A second way in which we can foster high-quality research is by continuing to improve our scholarly program and mobilizing our members to create sessions which can serve to introduce non-members with a strong scholarly profile to our division.

In the past we have organized symposia that include leading change scholars as well as researchers who may not immediately identify themselves as change scholars but who do rigorous research of interest to our membership. Some of these have been broadcasted as our kick-off sessions, such as “The Role of Values” in Montreal and “Bridging East and West in ODC” in San Antonio. The underlying idea with these sessions is to leverage the diversity and the open-mindedness within our division by bringing in alternative and opposing perspectives and through this provide new insights on specific change-related topic.

The board has also worked actively to shape the PDW program by supporting a selection of regular high-profile sessions. “High impact change exercises” has been offered as a highly successful PDW for a number of years and it typically attracts over one hundred participants from all divisions within the Academy. For the third year in a row, we will also be offering a PDW focusing on “Designing and Publishing Qualitative Studies in Organizational Change” in order to encourage practitioners, scholars, and PhD students to publish qualitative work on change. Since 20% of ODC members attend PDWs

each year, this is an opportunity to reach out to our members and mobilize for rigorous research.

Scouting for new talent: A vibrant division of high-quality research depends on attracting new scholars. We need to be alert and responsive to junior scholars who are looking to network and develop their career opportunities. Beginning in 2008, we experimented in creating an ODC doctoral consortium, inviting high quality academic institutions to send doctoral students. We made specific efforts to recruit students also outside of the USA. Our doctoral consortium aims to be different by emphasizing a hands-on, small setting of students “working with” established change scholars rather than “talking-to” PhD students. The positive feedback from participants suggests that the annual consortium has found its shape. The bi-annual Lyon conference, which will take place this summer, also serves as wonderful point of contact between more senior ODC researchers and doctoral students.

In addition to these ongoing consortia, we plan to initiate new activities aiming to include younger scholars in ongoing research sessions and connecting them more directly with more senior scholars. One effort to facilitate such interaction is the PDW on “Resistance to change” which is co-sponsored by the Journal of Change Management. The goal is to create an opportunity for researchers at various points in their career to meet and develop ideas that can feed into a special issue. This should be attractive to young scholars as it creates opportunities for publications as well as collaboration. Other plans for engaging younger scholars include launching a mentoring program for the purpose of connecting junior scholars with more established change researchers.

Expanding our notion of what constitutes rigorous research: Finally, although the criteria for what constitutes rigorous research are well established and ODC members must strive to meet these, the Board feels that we should also be working to expand the notion of what constitutes rigorous research. The current understanding of rigorous research is dominated by a belief in theory-driven research which means that in order to make a theoretical contribution, we must use existing research. However, generating theory from practice should be an equally valid approach to theorizing, without compromising demands for equally rigorous procedures. The newest journal within the family of

Academy of Management publications – Academy of Management Discoveries (AMD) is an exciting development towards more phenomenon-driven research. We expect that the ODC membership should be able to make important contributions both as authors and reviewers, so look out for the AMD!

Catalyzing Research on Key Topics

ODC members want to make a difference. We want our research on change to have an impact on organizations and on the world. In 2010 we launched the idea of creating intellectual attractors and we want to continue pushing this idea as it can create opportunity for ODC members to be at the research frontier on particular important and impactful topics.

Previous attempts at catalyzing research on specific topics have included sponsoring research using an action research approach and research on strategy implementation. Topics that have previously been suggested as future intellectual attractors include:

- Dynamics of Change in a Multi-Cultural World
- Leading Strategic Change that is Socially, Fiscally and Environmentally Sustainable
- Building Networks/Systems of Communities

We encourage you to suggest key topics of high practical value that the ODC division should “take ownership” of. Key topics will then be promoted in the conference program through targeted symposia and paper sessions.

Integrating Theory and Practice

The integration of theory and practice has always been at the forefront of our division. The large number of practitioner-members is also an aspect that differentiates our division from many of the others within the Academy. We have history of emphasizing practice, action and interaction, methods for studying practice and developing theory from practice. However, as a division, we are not leveraging our close connections with practice and practitioners to its full potential. Academic organizations such as AOM call for more relevance, yet an academic career is rarely assessed on its relevance.

We have attempted to learn from academics who have mastered the bridge between practice and theory, such as Michael Beer, who shared his experiences of successful collaboration with practitioners in a key note speech in Montreal 2010 and also in

our 2011 doctoral consortium. In the up-coming program for 2012 in Boston, a symposium on “Post-Merger Integration” will profile M&A researchers in dialogue with practitioners. This year, we have also launched a matching-service through the assistance of Dr. Gervase Bushe, where academics can connect with practicing consultants and collaborate on research projects.

As former Division Chair Frank Barrett so eloquently put it the ODC Five-Year Report for 2009: *“The board feels strongly that the inclusion of academics, practitioners, and students makes us a creative and exciting division that refuses to separate scholarship and practice.”* We want to build on this notion in our attempts at fostering high-quality research.

Thanks for the opportunities to strategize within the ODC!

I would like to round off by thanking current and past ODC Board members for the invigorating discussions, the open-mindedness and fun and friendly atmosphere that you provide. I look forward to continuing to strategize within the ODC.

ODC DIVISION DOCTORAL STUDENT CONSORTIUM

August 3-4, 2012

Jim Ludema

Division Chair Elect

We are now accepting applications for the 2012 Organization Development and Change (ODC) Doctoral Consortium to be held August 3-4 as part of the pre-conference program at the Academy of Management meetings in Boston. Applications are due to Jim Ludema (jludema@ben.edu) by June 15, 2012.

The consortium includes a dynamic and practical mix of presentations, discussions, and small group coaching sessions with leading ODC scholars. It is designed to support doctoral students in the early stages of their dissertation process toward successful completion, publication, and smooth transition into their academic careers.

We encourage advisors to nominate students for the consortium. To achieve the ideal faculty-student ratio for personalized feedback and coaching, we

limit the number of participants to about 20 doctoral students. Please apply early!

We welcome doctoral students from all disciplines who are studying issues associated with the dynamics of change in organizations and other human systems. Relevant topic areas include: Organizational change, development, and transformation; leadership and organizational change; strategic change; global dimensions of change; change management; strategy-as-practice; sustainable organizing; organizational learning and improvisation; institutional change; positive organizational scholarship; organizational design; creativity and innovation; responses to change; social movements and change; network dynamics; macro- and Micro-dynamics of change; team and group dynamics; change agent dynamics; complex adaptive systems, and other change-related topics.

The consortium runs Friday, August 3, 8:30 am-5:30 pm, plus an offsite group dinner with the ODC Executive Board, and Saturday, August 4, 8:30 am-2:00 pm. Continental breakfasts and lunches are provided. The consortium has a highly-innovative design, which has received rave reviews. It begins with a working paper session in which leading change scholar, Quy Huy (INSEAD), provides feedback to this year’s winner of the ODC Best Paper Award, Marguerite Schneider (New Jersey Institute of Technology), Marguerite provides feedback to Quy on a manuscript of his, and doctoral consortium participants chime in.

Next, we move into round one of the student research dialogues in which four or five doctoral students gather in a table group with two leading ODC scholars to receive personalized input and support for their dissertation research projects/proposals (which are distributed ahead of time) to help make them more rigorous, relevant, and publishable. Faculty for this session include Jeffery Ford (Ohio State U), David Grant (U of Sydney), Danielle Zandee (Nyenrode Business U), Cliff Oswick (City U), Mike Manning (New Mexico State U), Ron Fry (Case Western Reserve U), Karen Jansen (U of Virginia), Dick Woodman (Texas A&M), Ian Palmer (RMIT U), Gavin Schwarz (U of New South Wales).

Friday afternoon begins with an editorial panel including Bill Pasmore (Columbia U), Editor of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science (JABS),

Rune By (Staffordshire U), Editor of the Journal of Change Management (JCK), and Jason Shaw (U of Minnesota), Associate Editor of the Academy of Management Journal (AMJ). They will engage in interactive discussion with consortium participants on topics, trends, and trajectories in the field of change and how to publish in their respective journals.

Doctoral students then attend a PDW session on publishing qualitative research in premier academic journals led by Quy Huy, Kevin Corley (Arizona State U), Julia Balogun (Lancaster U), and Catherine Maritan (Syracuse U). This is an exceptional session that in previous years has had long waiting lists, but ODC doctoral consortium participants have their seats reserved. Friday concludes with an offsite group dinner including consortium participants and the ODC Executive Board.

Saturday begins with round two of the student research dialogues. Faculty for this session include Jeffery Ford, David Grant, Danielle Zandee, Cliff Oswick, Inger Stensaker (Norwegian School of Economics), Chris Worley (U of Southern California), Ram Tenkasi (Benedictine University), Frank Barrett (Naval Postgraduate School), Ann Langley (HEC Montreal), and Ryan Quinn (U of Virginia).

Next comes an expert panel on career paths and trajectories in ODC including Mike Beer (Harvard U), Gretchen Spreitzer (U of Michigan), and Andre Spicer (U of Warwick). The panelists represent three generations of high-impact scholarship and practice in the field of ODC. They will talk briefly about the evolution of their careers, the choices they made, and the lessons they learned along the way, and then open things up for spirited dialogue with consortium participants. The consortium concludes after lunch on Saturday with a session on Ethics in the Academy of Management.

The consortium offers a wealth of opportunities to meet other doctoral students, make connections with leading and emerging change scholars, and be exposed to a range of topics that will help you successfully complete your doctoral program and launch the next phase of your career. The ideal candidate for this consortium will have finished his/her coursework and be engaged in preparing a dissertation proposal—or just finished defending the proposal—but not yet into substantial data collection.

Because space is limited, we expect that no more than two students per program will be selected to participate, but additional students from a given program may be considered on a space available basis after the nomination deadline.

To apply, please send an email with the following three documents attached to Jim Ludema (jludema@ben.edu) by June 15, 2012:

- A recommendation letter from your dean, department chair, or major advisor that verifies your (a) status/progress and (b) year in your school's doctoral program.
- A one-page bio summarizing your contact information, research and teaching interests, and publications. This one-page bio will be distributed among consortium participants.
- A 3-5 page (typed and double-spaced) summary of your dissertation project, including the research question, rationale, hypotheses/propositions, proposed methods and results (if applicable). This will be distributed to consortium faculty and participants in advance of the August sessions.

We anticipate all selections will be made by July 1, 2012. Please direct any questions to Jim Ludema (jludema@ben.edu).

CALL FOR PAPERS ODC DIVISION RESEARCH AWARD

The ODC Division requests grant proposals for a \$3,000 OD&C Division Research Award (ODCRA). The details about this project include the following:

Purpose: To encourage scholarly research and inquiry in the field of Organization Development and Change Management.

Eligibility: Any person(s) planning to and/or conducting scholarly research and study in Organization Development and Change Management with intent to publish.

Criteria: Submissions must be rigorous and designed to advance the body of knowledge in Organization Development and Change Management, especially research that enhances and promotes a science-based change process.

Submission Requirements: ODCRA proposals should not exceed eight (8) pages and must include the following:

- Statement of objectives
- Research design
- Timeline for completion
- Statement of intent to publish
- Principal Investigator(s) Names, with short vita(s)

Graduate students should include their advisor's name with a short vita. (These documents are not included in the eight-page maximum.)

Submission Deadline: June 1, 2012

All proposals will be blind reviewed by at least three members of the ODCRA Board and decisions will be anonymous and final.

After a proposal is approved, the award funds will be paid in two installments. \$1,000.00 paid at time of award approval and \$2,000.00 paid when research is completed in publishable form.

The ODCRA Board Members are Jim Ludema, Ken Murrell, Peter Norlin, Deborah A. O'Neil, Gretchen Spreitzer, and Don Warrick. For more information, please contact: Glenn Varney: gvarney@bgsu.edu, (419) 352-7656.

**THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE AND DOCTORAL
CONSORTIUM ON ORGANIZATION
DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE**

**June 5-6, 2012
Lyon 3, France**

Since 2006, international conferences and doctoral consortium of the ODC Division of the Academy of Management have taken place every other year at ISEOR, University of Jean Moulin, in Lyon, France. These conferences have been extremely successful and enabled a total of 560 presentations of OD and Change by academics, as well as doctoral and master students from 22 countries. These events illustrate the value-added nature of the development of relationships across the Atlantic, as professionals share knowledge and experience in the

field of research. Themes have included:

- Comparing research methods
- Comparing the doctoral and MS-OD curricula in the field of ODC in various countries
- Helping Ph.D. and MS-OD students gain skills in collaborating on an international level.
- Presenting research on change management theories and evaluation methods of the results
- Bridging the gap between change methodologies and management control approaches to planned change

The consortium format will consist of two kinds of presentations:

- Papers, conferences and testimonies proposed by academics aimed at presenting the various and supplementary approaches applied to change management in different cultural settings.
- Workshops, where doctoral students, executive doctoral students and MS-OD are invited to present the progress of their research project in order to debate and exchange.

The best papers of academics and of doctoral students (if co-authored with their director of research) will be proposed for publication in the Journal Recherche en Sciences de Gestion/ Management Sciences/ Ciencias de Gestión.

Venue: ISEOR Research Center, University of Jean Moulin Lyon 3, is the pilot research center of the doctoral program in Socio-Economic Approach to the management of change and to organization development. Lyon, France is ideally located at the heart of Europe and is an academic powerhouse in the field of management. (see: www.lyon-france.com). The ISEOR Research Center has held several conferences with the following Academy of Management divisions: Management Consulting, Research Methods, Social Issues in Management, and Organization Development and Change.

Registration fees:

- Doctoral students: €100, which includes registration, CD-ROM proceedings
- Academics and professional participants: €300, which includes registration, proceedings, lunches and gala dinner.

Correspondence and submissions should be directed to colloquedc2012@iseor.com (also please see www.iseor.com).

This conference is based on an organized partnership with the ISEOR Research Center and the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management (USA). The languages of communications will be English, Spanish, and French.

WHY MANAGING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IN EAST ASIA MAY BE DIFFERENT FROM MANAGING CHANGE IN NORTH AMERICA

Quy Nguyen Huy*
William W. Maddux*
INSEAD

Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks
University of Michigan

2011 Carolyn Dexter Best International Paper
Finalist, Academy of Management

Realizing organizational change is difficult and underperformance risks are significant. Of particular importance for successful organizational change is having a clear understanding of how recipient employees will try to make sense of and psychologically respond to the change agents' actions. As organizations become more global, organizational change is increasingly affecting personnel from different geographical regions; thus, underlying cultural differences may lead to very different responses to organizational change initiatives for employees from different cultural backgrounds. However, researchers studying organizational change have yet to sufficiently integrate a consistent, cross-cultural perspective into the change literature, or have tended to assume a Western perspective.

Such oversight is unfortunate, not least because many firms have encountered significant business underperformance because of difficulties in navigating issues stemming from regional culture differences. Counter to speculation that economic globalization has produced a universal, culture-neutral business psychology, cultural divides can be more pronounced in organizational contexts relative to

other contexts (for a review, see Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). In this paper, we introduce a novel cross-cultural theoretical framework from the social psychological literature on culture that have important implications for understanding how organizational change may unfold differently in different cultures.

Regional Culture From a Social Psychology Perspective

We conceptualize regional culture (sometimes referred to simply as "culture") as the distinct pattern of beliefs, norms, and behaviors that reflect assumptions about what is true, valued, and efficient in a given geographical region. Regional culture is inherently a multilevel construct: It exists in the minds of individuals, but also in the socially constructed world in the form of organizational, economic, political, legal institutions and social practices. Such cultural patterns can be unique to a small collective, a tribe, a nation, or even a region that spans political. This term also acknowledges that within any country, regional cultures can vary widely. Because of the diffuse nature of cultural influences and practices, we focus on culture at the level of geographical region rather than at the level of nation (e.g., Japan, USA), a conceptualization which is supported by empirical findings reviewed below.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows: First, we introduce a key dimension of regional culture – analytic and holistic systems of thought – and we describe how this analytic/holistic dimension contributes to the understanding of organizational change across cultures. We then develop propositions regarding how cultural differences influence employee responses to several important processes of organizational change and describe factors that moderate these proposed effects. Next, we elaborate on how change agents might bridge the cultural divides in multicultural organizations.

Origins and Conceptualization of Analytic and Holistic Systems of Thought

One of the most compelling cross-cultural theories to emerge out of the last decade of culture research in social psychology is that of analytic and holistic systems of thought (Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001; Nisbett, 2003). This framework suggests that, whereas individuals from some cultural regions approach the social and physical world

from an analytic perspective, individuals from other regions tend to approach their world from a more holistic perspective. At its essence, analytic thought involves perceiving and understanding the physical and social world as one inherently characterized by the forces of independence and separateness: Individuals from analytically oriented cultures tend to place a strong emphasis on individual agency; they perceive people and objects as imbued with largely immutable traits and characteristics, viewing the world as static and unchanging; they perceive things as inherently independent of each other and separate from the larger social or physical context; they use formal rules to abstract and obtain knowledge that is generalizable across contexts; and they use logic and debate to solve problems and go to great lengths to avoid contradiction (Nisbett et al., 2001; Nisbett, 2003).

The strong focus on individual agency that is woven into the analytic system of thought (for sake of brevity, we also refer to this as an “analytic mindset”) has been traced to the ideas, practices, and institutions that arose in ancient Greece. Ancient Greece was one of the first cultures to imbue people with a sense that they were free to determine the course of their own lives and the ability to influence their environment through their personal will. This belief has subsequently evolved and grown during subsequent events in European and North American countries. As a result, individuals socialized in Western cultures tend to psychologically construe themselves as individual entities and are fundamentally independent of and separate from each other (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In addition to individual agency, ancient Greece also imprinted inhabitants of Western Europe with an analytical way of making sense of the material world by categorizing objects into discrete clusters, abstracting fundamental principles, and using logic and debate to solve problems. Thus, overall, this emphasis on individuals, objects, and events as independent and separate from each other is what defines the analytic mindset, which predominates in Western European, North American, and British Commonwealth countries.

On the other hand, in other cultures a more holistic system of thought is prevalent. A holistic mindset involves perceiving the physical and social world as inherently interdependent and interrelated: Individuals are seen as constantly changing entities

that fundamentally overlap with and are defined by their relationships with other individuals and memberships in social groups; events and objects are assumed to be interconnected in the social and physical environment, with everything exerting influence on everything else; the social world is interpreted to be constantly in flux and changing; reasoning involves recognizing and accepting contradictory and competing viewpoints; and preferred resolution to problems is to seek a compromise or find a “middle way” (Nisbett et al., 2001). This holistic mindset manifests itself in numerous ways: For example, in the Confucian emphasis on the importance of interpersonal relationships and harmony, social obligation and collective agency. A holistic mindset also leads individuals to feel part of a large, interdependent social unit in which prescriptive role relations guide expectations and behavior. Indeed, philosophers posit that in Taoism and Buddhism the concept of “self” does not actually exist in the absence of others. As a result of this concern with relationships and groups, debate to find the ‘one right answer’ was less critical; instead, avoiding open conflict and finding value in others’ opinions were more important. This holistic mindset was also applied to understanding the material world: Rather than categorizing objects and abstracting rules, the world was seen in terms of interrelationships among objects and events, which are embedded in a broader perceptual field with the background and context playing an important role in the understanding of causality. Researchers have found that holistic systems of thought predominate across East Asian and Southeast Asian countries (e.g., China, Japan, Korea, , Thailand), which were strongly influenced by Confucian belief systems and by Buddhist- and Taoist-inspired practices developed in and around ancient Chinese civilization.

Over the past two decades, a converging series of findings from research using different methodologies (e.g., archival analyses, field and lab experiments, and surveys) and populations (i.e., from young adults to seasoned managers) provide strong empirical support for this analytic-holistic framework. For example, in studies that have examined implicit attention to the social-emotional dimension of workplace communication, North Americans have been found to attend less to social-emotional cues at work as compared to outside work; however, managers from several holistically-oriented countries (China, Korea, and Thailand) show the

same attention to social-emotional cues both in work or non-work contexts (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003). Thus, this approach provides considerable theoretical parsimony and predictive power, as we will elaborate in the next section.

We propose that analytic and holistic systems of thought will differentially shape three challenges related to the realization of organizational change: receptivity to change, mobilization for change, and learning from change (Huy, 1999). Receptivity to change refers to organization members' openness to consider proposed organizational changes, and to assess their legitimacy and consequences of such proposals for themselves and for the organization. Mobilization for change refers to the process of rallying and propelling differentiated segments of the organization to undertake joint action and realize common change goals. Learning from change refers to the quality of the feedback loop between interpretation and action—between receptivity and mobilization for organizational change. For space reasons, however, we will discuss only how analytic and holistic systems of thought influence employees' receptivity to proposed organizational change.

Assumption about the naturalness of stability and change. Based upon the holistic emphasis about the interrelatedness of events and the fundamental naturalness of change, we postulate that individuals from holistic cultures will tend to be more receptive to organizational change (generally construed) than individuals from analytic cultures. For example, a key theme in both Buddhism and Taoism is the constant change inherent in the mental, physical, and social world (e.g., Nisbett, 2003). However, the Western cultural tradition takes a more static and linearly predictable view. Some Greek philosophers argued that change was essentially impossible; objects could be only what they currently were or else would cease to be at all and become something completely different. Even when change did occur, this new path was then taken to be constantly moving into the future. Thus, change seems to be a more natural and expected occurrence in holistic rather than analytic cultures.

Willingness to adjust to and take the perspective of others. Change receptivity depends on the willingness and ability of employees to understand and adjust to others, a tendency that varies across analytic and holistic cultures. In one study, situations where people exerted influence over others were

more memorable and occurred more frequently in the past for analytically-oriented Americans, whereas holistically-oriented Japanese tended to remember more situations that involved adjusting to others' desires. For Japanese (but not for Americans), adjustment behaviors elicited strong feelings of closeness to others.

Proposition 1: Other things being equal, employees from holistic cultures will tend to show higher levels of receptivity to a proposed organizational change than will employees from analytic cultures. This difference, moreover, will be mediated by differences in folk wisdom about inevitability of change and willingness to adjust to others.

The moderating effect of first- and second-order change. Although the literature in social psychology suggests greater receptivity to change in holistic cultures than in analytic cultures, we believe this effect is likely to be moderated by the nature of the proposed organizational change. In particular, we suggest that individuals from holistic cultures will be more receptive than individuals from analytic cultures to first-order change—that is, change that is perceived as consistent with long-established belief systems and that does not fundamentally change the belief systems themselves. However, cultural variation in receptivity to the less common but more radical, second-order change—proposed change in the organizational actual belief systems themselves—could show reduced or reversed cultural effects. The rationale for this hypothesis is that in holistic cultures, interpersonal harmony is arguably the primary social motivation, and individuals are continuously socialized to be aware of how their actions impact others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Additionally, individuals from holistic cultures tend to have social structures that are relatively fixed and closed, what researchers refer to as low “relational mobility,” whereas analytical cultures have social structures that are more open and fluid and thus higher in relational mobility (Schug, Yuki, & Maddux, 2010). Relational mobility refers to the ability of individuals to freely terminate old interpersonal relationships and groups memberships and form new ones. Thus, individuals in low mobility (more holistic) cultures are highly motivated to maintain social harmony since mobility is limited and thus maintaining and protecting existing relationships is critical; as a result, holistically-oriented individuals may try to delay, or even avoid, organi-

zational change if they perceive the cost of disrupting social harmony is too high. However, given that relational mobility tends to be higher in analytic cultures and social relationships can be formed and terminated more easily, maintaining interpersonal harmony is less critical, and thus disrupting social harmony through second-order change should be seen as less costly. To illustrate further, continuous first-order changes that are seen as improving harmoniously past work patterns such as Total Quality Management (TQM or Kaizen) were first widely embraced by Japanese firms although the concept originated in the US. US firms that had initially shunned TQM might have implicitly followed the folk wisdom related to stability, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Proposition 2: Cultural differences in receptivity to change will be moderated by the type of organizational change: Compared to employees from analytic cultures, employees from holistic cultures will be more receptive to first-order change, whereas this relationship will be reduced or even reversed for second-order change.

Cultural Competence in Facilitating Change in Multinational Organizations

Researchers have suggested that cultural divides may be bridged by leveraging the abilities of employees with certain types of multicultural profiles, cultural abilities, and by constructing teams composed of culturally diverse members. Individuals who have more than one cultural identity (e.g., biculturals) are therefore able to draw on two or more cultural repertoires depending on which identity is made salient in a particular context (Hong et al., 2000). Indeed, a growing body of work suggests that individuals with multiple distinct cultural identities (e.g., a Chinese-American) are more able to flexibly shift emphasis between identities and respond to the social world differently depending on which cultural identity is salient in a particular context. The cultural ambidexterity afforded to biculturals, for example, suggests that bicultural change agents may be able to serve as a bridge between the regional cultures that make up their dual identity, in part through more accurate perspective-taking and thoughtful cultural translation of change proposals (Chiu & Cheng, 2007). Importantly, bicultural ability does not have to be solely an individual-level characteristic; change leaders can deliberately build bicultural work units

by appointing, for example, at least two co-managers from different cultures who know and respect each other's cultures and have good interpersonal relations. These co-managers, in turn, can help their monocultural colleagues understand the perspectives of the other subgroup.

Individuals need not necessarily be considered bicultural or have immersive experiences, such as living abroad, to develop valuable cultural skill that can bridge cultural perspectives; individuals who have certain culturally relevant motivations may be similarly effective. Individuals high in "cultural intelligence" (CQ; Earley & Ang, 2003) have been found to use more integrative negotiation strategies and to invest more cognitive effort into accurately understanding counterparts from different cultures. Thus, culturally relevant motivations like CQ may also help bridge cultural divides during organizational change.

Nevertheless, even in the most diverse organizations, it may be unrealistic to expect that all employees in influential positions will be bicultural or will have rich cross-cultural experiences or abilities. In the absence of such individuals, it may be possible to construct decision-making teams to be culturally diverse so as to include the different cultural perspectives represented by employees. For example, following the merger between IBM's PC division and Lenovo in 2004, the CEO and COO of Lenovo were Americans, but the CFO and COB were Chinese; thus, the main cultural perspectives were equally represented among the company's top management team. However, the teams literature suggests some critical caveats for culturally diverse teams, which operate effectively only in certain cases. In particular, because diverse teams often fail to share information held by one or a minority of members, diverse teams need to have strong social connections and sense of psychological safety between members in order for individual to feel comfortable expressing divergent opinions. Such a sense of psychological safety is most likely to happen when there are high levels of trust among team members, when superordinate identities are salient, when the overarching organizational culture is consistent with teamwork, or when group norms encourage openness and learning. Thus, strong social connections between culturally diverse team members is a necessary condition to deal with culture-related issues during organizational change,

and should enhance (that is, moderate) the effectiveness of various culture-sensitive interventions on employees' receptivity to change.

References

- Chiu, C.-Y., & Cheng, S. Y. Y. (2007). Toward a cultural psychology of culture and globalization: Some social cognitive consequences of activating two cultures simultaneously. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 84-100.
- Early, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55, 709-720.
- Huy, N. Q. (1999). Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review* 24(2), 325-345.
- Markus, A. A., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review* 98, 224-253.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently . . . and why*. New York: The Free Press.
- Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review* 108(2): 291-310.
- Sanchez-Burks, J., & Lee, F. (2007). Cultural psychology of workways. In Kitayama, S., & Cohen, D., (Eds.). *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 346-369). Guilford, NY.
- Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Choi, I., Nisbett, R., Zhao, S., & Koo, J. (2003). Conversing across cultures: East-West communication styles in work and nonwork contexts. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 85(2) 363-372.
- Schug, J., Yuki, M., & Maddux, W. W. (2010). Relational mobility explains between- and within- culture differences in self-disclosure toward close friends. *Psychological Science*, 21: 1471-1478.

ASSESSING QUALITY IN ACTION RESEARCH WITHIN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

David Coghlan
Trinity College
Dublin, Ireland

A.B. (Rami) Shani
California Polytechnic State University and
Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy

What constitutes good quality action research within ODC? On what criteria might editors assess a submission? These are not easy questions to answer as there is no consensus on any one answer. Indeed there may be disagreement. This is because there is no single version of action research where one set of criteria might be considered definitive. Action research is considered to be a family of approaches that operates in a wide variety of settings and with great diversity (Reason & Bradbury, 2008). This article is not aiming to retrace that ground but rather to complement what Hilary Bradbury Huang wrote in 2010 and to focus on one particular domain of action research, namely action research within the field of ODC.

Within the wide variety of approaches to and definitions of action research that can be found within the field, we are working from Shani and Pasmore's definition that for us captures the essence of action research in the OD context.

Action research may be defined as an emergent inquiry process in which applied behavioral science knowledge is integrated with existing organizational knowledge and applied to solve real organizational problems. It is simultaneously concerned with bringing about change in organizations, in developing self-help competencies in organizational members and adding to scientific knowledge. Finally, it is an evolving process that is undertaken in a spirit of collaboration and co-inquiry (1985: 439).

In tune with this definition, we are following Shani and Pasmore's research that quality in action research in the context of OD needs to be explicit about the following areas:

- Purpose and rationale for action and inquiry,
- Context,
- Methodology and method of inquiry,

- Design,
- Narrative and outcomes,
- Reflection on the narrative in the light of the experience and the theory;
- Extrapolation to a broader context and articulation of usable knowledge.

Before we discuss these areas, we note some critical features of action research in OD that underpin the approach to assessing quality in action research in organization development. Our first feature is that action research in organization development and change seeks to generate practical knowledge, that is, knowledge of how to change. The realm of practical knowing, as contrasted with scientific knowing which seeks to create universal knowledge, directs us to the concerns of human living and the successful performance of daily tasks and discovering solutions that work (Coghlan, 2011). It is particular, contextual and practical and it changes with every situation as what is familiar in one place may be unfamiliar in another and what works in one setting may not work in another. Therefore, practical knowing is always incomplete and can only be completed by attending to figuring out what is needed in situations in which one is at a given time. As no two situations are identical we reason, reflect and judge in a practical pattern of knowing in order to move from one setting to another, grasping what modifications are needed and deciding how to act.

Our second feature is that action research involves researching in the present tense. Action research builds on the past, takes place in the present with a view to shaping the future. Accordingly, engagement in the cycles of action and reflection perform both a practical and philosophical function in its attentiveness and reflexivity as to what is going on at any given moment and how that attentiveness yields purposeful action. Accordingly, action researchers need to show how they engaged in cycles of action and reflection in collaboration with others, how they accessed multiple data sources to provide contradictory and confirming interpretations, what choices were made along the way and how they were made, provide evidence of how they challenged and tested their assumptions and interpretations continuously throughout the project and how their interpretations and outcomes were challenged, supported or disconfirmed from existing literature.

Pasmore, Woodman, and Simmons (2008) postulate that action research and collaborative research needs to be rigorous, reflective and relevant. Under rigor, they group: data-driven, multiple methodologies, reliability across settings, co-evaluation, causality, underlying mechanisms and publishability. Under reflection they group: historical impact, referential, co-interpretation, community of practice, collection and repeated application. Under relevant they group: practical, codetermined, re-applicable, teachable, face-valid, interesting, true significance and specific. In enacting action research in organization development in the present tense and aiming to produce practical knowing that is rigorous, reflective and relevant, a general empirical method that is grounded in: attention to data of sense and of consciousness (experience), explore intelligently to envisage possible explanations of that data (understanding), judge soundly, preferring as probable or certain the explanations that provide the best account for the data (judgment) and being responsible for decisions and actions is central (Coghlan, 2010). When OD researchers and practitioners attend to organizational experiences, converse together to understand, and construct shared meanings (however provisional) from which appropriate OD research interventions may be selected and implemented, they are enacting the general empirical method. In this manner they are embodying rigor in a science of action and addressing explicitly the pitfalls of working from untested inferences and attributions (Argyris, 2004).

Table 1 presents a template by which the key areas of: purpose and rationale for action and inquiry, context, methodology and method of inquiry, design, narrative and outcomes, reflection on the narrative in the light of the experience and the theory; extrapolation to a broader context and articulation of usable knowledge are presented in their terms of their essence and are juxtaposed in terms of rigor, reflective and relevant. It forms a checklist as indicative of how quality in action research in organization change and development may be assessed. A scale of 1-5 (1=not at all, 3=to an acceptable level, 5=to a very significant extent) may be applied to any individual question in the checklist. Based on the number of dimensions that we have, the maximum points that one can get is 185 (for rigor the maximum number of points is 14x5=70; for reflective 13x5=65; for relevant

10x5=50). So any manuscript within the range of 160-185 can be considered an AR-based paper.

Key areas for assessing action research in organization development include the following:

Purpose and Rationale of the Research

When authors are presenting the purpose and rationale of an action research piece of work, they are, in effect, presenting the case, stating why the action chosen was worth doing for the organization, why it is worth studying and what it is that it seeks to contribute to the world of theory and of practice. It is critical issue for authors, at the outset of an action research paper, to make both a practical and an academic case for what they are doing. This is not just an argument for credibility but a formal effort to locate their work in both a practical and an academic context. Accordingly, table 1 poses questions as to how rigor, reflective and relevant are present in the presentation of the purpose and rationale of the action research project.

Context

Context here refers to the business, social and academic context of the research. There are three context areas: the broad general business context at global and national level; the local organizational/discipline context, that is what is going on in the selected organization; and then the specific topic area. In action research framing the business and social context is very important. Therefore, authors need to describe the business context in which the organization operates, and the organization with which they are working. This would include some details of competitive environment, an introduction to the organization, what it does, some historical background about the organization, its evolution and history with OD efforts if any, what its concerns are and what the issues in which it is are engaging mean and what is intended and hoped for out of the action research project. This description contains not only a presentation of the facts of the organization in its business and competitive setting but also contains a review of some of the relevant literature on the setting. Academic context is also important. Not only are authors reviewing the business context of their project, they also review and critique the research that has been done in that context and locate their action research in that tradition and so lay the ground for their hoped-for contribution. Table 1 poses questions as to how

rigor, reflective and relevant are present in the presentation of the context of the project.

Methodology and Methods of Action and Inquiry

This is a section on methodology in which the action research approach, methodology and methods of inquiry are described. This is a matter of providing some basic information on action research and an introduction to any particular modality that will be used. For example, if the project is built on an appreciative inquiry modality, then a definition, some history and the main philosophical tenets of appreciative inquiry would be provided and justified for this context. Alternatively the action research may be framed as collaborative management research and so this modality's tenets and methods would be introduced (Shani, Coghlan & Cirella, 2012). Both OD and action research have changed over the past thirty years (Coghlan, 2012). A paper on action research in OD would need to position itself with regard to the approach it takes. For example, a particular project may be focused on the conversations in the organization as so positions itself in terms of 'dialogic' OD (Bushe & Marshak, 2009). In contrast, a project may follow a more traditional process of expert diagnosis, planning, implementation and evaluation. Table 1 poses questions as to how the philosophical grounding of methodology and methods of inquiry build in structures of rigor, reflection and relevance.

Design

There needs to be a general plan of how learning mechanisms are designed both to address the practical issue and to generate knowledge and how ethical issues were considered (Shani & Docherty, 2003; Coghlan & Shani, 2005). For example, the design might be built around project teams that would meet to address the issues confronting the organization and which might work in an action learning mode to articulate their learning in-action. As the project proceeds in the present tense, ethical issues of obtaining consent, ensuring anonymity and confidentiality and balancing conflicting and different interests are grounded in the cycles of planning, taking action and reflection (Walker & Haslett, 2002).

Selecting an appropriate research intervention involves two processes (Coghlan & Shani, in press). First, there is the collaborative process between OD researchers and organizational practitioners in the

mode of 'dialogic OD' and action research and collaborative management research. Second, there is the method they use in assessing the experiences that lead to OD intervention and theory generation. These describe how the design was collectively constructed to meet the requirements of rigor, reflection and relevance.

The action researchers also need to locate themselves in the project, i.e. as external or internal OD consultants, senior or line managers. Here they introduce themselves in terms of their role regarding the project and position themselves and the challenges they face. Authors who acted as OD consultants need to explain how the research role was negotiated, especially if the initial contract was more oriented toward helping than research (Schein 1995).

Narrative and Outcomes

The heart of any action research paper is the narrative or story of what took place. A critical issue in presenting the narrative is to distinguish the events which took place, about which there is no dispute, and the meanings attributed to these events. This form of presentation gives the evidence in a factual and neutral manner. The authors' view of these events and their theorizing as to what these events are considered to mean should not be mixed in with the telling of the narrative. By separating the narrative from its sense-making, and by clearly stating which is story and which is sense-making, authors are demonstrating how they are applying methodological rigor to their approach. Combining narrative and sense-making leaves them open to the charge of biased story-telling and makes it difficult for readers and editors to evaluate their work. The questions in Table 1 challenge the narrative of the events of the project in terms of rigor, reflection and relevance.

Reflection on the Narrative and Outcome

Here the authors present their understanding of the events of the narrative and their theorizing as to what these events and outcomes are considered to mean and what their judgments are about them. The outcomes, both intended and unintended, are judged in terms of the intention of the project to address the organization's needs and the rigor, reflection and relevance of the collaborative processes in coming

to judgment about the project's success or otherwise.

The Discussion/Extrapolation to a Broader Context and Articulation of Usable Knowledge

One of the most common criticisms of published action research is that it lacks theory. In other words, action research accounts tell a story but do not address issues of emergent theory and so contribute to knowledge. Action research projects are situation specific and do not aim to create universal knowledge. At the same time, extrapolation from a local situation to more general situations is important. Action researchers are not claiming that every organization will behave as the one studied. But they can focus on some significant factors, consideration of which is useful for other organizations, perhaps like organizations or organizations undergoing similar types of change processes or offer a contribution to methodology.

In terms of the framework of the paper, the authors need to reflect on purpose and rationale for action and inquiry, context, methodology, how design and method of inquiry, narrative and outcomes, and so on. For example, on context, the discussion may reflect on the impact it had on the project, especially if it changed in some way. The discussion would reflect on the quality of relationship between the researchers and organizational members and how the relationships need to be managed through trust, collaboration, dialogue concerns for one another's' interest, equality of influence, common language and so on. It would also reflect on the quality of the action research process itself – how the collaborative processes of shared inquiry and action worked. Finally the discussion would reflect on the outcomes of the project – what might be sustainable (human, social, economic, ecological) and the development of self-help and competencies out of the action and the creation of new knowledge from the inquiry.

The discussion on the action research process itself is central. OD researchers work to help the organizational members to understand what is going on and to take action based on that understanding (Coghlan, 2009). Through their interventions, both those to help take action and those to help generate knowledge, OD researchers employ the general empirical method in engaging with organizational members, whether as clients or fellow organization-

Key Areas	The Essence of the Key Areas	Rigor	Reflective	Relevant
(1) Purpose and Rationale for Action and Inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Case for why action and research are necessary or desirable? *What contribution is intended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Does it provide a clear rationale for inquiry and action? *To what extent the focus addresses a gap in the scientific literature? *Does it display the data to justify the purpose and rationale for the study? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Is it linked to past research and scientific literature? *Is it linked to contemporary business and organizational issues? 	Does it describe why action is necessary or desirable? (to achieve what for whom)
(2) Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Understanding the business, organizational and academic context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Is the contextual data captured in a scientific, systematic and holistic way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Does it build on past and present scientific research that is central to the focus of the study? *Does it build on past and present organizational experience that is central to the issue studied? 	To what extent relevant analytical frameworks applied to understand the context?
(3) Methodology and Method of Inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The role of the action researcher *Ethical issues *Contracting *Establish learning mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent is the process of contracting, selection of methods of action and inquiry collaborative? *To what extent are the methods and inquiry process described with sufficient details? *To what extent are alternative LMs tapestries explored? *Are appropriate modes of AR selected and justified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent are the action and research cycles described? *To what extent is the LMs tapestry involved in the development of the methodology and inquiry method? 	To what extent are the methods of action and inquiry driven by the organization's needs and scholarly criteria?
(4) Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Data collection and generation *Cycles of action research *Building relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent is the project designed and implemented to ensure rigor? *To what extent the data is collaboratively and rigorously generated, collected and explored? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent is the project designed and implemented collaboratively? *To what extent attention is paid to the development of the quality of the relationship? 	To what extent is the research design directed to meet the organization's needs, as well as those of academic rigor?
(5) Narrative and Outcomes,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Describe the story and outcomes, (intended and unintended) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *How well is the story told, with an appropriate level of detail? *To what extent are facts and values distinguished? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent does the story demonstrate collaborative inquiry and action in the present tense? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent does it captures what happened? *What were the outcomes, both intended and unintended?
(6) Reflection on the Narrative & Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Analyze story and reflection *Make judgments on the process and outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent do the narrative and description of outcomes meet the standards/criteria of research? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent is the story reflected on collaboratively? *To what extent is shared meaning created? *To what extent did dialogue about meaning and possible actions among different organizational groups/units/communities of practice take place? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent are story and outcomes' meaning focused on the organization's needs? *To what extent are story and outcomes' meaning focused on addressing the scientific needs?
(7) Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extrapolation to a broader context • Articulation of actionable knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Link story to theory (existing and emerging theory) *Discuss the story and outcomes *Discuss the action research process, quality of relationships, and sustainability of the outcomes *Articulate contribution to both theory and practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent does the entire account (purpose/rationale, methodology & methods, design, narrative and outcomes, reflection, the quality of the action research process, the quality of relationships) contribute to knowledge and practice? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent does the entire account (purpose/rationale, methodology & methods, design, narrative, outcomes, sustainability of the outcomes and, reflection) fit the quality of the action research process and the quality of relationships? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *To what extent does the entire account (purpose/rationale, methodology & methods, design, narrative and outcomes, reflection) contribute to sustainable outcomes for the organization and actionable knowledge for scholars? *To what extent does the AR approach demonstrate returns that make the process and effort worthwhile?

Table 1: Assessing the Quality of an Action Research Paper: A Reviewer's Check List

al colleagues, to draw out their experience, their insights, their judgments and their actions in the settings where things change as a consequence of intervention, and where perceptions and meanings shift as people interact and enact strategies and actions for change. The focus is firmly on acts of knowing and doing in the present tense as the project unfolds. Hence, the discussion needs to show the integrity between the purpose of the research and action, how the context is assessed, the quality of the relationships whereby how the participants have engaged in cycles of action and reflection on a real-life issue, and how the outcomes are workable and that they generate actionable knowledge.

As Coghlan and Shani (in press) explore this involves discussing how rigor, reflection and relevance pertained to the criteria discussed above. They discuss, for example that if rigor is viewed as upholding the standards of scientific proof in assessing the impact of a specific organizational issue on performance, then a discussion of how a dialogical process that is embedded in scientifically generated data, data analysis and data interpretation may be rigorous. Also, if reflection is viewed as the process of jointly and collectively creating new insights and theories by referring to the related work of others, the discussion needs to discuss how the contextual factors might impact on the quality of reflection as well as about the design choices of the dialogical process that can facilitate creating the most appropriate context for that reflection. Finally, if relevance is understood as addressing the concerns of both the practitioner and academic communities then the processes of inquiry and action and the outcomes need to address both communities. In short, the questions in Table 1 capture the entire project.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to explore the question of what constitutes good quality action research within ODC. Given the broad range of approaches that operates in a wide variety of settings and with great diversity, this is a difficult question. Through working from a definition and a framing of action research within an ODC context using the broad criteria of rigor, relevance and reflective specific assessment dimensions were proposed. Implemented systematically they provide a profile that would suggest the degree to which the reviewed manuscript meets the criteria of being labeled an action research-based study. While not everyone

undertaking action research in OD may use the same definition, we are confident that the criteria in this paper have a relevance to other definitions. While a reviewer might be faced with a paper that takes a different approach, we suggest that irrespective of the definition adopted (and the quality criteria that might be gleaned from that), the above quality criteria remain pertinent.

References

- Argyris, C. (2004). *Reasons and rationalizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bradbury Huang, H. (2010). What is good action research? Why the resurgent interest? *Academy of Management ODC Newsletter, Winter, 1*, 3-13.
- Bushe, G. R. & Marshak, R. (2009). Revisioning organization development: Diagnostic and dialogic premises and patterns of practice. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45*(3), 248-268.
- Coghlan, D. (2009). Toward a philosophy of clinical inquiry/research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45*(1), 106-121.
- Coghlan, D. (2011). Action research: Exploring perspective on a philosophy of practical knowing. *Academy of Management Annals, 5*(1), 53-87.
- Coghlan, D. (2012). Organization development and action research: Then and now. In Boje, D., Burnes, B., & Hassard, J. (Eds.). *The Routledge companion to organizational change* (pp. 47-58). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Coghlan, D. & Shani, A. B (Rami) (2005). Roles, politics and ethics in action research design. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 18*, 533-546
- Coghlan, D. & Shani, A. B. (Rami) (in press). OD research interventions: Perspectives from action research and collaborative management research. In Leonard, S., Lewis, R., Freedman, A., & Passmore, J. (Eds.). *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of OD*. New York: Wiley.
- Pasmore, W. A., Woodman, R., & Simmons, A. L. (2008). Toward a more rigorous, reflective, and relevant science of collaborative management research. In Shani, A. B. (Rami), Mohrman, S. A., Pasmore, W. A., Stymne, B. & Adler, N.

Handbook of collaborative management research (pp. 567-582). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (2008). *Handbook of action research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Schein, E. H. (1995). Process consultation, action research and clinical inquiry: Are they the same? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10 (6), 14-19.

Shani, A. B. (Rami), Coghlan, D., & Cirella, S. (2012). Action research and collaborative management research: More than meets the eye? *International Journal of Action Research*, 8, 1, 45-67

Shani, A. B. (Rami), & Docherty, P. (2003). *Learning by design*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shani, A. B. (Rami), & Pasmore, W. A. (1985). Organization inquiry: Towards a new model of the action research process. In Warrick, D. D. (Ed.). *Contemporary organization development: Current thinking and applications* (pp. 438-448). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company. [Reproduced in Coghlan, D., & Shani, A. B. (Rami) (Eds.) (2010). *Fundamentals of organization development* (Vol 1, pp. 249-260). London: Sage].

Walker, B. & Haslett, T. (2002). Action research in management-ethical dilemmas. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 15(6), 523-533.

**AUTHORIZED PEER PRESSURE:
EFFECTIVE REAL-TIME
ACCOUNTABILITY
IN CROSS-DISCIPLINARY TEAMS**

Faaiza Rashid
Harvard University
2012 Susan Cohen Award

Many failures in work settings such as cost overruns, low product quality, and schedule delays are a result of ineffective real-time accountability. Real-time accountability involves coworkers proactively appraising each other's work, in advance of task completion, to facilitate adjustments in ongoing progress. Interim progress lags do not accrue and corrective action is prompt when real-time accountability is effective. But how do people engage in

effective real-time accountability, especially in work settings where it is critical yet difficult to foster?

In organizational scholarship, accountability refers to holding people responsible for their activities; it is closely associated with control and authority, concepts with a long history in organizational theory (Fayol, 1917; Taylor, 1911; Weber, 1978) and with implications for vital organizational phenomena including job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959), employee motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Hackman, Oldham, Janson & Purdy, 1975), organizational learning (Argyris & Schön, 1996), and work effectiveness (Barnard, 1938; Follett, 1925; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Although accountability has long been considered critical for performance (Chandler, McCraw, & Tedlow, 2000) little is known about its interpersonal dynamics. At the organizational level, scholars have focused on formal measures to hold employees accountable post completion of work (Antle & Demski, 1988; Simons, 2005). At the individual level, accountability has been studied in labs (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999; Naquin & Kurtzberg, 2004; Paolini, Crisp, & McIntyre, 2009; Tetlock, 1992), but primarily in non-interactive settings that are unlike real work settings characterized by ongoing interactions. And, even though work in organizations is increasingly achieved by teams (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993), there is lack of context specific research on accountability at the group level. For example, peer monitoring has been studied in manufacturing teams (Barker, 1993), but accountability in cross-disciplinary teams remains under-examined despite a rise of such teams across many industries (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006; Wind & Mahajan, 1997).

I undertake a multi-method field study to investigate the dynamics of accountability in cross-disciplinary teams engaged in knowledge-intensive work. Real-time accountability is relevant in settings where it is costly and unproductive to hold people responsible till after completion of work. And, it is likely to be significantly more important for complex and interdependent work, where people from different disciplines must collaborate effectively. In such work contexts, it is often impractical for one person to monitor all aspects of an evolving task. To maintain work cohesiveness and promptly detect and correct performance lags, team members need to regularly

appraise each other's progress and proactively hold one another accountable. Nevertheless, sufficient proactive accountability is particularly difficult to generate in cross-disciplinary work environments due to (i) lack of common evaluation criteria across disciplines (Lamont, 2009) and (ii) status differences (rooted in formal hierarchy or in the implicit pecking order amongst members' disciplinary backgrounds) that inhibit open exchanges of concerns (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006).

A recent qualitative study of a cross-disciplinary team in the U.S. construction industry suggests that under certain conditions, people may overcome their status and disciplinary differences to engage in authorized peer pressure. Authorized peer pressure refers to a "mutually accepted use of pressure among team members" for fixing progress lags (Rashid & Edmondson, 2012, p. 144).

In this dissertation, I examine interpersonal dynamics of accountability in 55 cross-disciplinary teams and advance the construct of authorized peer pressure. Preliminary results of this study reveal that authorized peer pressure – a type of effective real-time accountability dynamic – facilitates timely adjustments in work activities. It involves team members sharing implicit, mutual permission for proactively holding each other accountable. Under authorized peer pressure, requests to modify intermediate or final work deliverables (and associated processes for achieving them) are perceived to be in service of efficient completion of a quality product. By measuring antecedent, process, and outcome variables, results of this study explicate the mechanisms that enable authorized peer pressure and its impact on team effectiveness. In conclusion, this study presents a new model of accountability as a proactive process rather than a reactive intervention, implemented after final completion of work.

Research Setting

I undertake a multi-method, three-phase field study of 55 cross-disciplinary teams from a global creative services firm in the advertising industry. The firm, with offices in North America and Europe, has annual revenues of about \$100 million and employs over 500 people. Employees come from a range of backgrounds, including architecture, graphic arts, industrial design, strategy, and video production.

Most teams in this firm work on time-bound projects. Teams not constrained by time, such as those

involved in the firm's long term operation, are excluded from this study because their final work performance is difficult to assess. Project duration averages three to six months, although there are also shorter projects that last one to four weeks. Each team has a chief strategist, a creative director, and an account executive, each of whom usually oversees multiple teams. The rest of the team members are from different disciplines, chosen based on the expertise needed and available for the project and the type of client.

The firm is known for its multi-disciplinary approach to teamwork and creativity. It has produced world famous advertising campaigns and won prestigious awards and accounts from globally recognized clients. Although the firm celebrates its cross-disciplinary and multicultural teamwork, preliminary fieldwork indicates a significant variation in effectiveness across teams. In addition, firm executives and managers have expressed interest in learning more about teamwork on their projects. As a result, the research site is a suitable fit for investigating accountability dynamics in cross-disciplinary teams.

Methodology

Due to the early state of research on interpersonal dynamics of accountability, I undertake a three-phase, multi-method field study. I collect qualitative and quantitative data on antecedents, process, and outcome variables through semi-structured interviews, participant observations, two surveys, and archives (such as project strategy documents and meeting minutes).

In the first phase, members of fifteen teams are interviewed to verify if the constructs of accountability, such as authorized peer pressure, can be operationalized in this research setting. Thus far, I have conducted 83 (60-150 minute) interviews, numerous participant observations, informal conversations during site visits, and archival analysis. Using a grounded method approach (Charmaz, 2006), I examine team members' interpersonal dynamics of accountability, including who holds who accountable, for what, when, how, and to what effect. I take detailed notes on how team member(s) held one or more team members responsible for prior commitments (such as quality or timeliness of a deliverable) and for interpersonal and task-related methods for generating them (such as adhering to a communication protocol). I take extensive notes on

account-givers' and account takers' responses in these episodes of interpersonal accountability. I also listen for instances where interim progress lags accrue to performance failures and probe team members to describe what happened.

I analyze qualitative data from phase one to note variations in form and extent of accountability behaviors within and across teams. Combining findings of phase one with literature, I (i) identify tentative types, antecedents, and consequences of accountability dynamics, (ii) generate hypotheses associated with accountability dynamics and team effectiveness, and (iii) refine the contextual relevance of items on surveys administered in phase two.

In phase two, I collect quantitative data and test my hypotheses with two survey instruments. The first survey is administered to all members of the 55 teams and includes items on team structures, shared team beliefs and practices, accountability dynamics (developed from phase one findings and existing literature), and items from the team diagnostic survey (Hackman, 1990; Wageman, Hackman, & Lehman, 2005) to measure team onset conditions and work processes. Upon project completion, a short survey is administered to all team members to measure their perception of team effectiveness. To mitigate common method bias and to gain additional independent perspectives, this survey is also administered to firm executives.

Since the surveys collect data at both individual and team level of analysis, I use hierarchical linear modeling (Goldstein, 1995; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) for testing relationships among antecedent, process,

establish the domain of organizational activity to which authorized peer pressure is more relevant and likely to promote work effectiveness. In conclusion, I propose a model of effective real-time accountability in cross-disciplinary teams.

Preliminary Results

The key findings of this research are several. First, this research presents a typology of accountability dynamics in cross-disciplinary teams (Table 1). Data from phase one reveal teams where members primarily engage in authorized peer pressure. Authorized peer pressure initiates with team members requesting each other to expedite delivery and/or improve quality of an intermediate deliverable. In ensuing conversations (that tend to be collaborative, respectful, and solution focused) team members explore interpersonal and task-related remedies to a given progress lag, while trusting each other's intentions to be project advancement. Team members (independent of expertise and status differences) seem to share implicit mutual permission to proactively hold each other accountable. Peer pressure to adjust ongoing activities is perceived as legitimate and in service of efficient and high-quality completion of work.

Conversely, the data reveal teams where members react to performance failures that tend to arise from a gradual condoning of intermediate progress lags. In the aftermath of a major performance failure, team members blame each other and try to acquit themselves of responsibility. This finger pointing usually stops when a senior executive steps in to settle responsibility and propose remedial action.

Table 1: Types of Accountability Behaviors

	UNAUTHORIZED	AUTHORIZED
REACTIVE	<p><u>Finger pointing</u></p> <p><i>After a failure, involved parties blame others to acquit themselves of responsibility. Each party considers others unauthorized to make such judgments.</i></p>	<p><u>Settling accounts</u></p> <p><i>Post incident, people go through their records and try to establish (often with the help of an arbitrator) who is responsible for what and how to proceed.</i></p>
PROACTIVE	<p><u>Coercive performance pressure</u></p> <p><i>Without implicit mutual permission to hold each other accountable, pressure to modify ongoing progress is perceived as coercive and often disregarded.</i></p>	<p><u>Authorized peer pressure</u></p> <p><i>People share implicit mutual permission to hold each other accountable. Peer pressure to modify ongoing progress is perceived as legitimate.</i></p>

Afterwards, afraid of running into another crisis, team members try (for some time) to proactively push each other to maintain progress. However, when this peer pressure is perceived as coercive or intrusive, it is mostly disregarded by the party being proactively held accountable and team members steadily relapse into a reactionary form of accountability.

Second, this research investigates mechanisms that foster authorized peer pressure. Phase one data reveal that people are more likely to engage in and respond to authorized peer pressure when they have (i) clarity on what to hold each other accountable for and what to be held accountable on, (ii) a rationale for why it is worth their time and effort to hold someone accountable or to be receptive when they are being held accountable, and (iii) a strong team-wide communication repertoire that fosters open exchanges of concerns about ongoing work activities and promotes constructive dialogue that helps remedy progress lags.

The qualitative data suggest that shared expectations about interim milestones, performance standards, and means and methods for achieving project goals provide people with clarity on what to hold others accountable for and what to be held accountable on. Shared expectations also help team members expediently detect progress lags and underperformance. Although subject to revisions based on new information, shared expectations seem to provide people with a common ground and reference point during acts of authorized peer pressure. Further, shared belief in collective responsibility, mutual concern for project outcome, and trust seem to provide people with a rationale as to why it is worth their time and effort to engage in authorized peer pressure.

Qualitative data also suggest that in moments that call for authorized peer pressure, team members ought to be equipped with a strong communication repertoire – a set of conversational and listening skills necessary for honest, constructive and respectful dialogue. A strong communication repertoire provides people the means with which to successfully engage in authorized peer pressure. Inadequate listening, poor choice of words, non-actionable suggestions, or a tone that is perceived as disrespectful are characteristic of a weak communication repertoire. When team members with a weak communication repertoire attempted to hold others accountable or were held accountable they seemed

to talk past each other and struggled to exert authorized peer pressure.

Finally, this study explores the link between authorized peer pressure and team effectiveness. Phase one data suggest that authorized peer pressure improves team effectiveness because through it (i) team members regularly appraise progress, (ii) adjust performance by promptly catching mistakes and remedying interim progress lags, and (iii) preempt ultimate performance failures. In phase two and three of this study, I test and advance these findings.

Implications

This research could make a useful, original contribution to both theory and practice. At present, organizational scholarship under-examines interpersonal dynamics of accountability despite a rise of cross-disciplinary, knowledge-intensive work where effective real-time accountability is important yet difficult to foster. Filling this gap in our scholarship can shed critical insights on some of the causes behind work effectiveness and failures in such settings. Further, by exploring the mechanisms that foster authorized peer pressure and by explicating its impact on team effectiveness, this study can contribute to organizational theory on accountability and teamwork in real organizations.

Having shared preliminary research findings with practitioners from the fields of professional services, disaster response, crisis management, health care, new product development, design and construction, the topic of this study seems to deeply resonate with people working in a variety of settings. Practitioners often comment that without effective real-time accountability, interim progress lags build up to costly and often unfixable failures. Hence, there is a managerial imperative for this study and its findings may generalize to multiple cross-disciplinary contexts.

References

- Antle, R., & Demski, J. (1988). The controllability principle in responsibility accounting. *The Accounting Review* 63: 700-718.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:408-437.

- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Chandler, A. Jr., McCraw, T., & Tedlow, R. (2000). *Management past and present: A casebook on the history of American business*. Cincinnati: South-Western.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Fayol, H. (1917). *Administration industrielle et générale; prévoyance, organisation, commandement, coordination, contrôle* (in French). Paris: H. Dunod et E. Pinat
- Follett, M. P. (1925/1995). Constructive conflict. In Graham, P. (Ed.). *Mary Parker Follett—prophet of management: A celebration of writings from the 1920s*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goldstein, H. (1995). *Kendall's library of statistics* (Vol. 3, Multilevel statistical models). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hackman, J. R. (Ed.) (1990). *Groups that work (and those that don't)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G., Janson, R., & Purdy, K. (1975). A new strategy for job enrichment. *California Management Review*, 17(4), 57-71.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1993/1959). *The Motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers (Original publication: 1959, John Wiley & Sons).
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lerner, J., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 255-275.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., & Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation analysis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 593-614.
- Naquin, C. E., & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2004). Human reactions to technological failure: How accidents rooted in technology vs human error influence judgments of organizational accountability. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 93: 129-141.
- Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. Special issue on healthcare: The problems are organizational not clinical. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27(7): 941-966.
- Paolini, S., Crisp, R. J., & McIntyre, K. (2009). Accountability moderates member-to-group generalization: Testing a dual process model of stereotype change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 676-685.
- Rashid, F., & Edmondson, A. C. (2012). Risky trust: How multi-entity teams build trust despite high risk. In Kramer, R., & Pittinsky, T. (Eds.). *Restoring trust in organizations and leaders*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Sage Publications.
- Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7(4), 422-445.
- Simons, R. (2005). *Levers of organization design: How managers use accountability systems for greater performance and commitment*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York.

- Tetlock, P. E. (1992). The impact of accountability on judgment and choice: Toward a social contingency model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25: 331-376.
- Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., & Lehman, E. V. (2005). Team diagnostic survey: Development of an instrument. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 41, 373-398.
- Weber, M. (1978). In Ross, G., & Wittich, C. (Eds.). *Economy and society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wind, J., & Mahajan, V. (1997). Issues and opportunities in new product development: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34: 1-12.

**KNOWN UNKNOWN OF
MAINSTREAM ODC: NEED TO MOVE
BEYOND CURRENT “BORDERS”**

Raymond Saner
Lichia Yiu

The Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development
Geneva, Switzerland

“Learning is a lifelong process of keeping abreast of change. And the most pressing task is to teach people how to learn”

—Peter Drucker

One who knows and knows that he knows . . .
His horse of wisdom will reach the skies.

One who knows, but doesn't know that he knows . . . He is fast asleep, so you should wake him up!

One who doesn't know, but knows that he doesn't know . . . His limping mule will eventually get him home.

One who doesn't know and doesn't know that he doesn't know . . . He will be eternally lost in his hopeless oblivion!

—Persian Saying

**Call for Enlarging the Scope of ODC:
Responding to Extraordinary Times With New
Knowledge**

We are living in extraordinary times. We are witnessing multiple instabilities and discontinuous social changes in different parts of the world rang-

ing from societal and economic upheavals in the Middle East (the Arab Spring) to continuous instabilities in war-torn countries such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Congo, and Somalia, and deepening social injustice and exclusion caused by radical austerity measures in many OECD countries.

Besides regional wars, civil wars, violence, and social instability, other problems needing urgent attention and intervention are entrenched poverty, inadequate health provisions for many of the impoverished families in the middle income countries, and lack of social and economic development in many parts of the developing world. Many people, especially the multitudes who live at the bottom of the pyramid, need urgent support to get out of their poverty trap. Providing support and assistance in such circumstances requires not only financial resources but also, ever more urgently, the know-how of ODC and its extended application to larger complex systems (inter alias, Origination *and* social development—in short, OSD)!

Without active engagement and skillful intervention of the OSD experts, many reform projects quickly falter due to insufficient attention being given to the process and structural realities of large system dynamics. This expertise gap has plagued the development field that dedicated itself to solve the larger societal and developmental issues around the world. The same gap also rendered many public administrative reforms of the OECD country short-lived. The former gap is one of the leading causes why so few of the developing countries were able to reach the state of industrialization over the last 50 years. Only a handful of countries moved up the development ladder. In most cases, the failure to improve was due to the inability of implementing a reform agenda. Domain expert such as economists and political scientists know what needs to be done, but are often not equipped with behavioural science knowledge and fall short of designing change processes that can achieve a sustainable state of economic and social development.

It is high time to get the traditional ODC professionals looking beyond their habitual boardroom. It is high time that traditional ODC experts look beyond the narrow lenses of private sector enterprise profitability and add to their task sheet the goal of contributing to the larger well-being of their communities at large without which all fancy organizational consulting remains unsustainable.

This Call for Responsiveness to the Larger System Performance Is Not New!

Taking Ibn Yamin's sayings as four possible options for ODC's future development, the authors suggest to further dwell on the second saying: "One who knows, but doesn't know that he knows... He is fast asleep, so you should wake him up!" It suggests that ODC scholars and practitioners know more than what they focus on in their daily practice and mainstream teaching, and that it is time to wake up the guild of ODC practitioners to face the current realities in our societies. It is time to get out of the stupor of being fixated on theories of ODC which go back to its founders in the 1950s, while at the same time "forgetting" that the revered founders, including Kurt Lewin, focused their work on larger social issues. They did so despite difficult times like the McCarthy era and its "hunt for all things suspect of being "social" (translated into "socialist"). In other words, let the ODC field return to its roots of OSD, short for Organisation & Social Development. The "C" for change is deleted as we consider adding "change" superfluous. No development—whether individual, social, institutional or national—is possible without change.

The above statements have been made by the authors before. The first author, for instance, wrote an article for the ODC newsletter provocatively titled "ODC Is Dead, Long Live OSD: Irreverent Thoughts of a Former ODC Executive Board Member" (Saner, 2004). Other ODC scholars have asked the question as to the need to broaden the scope of ODC and to make ODC more internationally relevant (see Richard W. Woodman, *ODC Newsletter*, winter 2006). Other members of the ODC Division have tirelessly worked to bring to the division a larger social perspective. Such was done over several AOM annual meetings by the late Rupert Chisholm or by Vijay Padaki, whose work focuses on social and institutional development in India (Padaki & Vaz, 2003).

Advocating a larger scope and role for ODC, the authors joined forces with other internationally-minded ODC colleagues and organized a symposium at the 26th International Congress of Applied Psychology in Athens, which focused on capacity building for social change (Saner, 2007). The symposium was put together by an international network of OD scholar-practitioners. Four members of the ODC Division participated in the event in addi-

tion to Vijay Padaki. Gary N. Mclean, Raymond Saner, and Lichia Yiu presented papers and Kenneth Murrell acted as discussant.

Appealing to the fundamental value of OD to join the fight against poverty and hunger

The great majority of low-income countries (48 countries) has a GNI per capita less than USD 992.-, and expected to reach 950 million people in 2015 (Waddell, 2003). Economic activities of these countries are mostly informal, which means that 60-70% of the population are captives of precarious living conditions with no real gainful employment, other than trying one's luck as street vendor or participating in semi-legitimate activities such as recycling of stolen goods and contraband. Often, when such transient jobs are harder to come by and environmental catastrophes reoccur (inundations, droughts), the affected population embarks on clandestine migration to other countries. A large influx of illegal migrants tends to exacerbate socioeconomic conditions in the host countries, leading to tensions and sometimes to outbreaks of violence.

Involvement of ODC experts in international development work is very much needed. The ODC-OSD experts' unique competence is based on a systemic perspective of development and change and brings design know-how needed for successful institutional and societal transformation. Equally relevant is what to do with increasingly unemployed and new poor in OECD countries. How could they be helped to remain resilient and persistent in their attempts to overcome the difficulties of today's austerity measures?

Most ODC experts do keep abreast of the challenges in many parts of the world. But only few in the ODC field venture out of their North America/Western Europe comfort zone and join others who are trying their best to improve conditions in countries afflicted by war, poverty, or both combined.

A growing number of business school and management scholars no longer consider themselves disconnected from the larger societal issues. The themes of the recent AoM annual conferences reflect this shift towards the larger social context and have increasingly become inclusive of international and larger social issues. Special interest groups tackling Bottom-of-the-Pyramid people, corporate social responsibility, and social entrepreneurship have sprang up within the AoM community. It

is time that more of our ODC colleagues take leadership and contribute to the larger social development issues at home and abroad.

Mainstreaming ODC to OSD

To make it easier for ODC scholars and younger colleagues interested in international social development work, the authors provide an overview of some fields and international organizations where ODC-OSD know-how could be provided for mutual benefits. In order to concretize this short introduction to international ODC-OSD work, case examples and publications are added based on the authors' own OSD work with the intention of making the excursion to the "known unknown" as concrete as possible.

Large-scale social discontinuities, which are typical in international development work but are also increasingly present in developed countries, show ODC practitioners and scholars a formidable challenge. If called in to advise or guide social interventions to address these large-scale change processes, what theory and methods should the ODS/ODC expert draw on to provide competent support to countries experiencing large-scale instability? Most of the existing ODC literature focuses on interventions for private-sector, profit-oriented enterprises in industrialized and highly-developed North American and Western European countries.

How can applied psychologists and behavioral scientists contribute to this monumental task? On one hand, ODC theories and methods appear well equipped to address the needs of large scale social intervention. Indeed, many development programs worldwide have already incorporated ODC principles and practices into their intervention strategies. On the other hand, social development and social discontinuities in low-income countries are characterized by multi-stakeholder (both overt and hidden) actors whose views of the world often differ from Western rationale and linear logic. For instance, most of the premises of classic macro-economic theory—such as the assumption that people pursue profit maximization and act rationally, and that market information is transparent and available—are not applicable. Some of these assumptions hold but other factors of human decision making enter into play that are not easily understood by Western experts: deference to elderly leaders, attribution of cause-effect to visible and invisible forces, and pref-

erences based on tribal membership, to name a few. The result of these often not easily identifiable differences is that linear thinking and planning such as the classic "Freeze-unfreeze/current-future state" conceptualization of ODC intervention need to be replaced by simultaneous linear and non-linear reality with more circular change processes involving client systems and often multiple shadow social systems which influence the ODC process considerably.

Working as an ODC-OSD expert within non-Western countries and also for International Organisation requires understanding of multi-stakeholder actor networks and their alliance building processes. A very good entry point into such complex ODC change processes is Steve Waddell's description of Global Action Networks (GANs) such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the Ethical Trade Initiative (ETI), Transparency International (TI), and other such GANs that operate internationally in developed and developing countries (Waddell, 2003). Similarly, OSD experts working in the international development field might benefit from studying the interactions between state, and non-state actors (NGOs, MNCs) and international organisations (Saner & Michaelun, 2009). Interactions between these different actors in the field of humanitarian action have also been described as "new diplomacies" and a new group of organizational and industrial psychologists who founded "Humanitarian Work Psychology."

Working in Complex Social System as an OSD Expert

Richard Beckhard reiterated during the 1999 AoM meeting in Chicago, which he attended a few months before his death, that ODC is an interdisciplinary approach combining psychology with sociology and that sociology has been very much absent in contemporary ODC literature and practice. This reminder is very relevant for anybody working in conflict zones and with post-war societies. In such environments, rebuilding the social fabric is of the essence, not changing it. Inspirations for OSD work in such situations are Durkheim's research on social anomie, Coleman and Bourdieu's research on social capital, and Moreno's pioneering work on sociometry, social atom, and sociodrama (Saner & Yiu, 2012).

Multi-stakeholder complex systems exist even within international organizations that appear "traditional"

or “structured.” The case in point here is the United Nations itself and its member agencies. ODC practitioners working within the UN system encounter difficulties because of ill-defined organisational structures, multiple political interferences (external and internal), cross-cultural value differences of UN staff, and different management practices of UN agency leadership that are best described as “porous boundaries.” The authors describe two case studies of working within UN agencies where in both cases the authors attempted to apply traditional ODC methods but had to learn and cope with “porous boundaries” effects which result from power politics frequently used in UN agencies but also by large member countries requiring the ODC experts to adjust their consulting approach to match these organisational challenges (Saner & Yiu, 2009).

Working at the national level and applying ODC-OSD theory and methods is an even greater challenge since linear processes are not possible due to the multitude of stakeholders involved (both overt and covert). Hence, diagnosis needs more time and experts and clients need to remain open to an emerging approach. At the request of the Republic of Slovenia, the authors designed a central administrative reform project to assist the newly independent country in reforming its central government by modernising and strengthening its administration. An “action technology” based ODC strategy was adopted for this project. Emphases were given to the speed of change and institutional learning. By adopting an action-based learning and change strategy, the authors were able to conduct know-how transfer activities and pilot reform projects in tandem with their Slovene partners over a period of fifteen months. The project resulted in the creation of a National Administrative Academy and an Organisation & Management unit within the Ministry of the Interior (Centre for Socio-Economic Development, 2009).

Conclusion

In the September 2012 issue of JAB, Gavin Schwarz reviewed articles published in eight journals between 1947 and 2008 (n= 473) and came to the conclusion that “publication of more on ‘change’ has not equated with more developed knowledge” (Schwarz, 2012). He went on to state,

As a community, change researchers are overwhelmingly focused on the most conservative

type of progress, resulting in research that replicates rather than extends or develops, which ranks fairly low on knowledge development scale (342).

The same conservatism can be observed in the application of OD theory and approaches. Without grounded practices on issues presented in the higher aggregate levels of a system, it is logical that theory development has not progressed much. Instead, more and more replication study is benchmarked on established worldview and sphere of application. The implication of the lack of theory development is profound for our field. More and more practitioners of ODC emerge from other fields like strategy and performance consulting and see change not as a dynamic process but as a top-down execution of off-the-shelf solutions borrowed from classic ODC practice.

The lack of knowledge advancement also affected the depth and relevance of ODC teaching programmes, which is increasingly seen as “exotic” and marginalised and continues to be perceived as U.S. tools for single-actor enterprises despite the fact that globalisation has deepened the interdependency between different societal actors such as government, business and civil societies, and between nations. More and larger system challenges are affecting all of us, no matter where we are. They call for large-system change architecture and development mechanisms for collective actions at global scale. As a field of specialised knowledge owners, we cannot afford to stick to the old boundary conditions of conventional ODC. Instead, we need to turn the known unknown into known known and integrate ODC into OSD (Porrás & Silvers, 1991).

References

- Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development (2009). *Administrative reform*. Retrieved from <http://www.csend.org/project-samples/slovenia/item/81-administrative-reform>
- Padaki, V., & Vaz, M. (2003). *Institutional development in social interventions: Towards inter-organizational effectiveness*. New Delhi & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saner, R. (2004). ODC is dead, long live OSD; Irreverent thoughts of a former ODC executive board member. *ODC Division Newsletter*, summer 2004.

Saner, R. (2007), Capacity building for social change. *ODC Division Newsletter*, winter 2007.

Saner, R., & Michaelun, V. (Eds.) (2009) *State actor versus non-state actor negotiations*. The Hague, NL: Republic of Letters.

Saner, R., & Yiu, L. (2009). A Sisyphean task: Managing porous boundaries during OD interventions in UN agencies. In Melnick, J., & Nevis, E. C. (Eds.). *Social healing interventions by gestalt practitioners worldwide* (pp. 151-180). Xlibris Corp. Retrieved from <http://www.csend.org/publications/organisation-al-studies>

Saner, R., & Yiu, L. (2012) Reconstructing the social fabric of communities after war trauma (workshop summary with literature references pertinent to OSD work). Retrieved from http://www.csend.org/images/articles/files/20120818-20120816rev_1st_Introductory_Workshop_Minutes.pdf

Schwarz, G. M. (2012). Shaking fruits out of the tree: Temporal effects and life cycle in organisational change research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 48(3):342-379.

Porras, J. L., & Silvers, R. C. (1991). Organization development and transformation. *Annual Rev. Psychology*, 42:51-78.

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. *Criteria for identification and graduation of LDCs*. Retrieved from <http://www.unohrrls.org/en/ldc/164/>

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. *Facts about least developed countries*. Retrieved from <http://www.unohrrls.org/UserFiles/File/Publications/Factsheet.pdf>

Waddell, S. (2003). Global action networks: Building global public policy systems of accountability. *AccountAbility Quarterly* 20, May 2003, pp. 19-26.

Yamin, I. Quoted from Persian literature, thirteenth-century, *یدمویرف نیمی نبا*. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/There_are_known_knowns

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the *ODC Newsletter* may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. Please address all correspondence to:

R. Wayne Boss
 Academy of Management ODC Newsletter
 Leeds School of Business
 Campus Box 419
 University of Colorado at Boulder
 Boulder, Colorado 80309
 (303)492-8488
 Email: 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 all recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague. (Indicate full citation.)
