



ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT ODC NEWSLETTER

Organization Development and Change Division

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Summer 2015

Published by the ODC Division

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE 2015 PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Julie Wolfram Cox
Monash University
Scholarly Program Chair
John Amis
University of Edinburgh
PDW Chair

This year's Distinguished Speaker is Professor Linda Putnam from UC Santa Barbara, who will address *Using a Discourse Lens to Explore Tensions and Contradictions in Organizational Theory and Change* (Monday, August 10, 3–4:30 p.m., Convention Centre East Ballroom C). Please mark your calendars for this important event.

In this presentation, Professor Linda Putnam will share her latest thinking on the role that discourse plays in theorizing, analyzing, and managing tensions in organizational life. Drawing on the growing literature on contradictions and paradoxes, she will set forth a discourse-based lens for research and reflective practice, one that includes analyses of families and hierarchies of tensions, choices and actions linked to tension management, and patterns that shape paradoxical outcomes. Special attention will be given to evolving models of organization that make process theories salient, classic dualisms problematic, and interventions complex. This talk also explores how these evolving models have implications for understanding and practising change as well as developing a new form of thinking about organizational life.

This plenary meeting will be followed by two other important events: the ODC Business Meeting (East Ballroom B, Monday, 4:30–6:30 p.m.) and our Members' Reception (Monday, 6:30–8:30 p.m., East Ballroom B).

Once again we have an outstanding PDW program that features a collection of cutting edge sessions from some outstanding thinkers. A key feature of our PDW program is the ODC Doctoral Consortium,

(see Cox and Amis, page 2)

TENSIONS AS A SOURCE OF CREATIVITY IN CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT—SOME REFLECTIONS ON OUR DIVISION

Sonja A. Sackmann
ODC Division Chair
University Bw Munich

In my role as an outgoing chair of the Organization Development and Change (ODC) Division, I have the privilege to reflect on the division—take stock, report on our actions that we have initiated and reflect on its current state, on the challenges that the division has been and will be facing as well as on some future directions. My five years on the Executive Board have fast filled with many dear

(see Sackmann, page 7)

Table of Contents

Julie Wolfram Cox & John Amis, Organization Development and Change 2015 Program Highlights	1
Sonja A. Sackman, Tensions as a Source of Creativity in Change and Development: Some Reflections on our Division	1
ODC Division Board Members 2014-2015	2
Danielle A. Tucker & Jane Hendy, An Examination of the Processes by which Social Accounts Influence Change, 2015 ODC Division Best Paper	13
Canterino Filomena, Rami Shani & David Coghlan, Collaborative Management Research as a Modality of OD Action Research: Learning from a Merger-based Study, 2015 ODC Division Best Action Research Paper Award	14
Hans Vermaak & Leon De Caluwe, Creating a Colorful Model of Change: A Case Study of Theory Development, 2015 ODC Division Rupert F. Chisholm Best Theory-to-Practice Paper Award	17
Marlene Walk, Because I Say So: The Impact of Leaders' Attitudes toward Organizational Change, 2015 ODC Division Best Paper Based on a Dissertation Award	19
Catherine Cassell & Bill Lee, Understanding Translation Work in the Multi-Organizational Translation of Ideas, 2015 ODC Nomination for the Dexter Award	21
Feedback to the Editor	23

**ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE 2014-2015**

Sonja Sackmann, Division Chair
University Bw Munich, Germany
Email: sonja.sackmann@unibw.de

David Grant, Division Chair Elect
University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
Email: david.grant@sydney.edu.au

Julie Wolfram Cox, Program Chair
Monash University, Victoria, Australia
Email: julie.wolfram.cox@monash.edu

John M. Amis, PDW Chair
University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Email: john.amis@ed.ac.uk

*Danielle Zandee, Representative-at-Large
(5-year term)*
Nyenrode Business Universiteit, Amsterdam,
The Netherlands
Email: d.zandee@nyenrode.nl

Bill Cooke, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
York University Management School, United Kingdom
Email: b.cooke@lancaster.ac.uk

Patrice Rosenthal, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
Fielding Graduate University
Email: prosenthal@fielding.edu

Quy Nguyen Huy, Research Committee Chair
INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France
Email: quy.huy@insead.edu

Kate Elgayeva, Student Representative
Chicago School of Professional Psychology
Email: kelgayeva@thechicagoschool.edu

*Robert Carpino, Executive Scholar-Practitioner
(2-year term)*
Quest Diagnostics
Email: robert.carpino@calstatela.edu

*Katherine (Kate) Heynoski, Executive Scholar-
Practitioner (2-year term)*
Battelle for Kids
Email: kheynoski@battelleforkids.org

Julie Smendzuik-O'Brien, Division Membership Chair
Fielding Graduate University
Email: jsmendzuik@gmail.com

Gavin Schwarz, Secretary/Treasurer
University of New South Wales
Email: g.schwarz@unsw.edu.au

Andre Avramchuk, Director of Communications
California State University
Email: arttooz@aol.com

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor
University of Colorado Boulder
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(from Cox and Amis, page 1)

which this year is convened by incoming ODC Division Chair David Grant and by one of our student representatives, (now Dr.) Kate Elgayeva. Doctoral students will get the opportunity to participate in a number of events including receiving feedback on their dissertation topics from established academics, hearing from journal editors on the 'dos and don'ts' of journal submissions, learning how to interrogate their own and others paper ideas, and getting the opportunity to network with leading scholars in a variety of environments. The Consortium will run on Saturday, August 8, 8:30 a.m.–6:30 p.m. in the Coal Harbour Suite, Pan Pacific Hotel. The consortium also includes a reception during which doctoral students and new ODC members will be able to meet with each other and with ODC Board members in an informal setting. Those who have participated previously have com-

mented on the value to them of this event, in terms of both their PhD studies and career planning.

Other highlights of our PDW program include our ever-popular session, "That Was Great!" *More High Impact Exercises for Teaching or Consulting on Organizational Change*. This workshop presents a hands-on a forum for educators, researchers, and consultants to showcase high impact, hands on, exercises for teaching organizational change in its many contexts. It takes place on Friday, August 7, 11:45 a.m.–1:45 p.m., at the Pan Pacific Hotel in the Cypress Suite.

Over several decades, research on organizational change has proliferated, but the rate of success of implementing strategic change in organizations has not significantly improved. This has led us to ask several questions: Is our academic research on change

(continued on page 3)

(continued from page 2)

useful for practice? What are the key questions for managing major change that future research will need to focus on? What are future avenues for cooperation between academics, consultants, and practitioners to improve the management of major change in organizations? A PDW featuring Michael Jarrett, Quy Huy, Jean Bartunek, and Myeong-Gu Seo addresses these and other questions in a session titled *What Is New in Research and Teaching about Managing Major Organizational Change?* It is scheduled for Saturday, August 8, 10:15 a.m.–12:15 p.m., at the Pan Pacific Hotel in the Crystal Pavilion Ballroom.

Action research offers a unique perspective on organizational systems, precisely because it engages in collaborative inquiry through action on real organizational issues. The contextually-based insights coupled with the collaborative inquiry process allow for the generation of actionable knowledge and simultaneously help organizations to continuously examine existing capabilities and develop new capabilities. Those interested in this topic will want to attend Action Research on Friday, August 7, 9:45–11:45 a.m. at the Pan Pacific Hotel in Gazebo 1 and Contemporary Action Research on Saturday, August 7, 3:00–6:00 p.m., at the Pan Pacific Vancouver in Crystal Pavilion Ballroom C.

Our scholarly program commences on Sunday, August 9, when we host discussion paper sessions at the Convention Centre and when you may also like to attend the MSR Best Symposium Proposal Winner and MSR/AOM Showcase session, *Leading with Societal Mindfulness: How the Leader's Awareness Impacts Governance* (2:45–4:15 p.m., Convention Centre Room 224). This session is strongly supported by ODC, SIM, and MED and will be followed by the Practice Theme Committee Gala Celebration and Awards—an interactive café with light refreshments (4:30–7 p.m., Convention Centre Room 118).

Our scholarly program includes three outstanding Showcase Symposia:

- *Reactions to Organizational Change and the Role of Social Context* (Monday, 9:45–11:15 a.m., Pan Pacific, Crystal Pavilion Ballroom A)

Chairs: Shani Tuttnauer; Hebrew U. of Jerusalem, and Shaul Oreg; Hebrew U. of Jerusalem

Discussant: Richard W. Woodman; Texas A&M U.

For several decades, the vast majority of studies of organizational change has undertaken a macro perspective and has typically overlooked recipients' perspective of the change. Only over the past decade, has there been a substantial increase in the systematic investigation of change recipients' reactions to change (see Oreg, Michel, & By, 2013 and Rafferty, Jimmieson, & Armenakis, 2013 for recent reviews). Nevertheless, there remain numerous unanswered questions concerning the nature of these reactions and their antecedents. In particular, only a restricted set of reactions has been considered, maintaining a somewhat simplistic and dichotomous view of reactions to change as involving either support or resistance. In addition, whereas a large variety of reaction antecedents have been considered, the social processes that shape these attitudes have received only little attention. Social influence may be central in shaping both the process through which change is interpreted and the content of the interpretation and as such deserves greater research attention. In this symposium we bring together studies from a variety of perspectives, all of which promote our understanding of the complexity involved in employees' reactions to organizational change. Specifically, this symposium highlights the role of employees' social system in shaping their response to change. Furthermore, it includes research on a range of understudied reactions such as ambivalence, gratitude and proactive behavior. The symposium includes five papers: (1) An empirical study of the impact individuals' social network has on their resistance to change social environment; (2) A longitudinal empirical study of the relationship between charismatic leadership, trust in colleagues and employees' reactions to change; (3) An empirical study of ambivalent reactions to change, and their prediction through employees' values and characteristics of the change (4) A conceptual model introducing the concept of gratitude during organizational change; and (5) An integrative theoretical framework using cognitive appraisals of change to link leadership, management, and Human Resource Management to employees' subsequent reactions to change.

With the help of a renowned organizational scholar as discussant, we expect to integrate these works in a stimulating discussion.

- *ODC: A Roadmap for Future Evolution* (Monday, 11:30 a.m.–1 p.m., Pan Pacific Crystal "Pavilion Ballroom A)

Panelists: Susan A. Mohrman; U. of Southern California; William A Pasmore; Columbia U.; Richard W. Woodman; Texas A&M U.

Moderators: Deborah Colwill; Trinity International U.; Dawn Newman; The Boeing Company.

“The greatest danger in times of turbulence is not the turbulence; it is to act with yesterday’s logic.” —Peter Drucker

In our rapidly changing world what was thought of as breakthrough yesterday may become mediocre or obsolete tomorrow. Is the field of Organization Development and Change keeping pace with or stepping up to the role it can play in today’s or tomorrow’s world? Do we rely too heavily on yesterday’s logic? The proposed symposium panel will discuss what is important for Organization Development and Change professionals to know now and in the future. We will build on research and experiences to share how the field is changing and propose challenging questions for dialogue. Therefore, the purpose of this panel symposium is to engage three well-published panelists in a moderated, interactive discussion to share success stories and envision important future challenges and opportunities for OD and Change scholars and practitioners to shape the future. Panelists: We invited experts in the fields of Organization Development and Change, Organization Design, and Management Consulting. As a whole, the members of the panel have numerous publications and extensive years of experience as researchers, scholars and practitioners. Yet they are all concerned that the field of Organization Development and Change may not be keeping pace with or stepping up to the role it can play in today’s and tomorrow’s world. This 90-minute panel symposium includes the latest research from scholarly practitioners and practical scholars and provides a venue for group interaction.

- *Emerging Debates in Organizational Change* (Tuesday, 11:30 a.m.–1:00 p.m., Pan Pacific Crystal Pavilion Ballroom A)

Organizers: Karen Jansen, Australian National U.; Jill Waymire Paine, IE Business School.

Participants: Inger G. Stensaker, Norwegian School of Economics; Jeffrey D Ford, The Ohio State U.; Myeong-Gu Seo, U. of Maryland; Mel Fugate, Southern Methodist U.

Discussants: Richard W. Woodman, Texas A&M U.; William A Pasmore, Columbia U.

Distinguished Speaker: Warner Burke, Columbia U.

In this symposium, we debate three key tensions within current and emerging organizational change scholarship and practice: engagement, energy, and emotion. The first debate considers the dialectic between readiness and resistance to deepen our understanding of organizational and individual engagement in change. The second debate focuses on how the drive for more change momentum and energy may be countered by change fatigue, burnout and disengagement. The third debate explores how helpful and harmful emotions affect the success of organizational change initiatives and the experience of those involved. Each of these debates is couched in a fourth duality: maintaining a balance between rigor and relevance. The ultimate goal of the symposium is to foster new research ideas for research and practice in organizational change.

It has been a privilege to work on this year’s program and a delight to see the program listed online this May. This year’s submissions were very healthy indeed. We received 30 Professional Development Workshop (PDW) submissions, up from 24 in 2014 and well up from the previous three years, and were able to accept 17, which was similar to the number of PDW acceptances in recent years. Our paper submissions remained constant and once again we were able to accept 60 of the 120 submissions. We received 39 symposia, well up from 33 in 2014 and 22 in 2013, and were able to sponsor or co-sponsor 32 of these, a great result for our division.

This year 277 reviewers signed up to assess our submissions, which was slightly down from last year but still meant that we were able to achieve an aver-

age number of reviewers per submission of 3.32. While the majority of reviewers still came from the US (152), a big change this year was in the increased proportion of international reviewers (up 11.6 percent from 2014). Overall, 38 countries were represented and the countries with the largest numbers of reviewers who signed up included Canada (17), UK (16), Australia (11) and Germany (10).

We are extremely grateful to all of our reviewers, including several who were able to take on emergency assignments and Board members who assisted with the selection of our best paper winners. We will recognise our outstanding reviewers along with those winners at this year's Business Meeting (Monday, as above). Sincere congratulations to all winners of ODC awards for 2015:

Best Paper

Danielle A. Tucker (U. of Essex) and Jane Hendy (U. of Surrey): An Examination of the Processes by which Social Accounts Influence Change.

Best Action Research Paper

Filomena Canterino (Politecnico di Milano), A.B. Rami Shani (California Polytechnic State U.) and David Coghlan (Trinity College Dublin): Action Research: Learning from a Merger-Based Study.

Rupert F. Chisholm Best Theory-to-Practice Paper

Hans Vermaak (Sioo & Twynstra) & Leon De Caluwe (Vrije U. Amsterdam): Creating a Colorful Model of Change: A Case Study of Theory Development.

Best Paper Based on a Dissertation

Marlene Walk (U. of Pennsylvania): "Because I say so": The Impact of Leaders' Attitudes toward Organizational Change.

Outstanding Reviewer Awards

Melanie De Ruiter, Nyenrode Business U.

Paula Ungureanu, U. of Modena.

We would also like to give our most sincere thanks to everyone who volunteered and reviewed for ODC in 2015:

Jeanna Abbott, U. of Houston; Shontarius Aikens, North Dakota State U.; Ayoola Alabi, Capella U.; Dale Alexander, Capella U.; Viktória Ali Taha, U. of Presov; Starr Allaby, Douglas College; Tatiana Andreeva, St. Petersburg U. GSOM; Johanna Anzengruber, Steinbeis - Hochschule Berlin; Lee

Ann Avery, Fielding Graduate U.; Lezlie Banks, Affiliation not available; Elise Barho, Benedictine U.; Jean Bartunek, Boston College; Safal Batra, Indian Institute of Management Kashipur; Danielle Beu Ammeter, U. of Mississippi; Michael Beyerlein, Texas A&M U.; Melvin Blumberg, Pennsylvania State U., Harrisburg; Alyncia Bowen, Franklin U.; David Bright, Wright State U.; Bart Brock, The Coleman Company, Inc.; Jade Brooks, Loughborough U.; Laura Bryant, Pensacola State College; Anthony Buono, Bentley U.; Jodine Burchell, Columbia Southern U.; Arne Carlsen, BI Norwegian Business School; Vincent Cassar, Birkbeck College, U. of London; Catherine Cassell, Leeds U. Business School; Maurice Cayer, U. of New Haven; Kenneth Chukwuba, Walden U.; David Coghlan, Trinity College Dublin; Dorianne Cotter-Lockard, Fielding Graduate U.; Dane D'Alessandro, Benedictine U.; Douglas Davies, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool U.; Leon De Caluwe, Vrije U. Amsterdam; Melanie De Ruiter, Nyenrode Business U.; Molly Delaney, Hay Group; Anthony DiBella, National Defense U.; Boram Do, Boston College; William Doucette, Benedictine U.; Sumeet Duggal, McGill U.; Daniel Dusch, Walden U.; Debora Elam, Colorado Technical U.; Kate Elgayeva, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Karen Elliott, Durham U.; Ann Feyerherm, Pepperdine U.; Hilde Fjellvaer, Trondheim Business School; Wendy Fraser, St. Martin's U.; Victor Friedman, Max Stern Jezreel Valley College; Ronald Fry, Case Western Reserve U.; Qingfen Fu, Tsinghua U.; Connie Fuller, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Manisha Garg, Affiliation not available; Christopher Garrabrant, North Central College; Stephanie Goble, Regent U.; Theresa Goecke, U. of Constance; Thomas Goh, Hay Group; Thomas Golden, Cornell U.; Kathryn Goldman Schuyler, Alliant International U.; Marie Gould Harper, American Public U.; Colleen Grady, Affiliation not available; Anne Graham, Waterford Institute of Technology; David Grant, U. of New South Wales; Ginger Grant, Sheridan Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning; Eric Green, Ivy Tech Community College; David Grogan, Case Western Reserve U.; Huong Ha, UON Singapore/ U. of Newcastle, Australia; Aida Hajro, Brunel U.; Michael Halinski, Carleton U.; Bruce Hanson, Concordia U. Irvine; Stanley Harris, Auburn U.; Cheryl Harrison, Manhattan College; Silja Hartmann, LMU Munich; Dale Hartz, Walsh U.; Jeffrey Haynie, Nicholls State U.; Thomas Head,

Roosevelt U.; Joseph Heinzman, South U.; Katherine Heynoski, Battelle for Kids; Malcolm Higgs, Southampton U.; Shilo Hills, U. of Alberta; Henry Hornstein, Algoma U.; Keith Hunter, U. of San Francisco; Joanne Ivory, Benedictine U.; Muayyad Jabri, U. of New England; David Jamieson, U. of St. Thomas; Karen Jansen, Australian National U.; Bilal Jathol, Grenoble Ecole de Management; Cheryl Jordan, Color Outside the Lines, LLC; Kate Joyner, Brisbane Graduate School of Business; Olivia Jung, Harvard U.; Bianca Keers, NLDA; Lori Kendall, Case Western Reserve U.; Gary Kesling, The U. of Texas Health Science Center—Houston; Maja Klindzic, U. of Zagreb; Linda Klonsky, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Irina Koprax, Johannes Kepler U.; Daniel Kowalski, Kowalski Consulting and Management LLC; Lori Kuehn, Lawrence Technological U.; Joana Kuntz, U. of Canterbury; Elizabeth Kurucz, U. of Guelph; Sari Laari-Salmela, U. of Oulu; Xiaodong Lai, Jiangxi U. of Finance and Economics; Kaouthar Lajili, U. of Ottawa; Mark Law, U. of Nebraska; Jee Young Lee, Seoul National U.; Riccardo Leoncini, U. of Bologna; Zonghui Li, Mississippi State U.; Christopher Linski, Colorado Technical U.; Robert Lion, Idaho State U.; Reut Livne-Tarandach, U. of Oregon; Kenneth Long, Colorado Technical U.; Ronald Lynch, James Cook U.; John MacCatherine, DeVry U.; Gary Mangiofico, Pepperdine U.; Josefina Martinez-Amador, Case Western Reserve U.; Barbara Mather, Fielding Graduate U.; Franz Maybuechen, U. of Goettingen; Tracy Maylett, DecisionWise; Paul McGrath, U. College Dublin; Nicolas Megow, U. of Paderborn; Anju Mehta, Northern Iowa U.; Anne Messervy, AUT U.; Pawe³ Mielcarek, Poznan U. of Economics; Emma Miller, U. of Phoenix; Cheryl Mitchell, Fielding Graduate U.; Michael Mlynarczyk, Colorado Christian U.; Mario Montijo Garcia, U. Autónoma de Sinaloa; John-Paul Morgante, Credit Union of Texas; Kurt Motamedi, Pepperdine U.; David Moura, Florida Atlantic U.; Kanimozhi Narayanan, U. of Edinburgh Business School; Rachel Nayani, Norwich Business School; Camilla Nellemann, Rikkyo U.; Mai-Anh Ngo, U. of San Diego; Ken Nishikawa, Konan U.; Herb Nold, Polk State College; Frank Novakowski, Davenport U.; Robert O'Neal, Chicago School of Professional Psychology; Tadao Onaka, Nagoya U. of Commerce and Business; Clifford Oswick, City U. London; Jill Paine, IE Business School; Cyrus

Parks, U. of Houston; Robin Parry, Capella U.; Vincent Parry, DeVry U.; Lori Peterson, Augsburg College; Suzanne Piotrowski, Case Western Reserve U.; Michael Provitera, Barry U.; Bernadette Racicot, U. of Delaware; Gary Rees, Portsmouth Business School; Rebecca Reese, Fielding Graduate U.; Michelle Region-Sebest, St Edward's U.; Taco Reus, Erasmus sU. Rotterdam; Cynthia Roberts, Purdue U., North Central; Gary Robinson, Capella U.; Caroline Rook, Anglia Ruskin U.; Patrice Rosenthal, Fielding Graduate U.; Samuel Roudebush, George Washington U.; Beena Salim, Higher Colleges of Technology; Carol Sanford, The Responsible Entrepreneur Institute; Valentina Schmitt, Escola de Comando Estado; Anja Schröder, U. of Kaiserslautern; Noman Shaheer, U. of South Carolina; Zachary Sheaffer, Ariel U.; W Sherman, Texas A&M, Corpus Christi; Frank Siedlok, U. of Auckland; Chrysvagi Sklaveniti, U. of St. Gallen; Michael Smith, U. of Phoenix; Carla Patricia Souza, U. Federal do Paraná; Dale Spartz, U. of Utah; Richard Stackman, U. of San Francisco; Liv Starheim, Technical U. of Denmark; Jacqueline Stavros, Lawrence Technological U.; Gregory Stephens, Texas Christian U.; Wookje Sung, U. of Kentucky; Therese Sverdrup, NHH Norwegian School of Economics; Jacky Swan, U. of Warwick; David Szabla, George Washington U.; Leslie Szamosi, The U. of Sheffield; Tomas Thundiyil, Texas A&M U., College Station; Gisa Todt, Ludwig Maximilian U. of Munich; Paula Ungureanu, U. of Modena; James Vardaman, Mississippi State U.; Frances Viggiani, Southern Connecticut State U.; Kim Villeneuve, George Washington U.; Oana Vuculescu, Aarhus U.; Gary Wagenheim, Simon Fraser U.; Sharon Wagner, Linfield College; Jennifer Walinga, Royal Roads U.; Marlene Walk, U. of Pennsylvania; Donald D Warrick, U. of Colorado, Colorado Springs; Ilene Wasserman, ICW Consulting Group; Dr Kymm Watson, South U.; Elijah XunMing Wee, U. of Maryland; Jennifer Whitener Fellows, Texas A&M U.; Catherine Wiberg, Colorado Technical U.; Sharna Wiblen, The U. of Sydney; Ralf Wilden, Newcastle U.; Veit Wohlgenuth, HTW Berlin; Julie Wolfram Cox, Monash U.; Valerie Yates, PwC; Robert Yawson, Quinnipiac U.; Danielle Zandee, Nyenrode Business U.; and Robert Zapf, ODC.

Please search our online program for our terrific paper sessions and our many co-sponsored symposia. Mark your calendars now and we'll look forward to seeing you in Vancouver!

(from Sackmann, page 1)

memories of lively debates and stimulating conversations face-to-face in different locations around the world as well as virtually by e-mail and Skype conference calls with a group of scholarly colleagues dedicated to keep the division alive and move it forward.

As we know from the field of research methods, there are different ways to go about reporting on some of the essence and developments of a five-year period. Rather than choosing purely a phenomenological exploration as used, e.g., by Spinelli (2015) or oral history, I take a multi-method approach using a combination of data. These stem from our membership survey that culminated in our five-year report of the division, from my own observations during the last five years that I have been on the board and from many conversations with board and division members as well as non-division members from our wider Academy of Management community and the all-Academy board.

Reflecting holistically on the wealth of data, my first inclination was to choose paradox as an underlying theoretical frame for reporting since the themes that emerged are inherently controversial in nature. Several authors have pointed out the paradoxical nature of change (e.g., Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2013; Lüscher & Lewis, 2008; Lüscher, Lewis & Ingram, 2006; Nutt, Backhoff & Hogan, 2000; Reeves, Duncan, Ginter, 2000). However, with further probing into all the data and framing the themes, I realized that their controversial nature does not necessarily lead to paradox. Instead, existing dualities created tensions fostering creativity in intense dialogues and ultimately led to new ways of operating and dealing with challenges and change, as some of our members and former chairs of the division have pointed out in their work (e.g., Seo, Putnam & Bartunek, 2004; Woodman, 2008; 2015). The themes that I have chosen for my reflection on the division refer to content themes that run through our division as well as process themes that characterize the working of our board. The content themes that pertain to our division are well known to our division members and long-standing issues; OD—OC—>ODC and scholar—practitioner. The themes that characterizes the work process of our board are less known to the wider membership; these are scattered rules—formal bylaws; information—communication; face-to-face

meetings—virtual exchange; losing money—gaining money; doing good work—receiving recognition.

OD—OC—>ODC

An intense onboarding experiences that I remember vividly was the lively discussion during the ODC business meeting run as a World Café at the Academy meeting in 2010. One of the topics heavily debated was the nature and name of our division. Should the “D” stay or should we part from it? This debate continued during several of our board meetings. One of the many arguments being that OD in its traditional sense comes across as being old fashioned and a focus on the “C” could attract younger scholars to our division since we experienced a drop in 5.85% of student members since 2010. As in the World Café, our debates among board members always ended in the conclusion that the large majority of our board members consider both aspects being central to the nature of our division and feel strongly committed to both letters “D” and “C”—hence, we should stick to the division name ODC and reach out to younger scholars. One very successful initiative for attracting younger scholars conducting research in ODC is our doctoral program receiving very positive feedback from attendees. For the first time, we will offer it in a one-day format this year on Saturday, August 8, in Vancouver.

The division’s name discussion is related to the next long-standing theme and source of further debates.

Scholar—Practitioner

Our vision statement says that the “Organization Development and Change division represents scholars and practitioners who create and disseminate knowledge or extend the practice of constructive change management and organization development” (see ODC Bylaws Article II.1.). Nevertheless, the way to serve these two constituencies best have led to many ongoing debates in the ODC executive board. Trying to make both feel at home without creating a scholar-practitioner divide that requires extensive bridging (e.g., Heracleous, 2011), the strategic decisions were to focus on scholarly research, provide an attractive PDW program and promote scholar-practitioner collaboration. Hence, the ODC board has promoted, initiated and implemented several activities over the last five years—with more and less success.

Planning the Academy meetings, we have tried to attract high quality contributions that foster the scholarly aspect of our division. Last year, for example, our division's nominee won the Academy wide Newman award! In addition to intensifying the scholarly focus, we have been careful in developing a strong PDW program that does not only pay lip service to the "P", "D" and "W" (workshop). The contributions to our PDW program do focus on professional development in workshop settings that engage participants. As for our PDW on high impact exercises that has been part of the program for several years, the room has always been too small packed with participants coming from a wide range of divisions.

We have also promoted opportunities for joint work/research/action research projects between scholars and practitioners to foster knowledge creation and transfer (e.g., Rynes, Bartunek & Daft, 2001). In my view, these initiatives for collaborative work have not really taken off. One future option could be experimenting with a platform for collaborative initiatives offered on our new ODC website—be it for knowledge exchange, research, teaching or consulting.

Besides finding ways to serve both scholar and practitioner members of our division best, our dual membership that is central to our division has in my view a much wider implication within the context of the Academy. Even though I remember the debate since decades with more and less intensity, the call for conducting research that is relevant to and for practice has never been as strong as in the past few years. Isn't that part of the core of our division and of many of our members' work? Why do many non-ODC members of the Academy who are interested in scholarly work that makes a difference to organizations and people's lives not seem to know about our ODC division? Why have some of the "...academics and practitioners who wish to advance knowledge and understanding of strategy as something people do rather than something organizations have" not seen our division a home for this interest? I would say that ODC is a "developmental community that offers opportunities for lively and stimulating engagement to scholars sharing this interest." While the SAP interest group's membership has grown from 221 members in its founding year in 2010 to 572 in 2014, our membership experienced a 17.32 percent decline in membership during the same period from 2,806 members in 2010 to 2,340

members in 2014. Discussing these numbers with members of the all-Academy board, they voiced that our division is important to the Academy because of the composition of its membership and the division's relevance for practice.

In my view, our division has a unique asset to offer to the Academy and a competitive edge that seems, however, not to be fully recognized by Academy members who are interested in meaningful research with relevance for practice and who are not (yet) our division's members. I think that we need to leverage much better the strength of our division's core, be more active in communicating to the wider Academy what our division is about and spread the word with the help of all of our members. This call for more visibility of our division within the community of the wider Academy leads to the next theme.

Information—Communication

Since I am on the board, the improvement of our division's information and communication has been an ongoing topic of debate and a standing topic on every board meeting's agenda. Newsletters have been delayed for various valid reasons turning the news more into historical records. To be able to better serve our members, the ODC executive board decided to appoint a communication director. With an updated format, news that are of interest to our members – be they from the board or from our membership to ODC members, are now disseminated more timely to our members during the entire year predominantly via e-mail since listserv does not seem to be used that heavily.

In order to keep the information on our ODC website up to date, the board appointed a volunteer web master in 2013 who, for personal reasons, was not able to contribute until the fall of last year. Not being satisfied with the looks of our ODC website, our board decided last summer to have it updated. The board commissioned an external organization with a proven track record for developing attractive looking, easy to handle web sites. Since not much progress was made by the commissioned organization until our mid-year board meeting in April, we gave them a firm deadline. Now, the development is moving and the new web site should be functioning in June of this year! We hope that our members will not only appreciate the visual face-lift of our new website. We also hope that the way we operate as a

division will become more transparent to our members making all those jewels that our division offers to its members more visible in one dedicated, easy-to-find place. Among these jewels are the many awards that we offer as a division (see further below).

In our board discussions, we also realized that we have to better differentiate between information and communication choosing appropriate channels for both. While the newsletter, e-mail and website are primarily tools for disseminating information, we are still debating how to improve two-way communications outside of our yearly Academy meetings and respond to the desire of our members voiced in the five-year report for more engagement. In this respect, our newly created membership engagement committee is very helpful in reaching out to our members. For last year's meeting, our membership engagement coordinator (Julie Smenzuik) initiated an ODC flyer for new and non-members that was distributed during the Academy meeting in Philadelphia. Given the positive feedback, we decided to update it on a yearly basis for the Academy meeting. The members of our membership engagement committee also greet new members at various occasions during the Academy meeting and help them in their orientation of the meeting.

As mentioned above, one additional option for engaging our ODC members in the future could be to provide a chat board on our website or a platform for offering and finding partners for collaborative work. What we have decided is to become visible and hopefully active on social media. Please, join our newly-created Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter accounts and make those tools alive within our division!

Other options to stay in touch with our membership are mid-year conferences such as the OD conference Lyon, the Colloquium on Organization Development and Change as well as webinars. In collaboration with the MC division and with the help of our ODC member Joanne Preston and her technical support as well as our two board members Quy Hui and Julie Smenzuik, we offered two free educational Webinars last fall on tips for successful submissions to our division for the yearly Academy meeting. Since both webinars were well-attended providing information that is highly valuable to members who want to submit a contribution to our division at the Academy meeting, we plan to make the content of the webinar available on our new website.

We hope that all these activities create value to our members and help attract new members to our division as well as increase the number of submissions that we have for the annual Academy meeting. As you may well know, our division's space on the Academy program depends on the number of submissions to our division!

Scattered Rules—Formal Bylaws

When I joined our board, it was not that easy to find out how the board is working. I learned on the way, year by year, about my specific responsibilities. Implicit and explicit rules did exist but the explicit ones were not readily available and required self-organization once they were passed on by handouts in board meetings and e-mails that disappeared after a while in the piles of paper on my desk and in files of my computer. This has changed. Being faced with the task of preparing and conducting our five-year division review, our past chair of the ODC division Jeffrey Ford discovered that other Academy divisions had formal bylaws and our division did not. Next to being responsible for the five-year report, he took on the task to develop a first draft of ODC bylaws that we heavily debated, amended, changed and debated again among board members during the period of about eight months. Once these bylaws were checked by the all Academy board in their nth version, they were finally put up for vote to our members last November. Having successfully passed the vote, our division now has bylaws that are available to all of our members on our ODC website. These bylaws help not only newly elected board members in their onboarding process specifying the respective roles and responsibilities for each year and function, they also make the board members visible and the board's way of working transparent to our entire membership. Hence ODC members are better informed for deciding how they may, for example, get actively involved in and engage with the division.

What we deliberately did not specify in the bylaws is the way how the board members get all those responsibilities done during the year besides the meetings held at the Academy. This leads to the next theme.

Face-to-Face Meeting—Virtual Exchange

Traditionally, the board has physically met twice a year for a formal board meeting. One board meeting takes place on the Sunday afternoon during the

yearly Academy meeting in early August as specified in our bylaws. The organization of the mid-year meeting was then the responsibility of the chair elect hosting the mid-year meeting in his or her home institution. Having become a multi-national board with board members' spreading the globe from Australia to Singapore, to the USA, Great Britain, Norway and Germany/Switzerland, this always implies for some of the board members quite a bit a travel for a one and a half or two day meeting. While it is exciting to visit different colleagues' institutions around the world, not all of the board members' teaching calendars are compatible. Besides finding a suitable date, the travel also requires resources, both time and money, with the latter coming either from board members' home institutions or out of board members' own pockets.

Last year, the board experimented with a series of online meetings via Skype to discuss those issues that we usually addressed and discussed during our mid-year board meeting with a focus on preparing the program for the yearly Academy meeting, nominations for new officers and nominations for awards. Given the time differences of our locations, finding time slots that would fit most board members without having to get up in the middle of the night was not an easy task. Nevertheless, we got the work done accompanied by some mixed feelings about the process. What we learned from the experiment was that quite a bit of the board work that requires board discussions relating to the planning of the Academy program including award decisions can be accomplished virtually. For other important issues such as the onboarding of new board members and the discussion of strategic issues, a face-to-face board meeting is more effective, as supported by findings in the area of virtual work arrangements (e.g., Gibson & Cohen, 2003). Hence, the current decision is to have an additional physical meeting attached to the yearly Academy meeting and to conduct a physical mid-year meeting every other year.

Doing Good Work—Receiving Recognition

Our division has a long history of giving various awards for high quality work. These are the

- ODC Division best Paper Award
- Rupe Chisolm Practical Theory Award
- ODC Division Best Student Paper Award
- ODC Division Best Paper Based on a Dissertation Award

- ODC Division Best Action Research Paper
- USC Susan Cohen Award
- Organization Development and Change Award and the
- Outstanding Reviewer Award.

In addition to these above listed awards, our division nominates scholarly papers submitted to our division for the all Academy Dexter Award and the Newman Award. Nevertheless, we felt that all the good work of our members deserves further recognition and our awards committee coordinated by our chair elect David Grant proposed three additional awards: The Pasmore-Woodman award, a distinguished scholar award and a distinguished educator award.

The call for nominations for the Pasmore-Woodman award has gone out in April. The board established this award in recognition of Bill Pasmore's and Dick Woodman's contribution to the field of ODC by creating the Research in Organization Change and Development Annual series 25 years ago. Hence, the annual award honors two or more colleagues who have managed to maintain a significant working relationship over a sustained period of time producing original and innovative research in the field of ODC.

The distinguished scholar award will also be an annual award and granted to an individual who has made a significant scholarly contribution to the field of ODC. Nominations will go out for the first award in 2016. Currently, we decided to award a distinguished educator, a person who has made a significant contribution in passing on knowledge about the field of ODC, every other year. Since each one of these awards is attached with financial recognition, we had to find ways to finance them. This leads me to the last duality.

Losing Money—Gaining Money

Our division's budget largely depends on the number of members who have signed up for our division. As you know, the yearly Academy membership fee includes two division or interest group memberships. Each additional division membership costs 11 USD per year. While this does not seem much (less than 1 USD per month or about one Starbucks coffee per quarter), our division experi-

enced a drop in members especially in that year when the all Academy board decided to include only two instead of three divisions or interest groups with their yearly membership fee. Hence, financial issues have accompanied our board discussions about membership since we spend most of our ODC budget on the yearly Academy meeting hosting our members. Unfortunately, catering costs have steadily increased over the years in the various venues chosen by the all Academy board.

Rather than further lamenting, our board decided to reach out strengthened by the newly created committee structure. Currently, we have gained several sponsors who contribute to our division. The Emerald Group Publishing is sponsoring the newly created Pasmore-Woodman award and the Routledge publishing group is going to sponsor our distinguished speaker and next year's distinguished scholar award. The distinguished educator award will be sponsored by UNSW Business School, at least for an initial three times. Pepperdine University hosted this year our mid-year meeting that we held in Los Angeles. Additional sponsors of our division are the Monash Business School, the NEOMA Business School and the Project Management Institute contributing in various ways to our division's activities during the Academy meeting. The members of our awards committee have currently developed the following levels of sponsorships (equating to levels of cash or in some cases other kinds of support): Bronze \$500–\$1500; Silver \$1500–\$3000; Gold \$3000–\$7000 and Platinum \$7000+. In turn, sponsors will be recognized on our website as well as during the Academy program.

Concluding Remarks—Moving Ahead

Reviewing all the board's activities and initiatives, I think we have accomplished quite a bit thanks to the idea, energy, time and strong efforts of all of our board members! Reflecting on the six months implementation period of our division's bylaws, my evaluation is that they are working! The review process of the responsibilities of the various roles have been very helpful in pushing ongoing efforts—especially in the area of information and communication. The newly created committee structure has given an impetus not only for effective work processes, but also for developing and implementing creative ideas and actions engaging and rewarding our members by newly created awards and by establishing sponsor relationships.

Despite all these accomplishments, there is always room for more that can be done—keeping the question in mind of how much can a division's board composed of voluntary members accomplish next to all their regular work and engagements? How much of their valuable time and energy can board members offer to the ODC division and how much can ODC members expect from the board? If we want to move beyond mere information and foster more communication, dialogue and engagement, our division's board needs communication and dialogue partners beyond the board members. The board can provide platforms such as our Newsletter, the new website, Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter accounts but in pure numbers, our board members are rather limited in making these tools alive for a division who has roughly two and a half thousand members. The board, and these tools, depend on all off our ODC division members' contributions—be they information, communication, seeking dialogue or showing engagement. Unfortunately, this requires time, effort and energy—all of those resources that are rather limited, precious and increasingly rare.

In my view, our division is and will be facing three major related challenges in the future: getting the attention of our members, staying relevant to our members and increasing our membership. How can the division get the attention of our members when competing with daily information overflow? How can the division get some of its members' time and energy having to compete with all the other commitments, engagements and obligations that all of us have? While technology and new work arrangements have provided us with the opportunity to function 24/7, we as human beings are still limited in how much we can attend to and accomplish during those hours we choose to be awake.

Staying relevant to our members, the division's board needs dialogue, regular feedback and initiatives from our membership. During my board membership, I experienced a group of highly motivated and engaged members. In comparison to our total membership, this is, however, a small group. What does our division mean to all those who are members but do not actively voice their opinion, needs and ideas? How can the division better tap into this more quiet group and find out what is relevant to them? How can we maintain a good age-balance in our membership and be relevant to younger scholars besides attracting them to our doctoral student workshop?

Even though the ODC division is still the sixth largest of the twenty-five division and interest groups of the Academy, our membership has declined over the past years—despite the fact that change is the most constant part of our lives and issues of organizational change and development are relevant to most organizations. While younger scholars may decide to join divisions that relate to organizational functions and professorships, issues of change also play a role in all functional areas. Somehow, our division needs to find ways how to better inform the wider Academy membership what our division is about and what it offers to its members. In exchanges with members of other divisions, I frequently have to explain what the three letters ODC stand for! Given the calls for more relevance in our academic work, I think our division has a unique asset to offer for those who want to make a difference in people's and organizations' lives.

Hence, I want to close with a call for all of our division members becoming an ambassador of our division; talk about what our division is about when meeting people from other divisions! Make non-ODC members interested in our division so that they may even decide to submit PDW's, symposia and scholarly papers to our division and eventually join our division! The ODC board cannot do it alone. We need all of our members to contribute.

Notes

1 The SAP mission statement taken from the AoM Website: The mission of this interest group on Strategizing Activities and Practices (SAP) is to create a developmental community for academics and practitioners who wish to advance knowledge and understanding of strategy as something people do rather than something organizations have. We aim to offer opportunities for lively and stimulating engagement to scholars sharing this interest.

2 For a detailed description of each of the awards, please visit our ODC website.

References

- Gibson, C.B. & Cohen, S.G. (eds.). *Virtual teams that work: Creating conditions for virtual team effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heracleous, L. (ed.) (2011). Bridging the scholar-practitioner divide [Special Issue]. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 47(2), 5-14.
- Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A. (2013). Contradiction as a medium and outcome of change: A Foucauldian reading. *The Journal of Change Management*, 26(3), 556-572
- Lüscher, L.S. & M.W. Lewis (2008). Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: Working through paradox. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 221-240.
- Luscher, Lewis & Ingram (2006). The social construction of organizational change and paradoxes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(4), 491-502.
- Nutt, P.C., Backoff, R.W. & Hogan, M.F. (2000). Managing the paradoxes of strategic change. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 9(1), 5-31.
- Reeves, T., Duncan, W. & Ginter, P.M. (2000). Leading change by managing paradoxes. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*. 7(1), 13-30.
- Rynes, S.L., Bartunek, J.M. & Daft, R.L. (2001). Across the great divide: Knowledge creation, and transfer between practitioners and academics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 340-355.
- Seo, M., Putnam, L.L. & Bartunek, J.M. (2004). Dualities and tensions of planned organizational change. In M.S. Poole & A.H. Van de Ven (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational change and innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 73-107.
- Spinelli, E. (2015). Experiencing change: A phenomenological exploration. *Existential Analysis*, 26(1), 4-21.
- Woodman, R.W. (2015). The science of organizational change and the art of changing organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 50(4), 463-477.
- Woodman, R.W. (2008). Creativity and organizational change: Linking ideas and extending theory. In J.Zhou & C.Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum: 283-300.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PROCESSES BY WHICH SOCIAL ACCOUNTS INFLUENCE CHANGE

Danielle A. Tucker

University of Essex, UK

Jane Hendy

University of Surrey, UK

2015 ODC Division Best Paper

During organisational change, managers use social accounts to influence the behaviour of organisational members. Social accounts are a specific form of communication. They are explanations of organisational actions (Bies, 1987; Cobb & Wooten, 1998; Shaw, Wild, & Colquitt, 2003). The account giver aims to influence the receiver's affective or behavioural reactions, often to mitigate reactions to negative outcomes (Bies, 1987; De Cremer, van Dijk, & Pilluda, 2010). Hence, social accounts are useful in creating support for change in affecting the sense people make of a particular situation.

Significant research has studied the relationship between social accounts and individual perceptions (Bies, 1987; Cobb & Wooten, 1998; Frey & Cobb, 2010) but theory is less developed in the process of *how* social accounts get taken up; specifically, the recipient's role in uptake. During change, both top-down and bottom-up processes influence organisational members understandings and employees themselves play a significant role in filling in gaps in information with their own expectations (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1999). Organisational members actively interpret information and influence the development of schema and the behaviour of peers (Balogun & Johnson, 2004; Maitlis & Sonenshein, 2010; Rouleau, 2005).

During change, employees are continually given information and suggestions about why events have occurred. Sometimes intended recipients do not register this information; they choose to attend to one piece of information over another; and only then is information subsequently given meaning and acted upon (Ginsberg & Venkatraman, 1995). In this paper, we first describe the processes when organisational members receive social accounts and then we formulate an explanation of why some accounts influence change behaviour whilst others do not. By understanding this process we advance social accounts literature, exploring the currently neglected role of the recipient in social account uptake.

Traditionally, social accounts research comes from a positivist tradition, with little consideration of context, for example how the organisational landscape might influence the account receiver. Instead research has focused on refining the design and delivery of accounts to maximise their likelihood of influencing behaviour (Cobb & Wooten, 1998; De Cremer et al., 2010; Frey & Cobb, 2010), but this focus is either the content of the account or the attributes of the account giver. The importance of account-giving in organisational change highlights that change represents a complex situation here numerous, often conflicting, explanations create challenges (Cobb & Wooten, 1998) but again little direct research asks how contextual influences affect the process of accommodating one account over another.

In this paper we explore this process, taking a cognitivist and an interpretivist approach to understanding context. We draw on influences from information processing and sensemaking to highlight how the interplay between context and cognition explains why some social accounts lead to changes in understanding whilst others do not.

Study Context and Approach

We analysed the interpretation of social accounts provided to other organisational members in an acute hospital undergoing profound change. The change involved the closure of two existing hospitals and a move to a new purpose-built facility. Much of the social accounts literature studies the specific wording and construction of social accounts (e.g. Frey & Cobb, 2010; Skarlicki, Folger, & Gee, 2004). However, alternative view takes a more social cognitive perspective, focusing on both the intended message given by the account giver and the receiver's perception of the account. Rather than focusing on the exact wording or first documented instance of an account's presentation we take a thematic view of each account. Where the underlying message remains the same we consider this to be one thematic social account.

Data collection. We spent 51 hours of active research time at the hospital (including tours of the new and old hospitals led by members of the Trust management, attendance at steering groups, executive and research committee meetings and reviews, informal research observations and impressions). In addition, we conducted 82 formal interviews, performed analysis of documentary evidence (116 doc-

uments, including internal documents, publicly available reports and research, media coverage and field notes). The data were collected over five phases covering three years.

Findings

On gathering different members' understandings we often observed that the primary content of the social account had become defused, blurred, or fundamentally altered. Taking our lead from these early cues we developed our analysis further, with our data highlighting that successful social accounts need to go through three key phases of cognitive processing. Social accounts need to be *situationally relevant* in terms of mapping into or overlapping with existing schema (to determine whether the receiver should pick the account out of the 'noise' surrounding the change), need to create *imperative for action* in terms of the account being considered contextually and personally important to the receiver, and be *credible*—whether the content of the account and account giver are perceived as legitimate and truthful based on recipients' existing and the political landscape.

Discussion

In this paper we aimed to understand the process by which social accounts influence organisational members during a large-scale organisational change. Having situational relevance was found to bring an account to our attention. In our turbulent context, a large amount of informational 'noise' obscured social accounts. Only accounts which related to personal schema were subject to further cognitive processing. Accounts which were not considered relevant were not easily recollected suggesting that they were filtered out before being attended to (Johnson et al., 2006; Lord & Levy, 1994). We were only able to understand the fate of these accounts from the past recollections of others. To each stimulus in our complex environment, we ask, "Do I need to pay attention to this?" and "Is it relevant to me?" If the message is too different from what a recipient already knows, or is so abstract that it is unrecognisable automatic cues will not be activated and account ignored.

If an account is deemed to be relevant and therefore recognised amongst the noise we pay attention. The extent to which an account creates *imperative for action* will then determine *how much* attention is paid. Once received, we found that accounts need-

ing action were given further consideration, whilst those which were not (in relation to the recipient's context) were disregarded.

At the credibility stage we found that organisational members went beyond simplistic and peripheral shortcuts (e.g. discrepancy detection, account giver expertise, attractiveness, message repetition (Johnson et al., 2006; Lord & Levy, 1994)) and instead consulted peers, made counterarguments and judged motives to assess evidence which supported the account and whether the rationale behind the account was legitimate. Unlike the two previous stages, this process of evaluating credibility mainly involves feedback from outside the individuals own experience.

Our research makes a number of theoretical contributions to literature on social accounts and organisational cognition. We found that recipient cognitive processes played a key role in determining the influence of social accounts. These cognitive processes of social accounts have been previously overlooked in the social accounts literature.

We view accounts not as an explicit statement but as a message prevalent in a series or collection of communication activities. This approach allowed us to gain a more holistic understanding of how accounts are interpreted and perceived by a range of organisational members. We argue that in order to understand the full implications of accounts we must take a more complex, 'real-life' view of this process.

References available from the authors.

COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AS A MODALITY OF OD ACTION RESEARCH: LEARNING FROM A MERGER-BASED STUDY

Filomena Canterino

Politecnico di Milano

Abraham B. (Rami) Shani

California Polytechnic State University

David Coghlan

Trinity College, Ireland

2015 ODC Division

Best Action Research Paper Award

Over the past sixty years the practice of action research has been central to the organization development tradition, with scholarly researchers and practitioners working together to address complex

issues of organizational change (Shani and Coghlan, 2014). Collaborative management research (CMR) may be understood as a modality within the broad family of action research approaches. The process of organizational inquiry is characterized by methods that are based on varied degrees of *action* and *collaboration* that were advanced during the last (and the current) century, each of which seems to emphasize distinct scientific, collaborative and action features (Shani, Mohrman, Pasmore, Stymne and Adler, 2008).

This paper reports on the nature and outcome of a CMR approach that was used to enable a particularly complex organizational change: the merger process of two real estate investment companies. Mergers and Acquisitions (M&As) are radical changes that require the capability to design and manage system wide transformation. At the most basic level, M&As imply a shift of the current systems in terms of their value, culture, structure and routines, and how to do business. It is not so surprising that post-merger and acquisition performance data suggests that most M&As do not meet expectations. M&As have received increased attention in the academic research in the broad field of organizational and management studies. The majority of these studies aims to identify the factors that are linked to the success of M&As, (e.g. relative size of M&A partners, managerial involvement, culture and organizational structural issues) (Calipha et al., 2010). Limited studies have focused on the root causes of unsuccessful M&As efforts. The scientific body of knowledge seems to lack congruency between findings, area of emphasis, theoretical perspectives adopted, different dimensions of analysis, and even views of “successful” M&As (Dauber, 2012; Birkinshaw et al., 2000).

The radical nature of M&As suggests the need to explore and integrate insights from the ODC literature. Surprisingly, there is a paucity of action research and collaborative management research in studying and/or guiding M&As efforts (Kernstock and Brexendorf, 2012). The nature of the collaboration, the process (that involves iterative cycles of identifying a problem, planning, acting, and evaluating) and the nature of relationship that it develops make CMR a promising approach for theoretical development and guiding practice for M&As. CMR approach in an M&As context focuses on how the M&As works and how to make it work while it’s happening, instead of focusing on defining the “suc-

cess factors.” This article is embedded in a CMR project conducted in a company, fictionally named ReBUILD, which had recently undergone through a strategic-driven merger within the real-estate investment industry context.

The Case

ReBUILD is the result of a merger between two very different companies in the Italian real estate industry (one was a young public company, founded in 2005 in Milan, while the other was an older company, slightly bigger, founded in Rome in 1998 by a joint initiative of the Italian National Social Insurance Agency and a banking house). After the merger deal, during an assessment of the current state of the merger effort, the management team realize that some deeper investigation of the dynamics in place was needed. Several critical issues had to be managed carefully. The most evident issue concerned the integration of the different parts of the companies. Furthermore, the radical change due to the merger created a climate of uncertainty and anxiety about the future.

The shift from small to a medium high-standardized company resulted in changes in basic work routine and created distance for most individuals from the actual decision making. This could be very problematic for people that were used to take part in meetings with the former CEOs that ran the two companies more as a family-based businesses. The potential distance between the top levels and the lower levels of the company, as long as the physical distance of the two locations of the new company (one office in Rome, one office in Milan) were not helping in making the integration effective. A sort of rivalry between the two location headquarters still existed and at times members of the two old companies saw each other as competing enemies. This brought the CEO to search for a process that can simultaneously shade light on the company’s complex dynamics and at the same time generate action plans for a better integration of the two companies. Based on a successful organization development effort in his previous company, the CEO approached the second author for a conversation to explore possible learning and change project.

The Research Project: Two-and-a-Half Cycles of CMR

Following few conversations with the CEO and a meeting with the executive team, the decision was

made to embark on a CMR project. The collaborative management research project lasted thirteen months, taking place from January 2013 to February 2014. The project involved two and a half sub-sequential cycles. Every cycle was composed of three phases: (i) *collaborative research process design*, in which researchers and practitioners with preliminary activities set the dialogue and the mutual education about the company and the research process, as long as preliminary agreements on the process and the tools and mechanisms that will be adopted; (ii) *understanding of the phenomenon under inquiry*, in which data are collected and analysed with the aim to create a shared meaning; (iii) *implementation/outcome*, in which further actions to be undertaken are identified on the basis of the insights of the previous phases.

The first cycle was aimed at a collaborative investigation of the company and its emerging post-merger dynamics through interviews with most of organizational members. This first cycle resulted in identifying the overall organizational culture (and subcultures) and its complexity as the most critical area that needs an in-depth study. The second cycle was devoted to mapping the “current” and “preferred” organizational culture, while utilizing a survey based on the Competing Values Framework by Cameron and Quinn (2006). The last half-cycle concerned the identification of four specific organizational interventions to be undertaken based on the results from the second cycle. In specific, the four projects concerned: (i) a leadership development project for middle managers, (ii) a project aimed to streamlining of procedures, (iii) a project aimed to the improvement of the internal company communication, and (iv) a project aimed to identify best practices in work to reduce the operational non-adding value activities.

The “engine” that housed and nurtured the research collaboration during the two and a half cycles was a hybrid learning mechanism. This learning mechanism incorporated internal and external knowledge bases. The top management team of the organization created a study team that was a microcosm for the organization. The team also included external researchers with varied disciplinary background such as organizational change and development, organizational behavior, human resource management and real estate background. The team included a member of the top management team that was responsible to sharing the study progress with the

management. Throughout the research process, the team jointly designed and implemented the different phases, protocols and tools. The team also engaged in collaborative sense-making and sense-giving activities.

As demonstrated in the ReBUILD case, the collaborative management research process created the capability that enabled the organization to address the emerging integration challenges of the merger by creating the environment, tools and methods for its members to engage in rigorous, reflective and relevant inquiry and action.

References

- Birkinshaw, J., Bresman, H., & Harkanson, L. (2000). Managing the post-acquisition integration process: How the human integration and task integration processes interact to foster value creation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(3), 396-425.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R.E., (2006). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Calipha, R., Tarba, S., & Brock, D. (2010). Mergers and acquisitions: A review of phases, motives, and success factors. *Advances in Mergers & Acquisitions*, 9, 1-24.
- Dauber, D. (2012). Opposing positions in M&A research. *Cross Cultural Management*, 19(3), 375-398.
- Kernstock, J., Brexendorf, T.O., (2012). Corporate brand integration in mergers and acquisitions—An action research-based approach. *Reputation Review*, 15(3), 169-178.
- Shani, A.B. & Coghlan, D. (2014). Action and collaboration between scholarship and practice: Core values of OD research. *OD Practitioner*, 46(4), 35-38.
- Shani, A.B., Mohrman, S.A., Pasmore, W., Stymne, B., & Adler, N. (2008). *Handbook of collaborative management research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CREATING A COLORFUL MODEL OF CHANGE: A CASE STUDY OF THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Hans Vermaak

Sioo/Twynstra

Léon De Caluwé

Vrije Universiteit

2015 ODC Division Rupert F. Chisholm Best
Theory-to-Practice Paper Award

Almost 20 years ago, we came up with a meta-theory of change, now referred to as the “color model.” Looking back, we wonder: What made the process of developing this model so productive? In order to contribute to our understanding of theory development, this article reviews the case history and traces how the theory evolved over time.

We selected Smith and Hitt’s (2005) model of theory development for our review. Their model emerged from asking 30 “great minds in management” to reflect on how they developed what are now considered established management theories. It had little to do with following formulas like “identify variables, state relationships, and clarify boundary conditions.” Only logical in hindsight, their experience at the time was instead of winding, multi-year journeys, full of barriers and serendipitous events. Analyzing these journeys, Smith and Hitt identified four common stages. First, there is “tension,” such as a contradiction between one’s theory and research findings; this fuels a “search,” during which one suspends beliefs and discovers a new framework. The framework is then “elaborated” by research, incremental modeling, and integrating ideas from other theories. In the last stage, “proclamation,” the theory is published and critiques are addressed. In this review, we take a composite and multi-criteria view of theory. Theory is more than just constructs, variables, and concepts; it describes how these elements are related, and clarifies underlying assumptions. Theory can be appreciated for contrasting and even conflicting reasons: originality, utility, validity, and resonance.

A Reconstructed Case History

If we liken theory development to a tree that branches out over time, the roots of the color model correspond to five paradigms of change; these are characterized by different underlying assumptions, which result in contrasting change behaviors. We labeled these paradigms with colors: Blue-print

thinking is based on the rational design and implementation of change. Yellow-print thinking is based on sociopolitical ideas about organizations. Red-print thinking focuses on motivational strategies. Green-print thinking sees changing and learning as inextricably linked. White-print thinking views change as a constant; change agents cannot control it but can discern undercurrents and support innovators. These paradigms were elaborated in terms of traits, related literature, and application guidelines—constituting the theory’s “trunk.” Over time the theory “branched out,” as we elaborated interactions between the colors, applied the theory in certain sectors, linked it to other disciplines, and developed aids for teaching and consulting.

In hindsight we can discern three periods in the development of our theory, within which Smith and Hitt’s stages of tension, searching, elaboration, and proclamation can be recognized. The “inception” period (1997–1999) started with a tension between the prevalence of organizational change in our firm’s practice and the absence of common knowledge. In response we reviewed the literature, asked our colleagues to share their cases and concepts, conceptualized methods and models, and created a change management course. A second tension arose between the eager acceptance of our collected ideas by our colleagues and their persistent, heated discussions about concrete cases. We noticed that the proponents of different approaches almost seemed to come from different planets. The creative leap was to map these divergent beliefs about change, leading us to a five-paradigm model. We linked the paradigms to change traditions in the literature and elaborated the characteristics of each, including types of interventions, roles of change agents, et cetera. The model quickly started to take on a life of its own when colleagues integrated it in their work and shared it with clients. This motivated us to publish a handbook for change agents that quickly became one of the best-selling management books in the Netherlands.

In the “storming and norming” period (1999–2006) new tensions arose based on how the model was received and used. Some academics critiqued us for trying to fit a complex subject into neat, objective boxes. Whilst the model was social constructionist in our minds, we had not articulated it in that way. We began to link it to literature on meta-language, metaphors, and the consumption of knowledge. We minimized the use of tables to present the colors,

describing them instead as self-referential “planets,” each an endlessly rich world in and of itself. We pointed out dynamics that hinder a multi-paradigmatic way of working, like the impossibility of talking “colorlessly” about the colors, given the inevitable bias of the presenter; the domination of some colors over others; and competency traps for lesser-used approaches. In contrast to the academics, some practitioners called for simplification, desiring clear-cut algorithms for application. Fearing instrumentalism, we deduced guidelines and examples to increase sophistication in diagnosis, intervention planning, self-reflection, and communication. During this period, we produced dozens of publications, translated our handbook into English, and produced didactic materials for educators.

In the “maturity” period (2006–2015) a new tension arose when advanced practitioners saw a need to combine color-based approaches in order to deal with more complexity. Coincidentally, economic crisis hit, leading organizations to undertake contrasting change efforts concurrently. In this context, we focused on the difficulty of designing multicolored change, the types of issues that warrant it, and the factors that would allow such change to be successful. These efforts were linked to the growing literature on paradoxes, dialogic OD, positive deviancy, and textual agency. Another tension arose from the diversity of people working with the model. A steady demand persisted for an introduction for those new to the field, alongside the growing interest in complexity. It became clear that there was no single way to teach the color theory effectively: only tailored teaching, using stories to bring the colors to life and humor to handle defensiveness, reaches contrasting audiences. We also supported diverse ways of applying and researching the model. To allow the model to be used by an ever-widening group of people, we increasingly used web-based resources, such as video lectures, an Internet version of the color test, and an interactive platform for a community of practice. Lastly, we recaptured 20 years of developmental sprawl in several articles and books.

Reflection and Conclusion

We recognize the composite nature of the color theory as a collection of concepts and underlying paradigms. Both the interrelationships within the colors (congruency of traits) as well as relationships between the colors (in its key applications) are

explored. We also recognize that we have faced vexing choices in dealing with contrasting criteria. The theory scores well on originality, utility, and resonance in the world of practice. Having our primary base of operations in consultancy explains our desire that the theory be of value to our clients first, and to educational programs second. While the model sparked debate, new teaching, and testing in the academic community in the Netherlands, its international diffusion was limited as we published little and late in English. As a result, the theory’s originality and to some extent its utility in the academic arena has suffered. In contrast, the validity of the theory has increased over the years, especially though different forms of action research complemented by a firmer grounding in the literature and empirical testing.

We have found Smith and Hitt’s four-stage model useful for describing the theory’s development. Their framework spurred us to rethink the sometimes-contrasting recollections we had and increased our understanding of the development process. We have become acutely aware of how tensions fueled different periods of development. We have a deeper appreciation of the development process as causally ambiguous, driven by context and serendipity, and taking many years of incremental development. The case history makes us want to expand Smith and Hitt’s model a bit. We discerned three consecutive periods each sparked by a different type of tension, and thus resulting in corresponding types of search, elaboration, and proclamation. Might this be true for other theory development as well? We have also put more emphasis on proclamation, which may be due to our position as academic practitioners, unlike the “great minds” consulted by Smith and Hitts.

We conclude with two final points for consideration. First, we notice that the call to “bridge the gap” between academia and practice is mostly interpreted as a need for academics to inform practice. However, since many ideas in management come from the world of practice, an argument could be made that academics might be better off researching theories that have already “made it” in practice, instead of, or at least in addition to, importing new ones. Second, we observe a downside of the emphasis on originality. Academic journals require authors to contribute something new and practice-oriented publications remain popular only as long as they are “fresh.” But in other domains, we place a high pre-

mium on classics: a traditional pot roast, classic Coke, a perfect apple pie. We think it is worth pondering how to do the same with our “management classics,” creating a robust repository of ideas, and thus giving theory development more lasting relevance.

References

Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.) (2005). *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BECAUSE I SAY SO: THE IMPACT OF LEADERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Marlene Walk

University of Pennsylvania

2015 ODC Division Best Paper Based on a Dissertation Award

Oftentimes employees are exposed to conflicting processes while coping with change (Piderit, 2000). For instance, employees may wholeheartedly support a particular change initiative, but simultaneously resist the adjustments in work behaviors and routines that its implementation necessitates. Most research examining employees' reactions to change has focused only on the impact of change implementation, the inclination to resist or support concrete changes in the work environment. Studies have examined how attitudes to change implementation affect change success (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993) and key individual and organizational-level outcomes (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011). To date, however, little is known about employees' attitudes toward actual change content, the nature and value of the proposed change and its underlying normative connotations.

Resistance to change has predominantly been studied among followers. The possibility that leaders themselves may resist change has been widely overlooked in the organizational change literature (Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio, 2008), despite the fact that leaders may feel as put upon by change as their followers, such as when change is imposed by external policies or legislation. Given that resistance toward change is socially constructed and continually re-defined through interaction among those involved, it is important to account for the potential effects of leader-follower interactions during change processes (Van Dijk & Van Dick, 2009).

This study seeks to address both gaps in the literature. First, I consider two sets of attitudes toward organizational change: attitudes toward change content and attitudes toward change implementation. Second, I examine the interplay of leader and follower attitudes during an externally imposed organizational change initiative. Specifically, the research question driving this study is: How do leaders' attitudes toward change content and implementation affect followers' attitudes? Drawing on leadership theory (Hogg, 2001; Hollander, 1992; Smircich & Morgan, 1982), I hypothesize that leaders' attitudes toward both change implementation (hypothesis 1) and change content (hypothesis 2) will be positively related to followers' attitudes toward change implementation. Further, I predict that leaders' attitudes toward change content moderate the relationship between followers' attitudes toward change content and implementation, such that this relationship is more positive as leaders' attitudes toward change content becomes more positive (hypothesis 3).

Methodology

To test my hypotheses, I collected data from 54 German elementary schools undergoing major organizational change. In 2013, German school boards closed special needs schools to new enrollments assimilating all pupils into the same schools, effectively moving from one of the most segregated educational systems in the world to an inclusive educational system. Brought on by the ratification of the UN-Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which afforded all children equal access to education, this policy implementation has represented an institutional paradigm shift with profound implications for the organization of schools and teachers' jobs. The case of inclusive education lends itself naturally to this study, given the potential incongruity between attitudes toward inclusion as the specific change content and attitudes toward support or resist change implementation (Walk, 2015). In this study, I examined the influence of 54 principals/leaders' attitudes on 400 teachers/followers' attitudes toward change, testing hypotheses using multilevel linear regression.

Attitudes toward change content were operationalized using the 18-item Multidimensional Attitudes toward Inclusive Education Scale (Mahat, 2008). Attitudes toward change implementation were operationalized using the Change Attitude Scale, a 15-

item construct assessing affective, behavioral, and cognitive components of individuals' resistance to change (Oreg, 2006). I controlled for age, gender, profession and organizational tenure at the leader and follower level. Organizational size and inclusion rate was assessed on the leader level.

Findings

Findings supported hypotheses one and two, that leader's attitudes toward change content and their attitudes toward change implementation are reflected in followers' attitudes toward change implementation. These findings build on previous assumptions that follower resistance to change is not independent from their leader. I also found a significant direct effect between followers' attitudes toward change content and implementation. Contrary to the prediction in hypothesis three, however, analysis revealed that followers hold more negative attitudes (i.e. greater resistance) toward change implementation when leaders display more positive attitudes toward the change content. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) may provide one explanation of this counter-theoretical (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Hogg, 2001) finding. As such, the leaders might not be successful in communicating and creating a sense of shared identity essential for achieving the adaptation to the organizational change. If followers perceive the leader identity to be different from theirs and regard the leader as a member of an out group, followers might be inclined to resist the change—not because they are opposed to it, but because they are less positive about the underlying motives and attitudes of their leaders during the change process (Ellemers, De Gilder, & Haslam, 2004).

This study makes several contributions. First, I examine leader attitudes as a contributing factor to followers' attitudes during organizational change. In so doing, I highlight the underlying multilevel dynamics in organizations facing change and draw attention to the fact that leader resistance is a real and important aspect of change. Second, this study answers calls for a more nuanced view of attitudes toward change that reflects the potential for simultaneously occurring conflicting processes (Piderit, 2000). By disentangling attitudes toward change content and implementation, I provide evidence that both attitudes should be considered individually and in interaction. Finally, I contribute to the inclusive education literature, which has focused on attitudes toward inclusion (i.e., change content) when investigating inclusion success. In contrast to researchers

who attribute implementation failure to individuals' attitudes toward inclusion (Avisar, Reiter, & Leyser, 2003), I argue that the lack of acknowledgment of individuals' attitudes toward change implementation might be another contributing factor.

References

- Armenakis, A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703.
- Avisar, G., Reiter, S., & Leyser, Y. (2003). Principals' views and practices regarding inclusion: The case of Israeli elementary school principals. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18*(3), 355-369.
- Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management Review, 29*(3), 459-478.
- Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(2), 362-377.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). Social identification, group prototypicality, and emergent leadership. In M. A. Hogg & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 197-212).
- Hollander, E. P. (1992). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(2), 71-75.
- Mahat, M. (2008). The development of a psychometrically-sound instrument to measure teachers' multidimensional attitudes toward inclusive education. *International Journal of Special Education, 23*(1), 82-92.
- Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(1), 73-101.
- Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 47*(4), 461-524.
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional

view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783-794.

Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), 257-273.

Van Dijk, R., & Van Dick, R. (2009). Navigating organizational change: change leaders, employee resistance and work-based identities. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 143-163.

Walk, M. (2015). "The burden's always on us"—*Meaning of work during organizational change*. Paper presented at the European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS), Athens, Greece.

UNDERSTANDING TRANSLATION WORK IN THE MULTI-ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSLATION OF IDEAS

Catherine Cassell

University of Leeds

Bill Lee

University of Sheffield

2015 ODC Nomination for the Dexter Award

We have been conducting research on trade union sponsored learning initiatives for more than 10 years now. In 1997 in the UK, the Labour government sought to harness the capacity of the trade (labor) unions in encouraging the skills development of the workforce by offering financial support to trade unions to train individuals as union learning representatives (ULRS). These people have a statutory right to time off from their work duties to train for their role which involves encouraging other workers to access learning opportunities; identify those with learning and skills needs; support individual learners; and provide advice on all aspects of the learning process. More than 28,000 ULRS have been trained in the UK reflecting a somewhat radical commitment underpinning the scheme that workers have a right to learning.

The success of the scheme has led to trade unionists in other parts of the world seeking to initiate similar initiatives. In 2005 the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (NZCTU)—the central organization of trade unions in New Zealand—initiated a Learning Representatives (LR) project “based on the British model” (Farr, 2008, p.513). The scheme

was assessed as successful after the end of the pilot project and in 2008 the NZ government increased the funding to encourage further union involvement in the scheme.

Theoretical Background

This paper is about how an idea from the labour movement in the UK was translated into the New Zealand context. There has been an enduring interest within the management and organization literature in the translation of ideas across sectors, organizations and countries (Czarniawska and Sevón, 2005). Examples include the travel of HRM and scientific management to Israel from the USA (Frenkel 2005); and notions of lean management from Japan to the UK construction industry (Morris and Lancaster 2005).

Characteristic of much of the literature in this field is the assumption that translators are managers within a given organization seeking to institutionalise the idea as a way of improving organizational performance. However, in the example of the learning representative initiative, there are multiple translators from a variety of stakeholder organizations including individual trade unionists; trade union organizers; government officials; civil servants; and some employer representatives. Together these groups are challenging traditional governance structures to enable trade unionists and workers to play a role in identifying and acting upon their learning and development needs. Theoretically we know little about the intricacies of what Waeraas and Sataøen, (2014, p. 251) describe as “real-time translation work.” How do the translators of ideas do translation in practice; how is the idea sold and how do the processes by which it is sold change over time? How do the relationships between different stakeholder groups and translators influence how the idea is edited? It is these questions that the paper addresses.

Methodology

The data presented in the paper was collected over a seven-year period that included three concentrated periods of fieldwork in New Zealand, in 2005, 2008, and 2012. In conducting the data analysis we were interested in identifying the underlying narratives that underpinned the translation of the initiative. A key part of narrative work is constructing linkages within the data, and here we attempted to do this through the identification of various plots. As Czarniawska (1998) highlights, the same set of

events can be organized and understood by more than one plot. In identifying the different plots we wanted to see how those involved in the LR initiative were making sense of its progress and contributing to its translation. We were interested in their translation work. Through this analytic process we identified a variety of narratives that shaped how the initiative and its implementation were understood at the three separate time periods. Within the paper we detail these narratives and plots and characterise how they change as the scheme develops and the idea is translated.

Findings

The story of the unfolding translation of the idea is an interesting one. We see at the first point of data collection (February–March 2005) that all stakeholders are relatively enthusiastic about the scheme and its potential to deliver for the different stakeholder groups. There is recognition that all parties have a shared interest and there is much to gain. The positive talk of tripartism is a key plot which we position as important translation work in that it acknowledges the necessary commitment of all stakeholders.

By the second period of fieldwork in March 2008 the identity of the idea was developing. It was now being pushed down to the local level so individual trade unions and employers were becoming important players in the translation process. Translation work now was about embedding the idea into new institutional structures that could provide support. However, tensions were starting to emerge. The new set of organizations becoming involved in translation at a local level, were not necessarily as committed to the idea.

By the third period of fieldwork in 2012 the political situation in New Zealand had changed somewhat with a move to a conservative National Party government who introduced a range of austerity measures including reducing funding for LRs. The LR initiative was now seeking to survive in a difficult climate. Translation work at this time focused upon editing the idea so it addressed the literacy agenda: an agenda that the government were still keen to resource. Whereas previously there had been multiple organizations involved as idea translators, now all translation work was left to a few government agents and the trade unions, particularly NZCTU. The context within which the idea was operating and seeking to establish an identity and presence was now very different.

Conclusions

From our longitudinal analysis we suggest that translation work is a set of active, ongoing processes translators' use which strive to ensure the successful translation of an idea over a period of time. As such translation work is persuasive, where translators draw upon available resources and alliances to edit and contextualise both the idea and the rationale for the idea (or logic rules: Sahlin-Andersson, 1996) in a fluid way. Different kinds of translation work may be required at different stages of the translation process for different purposes. Multi-organizational translations are particularly complex, therefore to be successful, translators need to be both contextually aware and vigilant regarding the reception and response to their idea from the different key stakeholder organizations. The learning representative initiative remains in New Zealand, though in a somewhat different guise from that initially conceived.

References

- Czarniawska, B. (1998). *Narrative approach to organization studies*. London: Sage.
- Czarniawska, B., & Sévon, G. (2005). *Global ideas: How ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. Sweden: Liber and Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Farr, D. (2008). The New Zealand Learning Representatives project: An assessment of the pilot years. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 34(4), 513-526.
- Frenkel, M. (2005). The politics of translation: How state-level political relations affect the cross-national travel of management ideas. *Organization*, 12(2), 275-301.
- Morris, T., & Lancaster, Z. (2005). Translating management ideas. *Organization Studies*, 27, 207-233.
- Sahlin-Andersson, K. (1996). Imitating by editing success: The construction of organizational fields. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sévon (Eds.), *Translating organizational change* (pp. 69-92). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Waeraas, A. & Sataøen, H.L. (2014). Trapped in conformity? Translating reputation management into practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30, 242-253.

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.)
