

# 14 Organizational Communication and Applied Communication Research

## Parallels, Intersections, Integration, and Engagement

*David R. Seibold*

University of California, Santa Barbara

*Daisy R. Lemus*

California State University, Northridge

*Dawna I. Ballard*

The University of Texas at Austin

*Karen K. Myers*

University of California, Santa Barbara

At least since the mid-20th century, most members of Western societies have earned a living doing jobs that are *in* organizations in those countries; today, most of those citizens earn a living by doing jobs that either are *in* or associated *with* organizations (Bridges, 1995). Organizations, thus, are significant for persons' lives and livelihoods, and, consequently, organizational communication scholars undertake the description, understanding, and critique of communicative practices in organizational life—especially the complex issues involved in contemporary organizations and organizing. Those researchers are concerned not only with internal organizational communication processes but also with interorganizational interactions, as well as organizations and discourses in social institutions and globally. The organizational communication area, therefore, is rich with opportunities for applied scholarship.

Communication researchers have studied numerous areas of organizational life to answer theoretically interesting questions that have obvious relevance for illuminating significant social issues, improving practices, or redressing societal problems—the aims of applied research (Seibold, 2008). Applied organizational communication scholarship has included analyses of voice and workplace democracy (Cheney, 1995; Stohl & Cheney, 2001), employee participation structures (K. I. Miller & Monge, 1987; Seibold & Shea, 2001), matters of difference in gender and race (B. J. Allen, 2005; Ashcraft, 2005; see also Buzzanell, Meisenbach, Remke, Sterk, & Turner, this volume; Nicotera, Clinkscales, Dorsey, & Niles, this volume), promoting dialogue (Murphy, 1995; Pearce & Pearce, 2001), emotion management at work (Waldron, 2000); compassionate workplace communication (K. I. Miller, 2007), conflict and dispute resolution (Volkema, Bergmann, & Farquhar, 1997), crisis management (Downing, 2007), workplace surveillance (M. W. Allen, Walker, Coopman, & Hart, 2007) and bullying (Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006), improving group/team processes (Broome, 1995; Seibold, 1995), conducting job interviews (Jablin & Miler, 1990), leadership (Barge, 1994a; 1994b; Fairhurst, 1993b, 2007; Fairhurst, Rogers, & Sarr, 1987; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996; Parker, 2001), managerial effectiveness (Barge, 2004; Clampitt, 2009) and supervisory communication

with subordinates (Wagoner & Waldron, 1999), organizational work–family policies (Buzzanell & Meina, 2005; Kirby & Krone, 2002), organizational citizenship (Becker & O’Hair, 2007), organizational irrationality (Ashcraft & Trethewey, 2004), customer-service interactions (W. S. Z. Ford & Etienne, 1994), and organizational communication training programs (Seibold, Kudsí, & Rude, 1993).

These merely are a few of the myriad of topics studied by applied organizational communication scholars (for additional foci, see Harris & Nelson, 2008). Furthermore, applied research on organizational communication is authored by scholars with wide interests and broad identification in communication, and it is not always written by, or for, members of “organizational communication divisions” in the field’s scholarly societies. Similarly, applied organizational communication research has informed and been informed by theories from across the field of communication. Integrating theory and practice, in which problems do not fit specific functional units in the field nor the theories that cross them, requires a broadening of perspective rather than a narrowing of approach (Seibold, 2005).

For these reasons, it is challenging to settle on which areas of applied organizational communication research to review in detail. Many of the areas identified above (and others, such as teams in organizations, feedback and motivation, temporality, and organizational knowledge) certainly are candidates. However, for several reasons, we focus on four areas: organizational socialization/assimilation, organizational culture, diffusion of organizational innovations, and communication and planned organizational change. First, these areas have a long history, multimethodological foundations, programmatic research, and a critical mass of replicated findings that is not true of most of the other organizational communication research areas mentioned. Second, communication is especially significant for each area. Third, research in each of these areas has been conducted by communication scholars and others outside the field, reflecting a breadth of theoretical perspectives. Fourth, because these areas of scholarship are different from each other, there is much to learn from them. However, they also overlap as foci of both research and practice (e.g., socialization and culture, culture and planned change, and planned change and innovation diffusion), and collectively, they cross micro- to macrolevels of analysis. Hence, they are not as disparate or separate as many of the applied organizational communication research areas listed previously. Fifth, research in each of the areas is similar in terms of the organizations studied: U.S. entities, in the main, with probable generalization to Western organizations (for studies of organizational communication in other cultures, see Parrish-Sprowl, this volume)—but rarely global ones—including both for-profit and nonprofit organizations (regarding applied communication research on nonprofit organizations, see Eisenberg & Eschenfelder, this volume). Consequently, the scope of the databases and the recommendations are of the same order for each area. Sixth, and especially important, each area is driven by important practical organizational concerns and proffers many implications for practice. Seventh, theory and practice interpenetrate in each of these areas: In all four areas, there are examples in which the relationship is *parallel* and separate, other studies in which theory and practice *intersect*, and still others in which theory and practice are fully *integrated*.

We first examine each of these four areas of applied organizational communication research. We conclude the chapter by addressing the three relationships of theory to practice in these areas, including the emergence of a fourth form of applied organizational communication scholarship—engaged research.

### Organizational Socialization

The communicative processes by which individuals acquire knowledge and adopt the

attitudes and behaviors necessary to participate as organizational members is known as *organizational socialization* (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Organizations socialize recruits for several reasons: to (1) preview the job and organization to potential members, which aids in screening and selecting candidates (Jablin & Miller, 1990); (2) orient recruits to the organization's culture (Schein, 1992); (3) train newcomers how to perform job duties (Myers & Oetzel, 2003); and (4) develop members for advancement and leadership roles (D. Miller & Desmarais, 2007). Interest in socialization by scholars and practitioners is fueled by the increasing frequency with which workers enter and exit organizations. Premature turnover has been linked to unsuccessful assimilation (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990) and is an increasing concern. Approximately 4 million employees leave (quit, are laid off, or fired) each month ("Employee Tenure in 2004," 2004), and employees remain with their employers for an average of only 4 years ("Employee Tenure Summary," 2006). Each month, then, millions of people must be socialized as they enter new jobs and learn job duties, forge working relationships, and acculturate into the work environment. Although premature turnover and "job hopping" can be stressful for employees, they also are of concern to organizations, which must incur the cost of hiring and training employees, more so given that turnover rates are very high in the first few weeks of employment (Hartline & De Witt, 2004).

Organizational socialization is especially intriguing to scholars and practitioners because it is foundational in establishing relationships between newcomers and organizations and, thus, this seemingly mundane process has considerable short- and long-term implications for both parties. As newcomers are acculturated into the ways of an organization, they develop connections that influence whether they become committed to the organization and its goals (B. J. Allen, 2005; Jones, 1986). Organizational socialization practices, however, have been criticized for the potential manipulation of recruits. Although the critique is justifiable, organizations have much at stake as they integrate newcomers. Recruits bring with them assumptions and behaviors acquired from previous work and life experiences (Beyer & Hannah, 2002) that can positively affect an organization, but newcomers may not easily mesh with current members who have experience working in the environment. Newcomers can interfere with existing work practices by questioning established rules and procedures that have been honed by previous and current members (Ashford & Black, 1996; Kramer & Noland, 1999; V. D. Miller, Johnson, Hart, & Peterson, 1999). They also can bring negative attitudes or poor work behaviors that can inhibit good working relationships and productivity.

Many aspects of socialization have been explored by organizational scholars, including newcomer adaptation strategies (B. J. Allen, 2005; Ashford & Taylor, 1990) and the content and consequences of socialization (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994), as well as tests of general models of socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Much of the research on organizational socialization has been driven by practical concerns: the type of communication that characterizes the pre-entry, entry, and settling-in phases (Jablin, 1987, 2001); anticipatory socialization and assimilation (Gibson & Papa, 2000); how context affects socialization (Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998; DiSanza, 1995; Hess, 1993; Myers, 2005); the role of memorable messages in newcomer socialization (Barge & Schlueter, 2004; Bullis & Bach, 1989; Stohl, 1986); the influence of organizational insiders, work groups, and friendships on socialization (Moreland & Levine, 2001; Myers & McPhee, 2006; Zorn & Gregory, 2005); the role of mentoring in newcomer adjustment (Bullis & Bach, 1989b); and the effects of technology use on newcomer socialization (Flanagin & Waldeck, 2004).

Much of the early research on socialization investigated the means and effects of organizational efforts to socialize newcomers. Socialization typologies were created (e.g., Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and subsequent studies examined the

impact of socialization tactics on newcomer integration. For example, in a study of MBA graduates, Jones (1986) found that certain socialization tactics, which he labeled “institutional strategies” (collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture), caused newcomers to adopt custodial orientations to their roles, whereas “individualized strategies” (individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and divestiture) were related to newcomers’ attempts to question the status quo and personalize their roles. More recent studies have examined the effects of socialization tactics on several theorized socialization outcomes. For instance, individualized tactics are positively related to role innovation and role conflict, but negatively related to job satisfaction and commitment (Ashforth & Saks, 1996), and newcomers’ proactive behaviors mediate the effects of institutional tactics on newcomers’ belief that they are well suited for the organization (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005). Although these studies are theoretically significant, they also are practically relevant to human resources practitioners because they demonstrate how variance in a common practice—training and orienting newcomers—affects newcomer adjustment and organizational needs.

In contrast to organizations’ socialization tactics, new members’ proactive efforts at socialization, especially viewing newcomers as “active message senders and receivers” (Kramer & Miller, 1999, p. 360) who join organizations, has received much less attention. This perspective is especially appealing to those who are interested in reciprocal interaction that enables members to become acquainted, involved in the social system, and acquire information about how to perform duties to become assets to their organizations (Myers, 2006). Although training can introduce newcomers to much of what they need to know to perform their duties and succeed in an organization, new members also must actively seek information to acquire job competency, alleviate their uncertainty, and obtain feedback on their behaviors (Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006). Thus, among the many foci of organizational socialization scholarship, communication researchers have offered greatest insights into *how* socialization actually happens, research that is useful for developing or enhancing organizational training of newcomers.

V. D. Miller and Jablin’s (1991) exemplar research introduced a model of information seeking that outlined the influences and tactics used by organizational newcomers that has been the basis for a number of communication studies. V. D. Miller and Jablin proposed that newcomers seek information to answer three questions: (1) What must I do to succeed? (2) Am I succeeding? (3) Am I accepted by others? Their model depicts seven methods of information seeking: overt, indirect, third parties, testing, disguising conversations, observing, and surveillance. Several factors influence these tactics, including the amount of uncertainty faced by a newcomer, perceived social costs associated with information seeking, availability of information sources, types of information sought, individual member characteristics, and the organizational context. This theoretical information-seeking model has many practical implications and has provided a base for applied communication research, as we highlight next.

Much of the research on information seeking has focused on how it reduces newcomers’ uncertainty (e.g., Kramer, 1993; Kramer, Callister, & Turban, 1995; V. D. Miller & Jablin, 1991; V. D. Miller et al., 1999; Morrison, 1995; Saks & Ashforth, 1996). Studies also have explored information seeking to reduce uncertainty concerning membership in newly formed expansion organizations (Sias & Wyers, 2001), working in an organization following a workforce reduction (Casey, Miller, & Johnson, 1997), entering the clergy (Forward, 1999), special concerns of minorities entering mostly White organizations (Teboul, 1999), and women’s entry into nontraditional blue-collar jobs (Holder, 1996).

In their quest to reduce uncertainty, members must weigh social costs involved in seeking information (V. D. Miller, 1996). In line with social exchange theory (e.g., Blau,

1964; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), social costs are pertinent in information seeking because, as Morrison and Bies (1991) argued, the seemingly benign act of asking for appraisal can affect others' perceptions of newcomers. Social costs are related to a person's public image, including the fear that coworkers will see the newcomer as ignorant or incompetent (Morrison, 1993; Teboul, 1995). Similarly, newcomers may fear negative feedback that could damage their self-esteem and indicate a need for behavioral change (Morrison & Cummings, 1992). When newcomers predict negative, as opposed to positive, consequences, they are more likely to use less direct tactics of information seeking (Teboul, 1995). However, members may actively seek feedback when they believe that it will be mostly positive and, thereby, boost their self-esteem and enhance their public image (Morrison & Bies, 1991). Other intriguing areas of research include how information-seeking tactics vary according to the type of information sought (V. D. Miller, 1996; Morrison, 1993; Waldeck, Seibold, & Flanagan, 2004), differences in information seeking between newcomers and job transferees (Kramer et al., 1995), sources of information seeking using technology (Waldeck et al., 2004), effects of information seeking on socialization and adjustment (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Tsui, 1991), and changes in information seeking over time (Levy, Albright, Cawley, & Williams, 1995). These studies have offered numerous insights into circumstances that facilitate or inhibit newcomers' information seeking and socialization into organizations.

Future research should continue to investigate organizational socialization as a dynamic process of negotiation, answering questions such as: How do reciprocal exchanges influence and alter socialization? How do members communicate resistance to socialization, and to what effect? How do organizational culture and occupation influence information seeking, and what effects do these have on socialization?

## **Organizational Culture**

Organizational culture has been a central focus of both theoretical (Riley, 1993) and applied scholarship (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1991). Drawing from a metaphor of organizations as cultures—with rites and ceremonies, stories and myths, and taken-for-granted assumptions and values—researchers have explored the relationship between communication and organizational goals using a variety of epistemological and methodological tools consonant with postpositivist, interpretive, and critical approaches (see Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). From R. C. Smith and Eisenberg's (1987) study of root metaphors for organizational conflict at Disneyland and Pacanowsky's (1988) exploration of empowerment at W. L. Gore to Cheney's (1995) examination of democracy and globalism at a workers' cooperative in Spain and Rosenfeld, Richman, and May's (2004) study of information adequacy in a dispersed network organization, communication scholarship in this tradition integrates practically relevant and theoretically rigorous inquiry.

Eisenberg and Riley (2001) offered a thematic typology that underscores the role of communication in investigations of organizational culture. They arrayed extant research within six overarching themes: culture as symbolism and performance, text, critique, identity, cognition, and as climate and effectiveness. Although they characterized the last category as "practical," the applied findings of work across all the themes are apparent. For instance, Hylmö and Buzzanell's (2002) exploration of the organizational subcultures surrounding telecommuting practices in a hybrid federal agency is an excellent example of research within the "culture-as-text" tradition that has important practical relevance. The study drew on Martin's (1992) three cultural lenses of *integration* (which focuses on consistency across members' accounts and shared experiences), *differentiation* (which focuses on inconsistencies across members' accounts and the subcultures that represent



areas of consensus among them), and *fragmentation* (which acknowledges the ambiguity that persists in both the integration and differentiation perspectives, and focuses on the lack of any consensus among organizational members). Using these lenses, Hylmö and Buzzanell demonstrated that even as scholars maintain an ironic stance and highlight the multivocal nature of cultural texts, they still can explore ways in which organizational actors might benefit from conversations about the contested spaces, ambiguity, and flux that characterize their work. In fact, because Martin's work has had such enormous heuristic value for organizational culture research, the topical relevance and theoretical rigor of Hylmö and Buzzanell's study make it an illuminating exemplar of how this important metatheoretical perspective might be used to understand both communication processes and organizational goals. Hence, we describe the study in some detail below and underscore its applied findings.

Whereas most telecommuting research views communication primarily as an outcome—the impact of time–space distantiation on organizational members' communication patterns—Hylmö and Buzzanell (2002) explored the social construction of this contemporary organizational practice through both in-house and telecommuting members' discourse. Set in a private-sector federal agency, where 11% of employees were full-time telecommuters, the researchers interviewed 37 members, 13 of whom were full-time telecommuters. Participants were asked general questions about the agency, its culture and subcultures, their work-related tasks, and their experiences with telework.

Using Martin's (1992) integration perspective, Hylmö and Buzzanell (2002) looked for coherence in interviewees' recurring themes, symbols, and practices. A utopian narrative emerged, with telecommuting policies described as evidence of the "greatness" and "uniqueness" of the agency's innovative culture, ideal working conditions, and transformational leadership. Telecommuting primarily was seen as an innovation that allowed employees to service client needs better and, secondarily, as a practice that enabled them to manage their family and other personal needs. Most important, members viewed telecommuting as one manifestation of the "employee centrism" that characterized the culture of this organization, where members chose the work context best suited for their individual needs. This utopian narrative also revealed how organizational leaders' use of strategic ambiguity, rhetorical framing, and various cultural indicators helped members to identify with this organization despite their differences.

To develop the differentiation perspective, points of disagreement across groups that lead to the formation of subcultures were examined. Instead of finding two groups clustered around spatial working conditions, the researchers observed four subcultures among employees demarcated by their own and others' assessments of their advancement potential, as well as their experiences with on-site or teleworking arrangements. They also found that employees' perceptions of promotability were related to the fluidity or fixity of their working hours, as well as to their spatial orientations. Paradoxically, in-house members who desired promotion constructed more fluid, event-based temporal boundaries and saw face-to-face interaction as critical to advancement. Telecommuting members attempted to create more fixed temporal boundaries by keeping to schedules and compartmentalizing their time, and they felt that face time was not a factor in career advancement. In contrast, teleworkers who believed they had reached a plateau in their career enacted a fluid time between work and home activities, and purposely withdrew from workplace interactions to loosen their ties to the organization, whereas similar in-house members kept rigid working hours but maintained close working relationships with others on-site. An important finding was that neither group of in-house employees saw themselves as colleagues with the telecommuters and, consequently, their discourse reflected an "us–them" mentality.

The findings from the integration and differentiation perspectives raise two practical concerns for people contemplating a telework arrangement. Despite the intent of telecommuting to offer flexibility, the findings support Steward's (2000) conclusions that teleworkers have increased workloads and fewer leisure hours than other workers due to their willingness to accommodate others' schedules. Given that individuals often select this arrangement because of challenges they face in balancing work-life concerns, it seems imperative that these findings be considered alongside the increased flexibility of such work. In addition, the need for alternative ways to develop peer relationships, mentoring, and fairness for all employees must be addressed.

Finally, using a fragmentation lens, the investigators focused on the ambiguity, paradox, tension, and contradiction reflected in in-house and telecommuting members' discourse. Telecommuting was shrouded in mystery for in-house employees, who wondered what their teleworking colleagues really did and whether relationships with them could be maintained during a time of change, given their physical absence. Their language reflected a sense of loss, which went unacknowledged by themselves and management. Hylmö and Buzzanell (2002) explained that "although many employees recognized the loss of informal interaction at one level, at a deeper level the losses went unnoted or were swept aside. The losses and feelings of disconnectedness amounted to grief because of lost or transitioning relationships" (p. 345).

As Hylmö and Buzzanell (2002) described, findings within the fragmentation lens point to promising interventions that communication and human resource professionals might consider. The perceived mystery of telecommuting by in-house employees stresses the need for open communication with all organizational members concerning telecommuting policies and practices. Hylmö and Buzzanell suggested that electronic exchanges, meetings, newsletter columns, or even videos (e.g., *A Day in the Life of a Telecommuter*) might address these issues, as well as conversations that strengthen the perceived legitimacy of different work arrangements. In addition, members should have opportunities to address feelings of loss associated with colleagues moving off-site to perform their jobs.

Studies of organizational culture, such as Hylmö and Buzzanell's (2002) study, offer practicable findings for organizational members in a range of contexts (e.g., Hecht & Parrott, 2002; Scheibel, 1994; Schrodt, 2002; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994; Trujillo, 1992; Witmer, 1997). Such research offers idiographic rather than universal, generalizable findings; consequently, these studies allow us to consider an array of communication goals and processes within diverse approaches. The unity within this diversity, however, is reflected in the commitment of cultural scholars to respond to organizational members' everyday concerns. For instance, similar to Hylmö and Buzzanell's (2002) discussion of potential interventions, F. L. Smith and Keyton (2001) articulated ways in which communitarian contracts between employers and employees can attract and retain an engaged, committed workforce. Rosenfeld et al.'s (2004, p. 50) findings about a dispersed network organization also reflected the differentiation discourse that characterized Hylmö and Buzzanell's in-house and telecommuting subcultures, and they offered guidelines for a "unified diversity" among spatio-temporally distinct organizational members. Future studies should investigate cross-context similarities in these processes and effects, and simultaneously continue to explore organization-specific dynamics.

## **Diffusion of Organizational Innovations**

*Diffusion* is the process by which an innovation is communicated through channels over time among members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). Research on the diffusion of innovations focuses on communication processes that shape how, why, and when members of

a social network adopt ideas, practices, or objects that they perceive as new. Such research examines how knowledge of an innovation moves from one source to another, explains why some issues and not others are taken up and talked about, and accounts for the speed of this transmission. Practitioners are concerned with these matters because it is vital for organizations to stay current with regard to procedures, practices, and technologies.

The concept of “diffusion” originated with sociologists and anthropologists in Europe early in the 20th century. However, Rogers (1962) first offered a grounded perspective of diffusion, beginning with his research on how farmers learned from one another (and from nonnative experts) about new agricultural methods and how such knowledge changed their farming views and practices. His pioneering research is responsible for the applied focus that has made this tradition a significant part of communication scholarship, in general, and organizational communication scholarship, in particular. That tradition spans a range of contexts and topics—from durable goods to industrial innovations to social movements (see, e.g., Strang & Soule, 1998; Sultan, Farley, & Lehmann, 1990; for its tradition in development communication, see Kincaid & Figueroa, this volume)—and is of concern both to theoreticians and practitioners in research and development laboratories, marketing departments, and the federal government.

The four main elements within the process of diffusion are the innovation, communication channel, time, and social system. An *innovation* is an idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual, group, organization, or other entity. The *communication channel* is the medium through which messages concerning an innovation are exchanged. The relevance of *time* concerns (1) the lapse between knowledge of an innovation and an adoption or rejection decision about it—the period known as the *innovation-decision process*; (2) the time lag between early and late adopters; and (3) the adoption rate, or number of new adopters within a given time period. Finally, the *social system* is the group of interrelated units or nodes (individuals, groups, organizations, etc.) involved in the larger diffusion process.

The diffusion of an innovation is facilitated by its salience within a given social system. For example, when organizational members deem an innovation to be salient, they discuss it among their social networks—extending from departmental colleagues to members of other organizations—and these discussions shape their attitudes about it. Such discussion reflects the first two stages of the innovation-decision process, which consists of (1) knowledge (which most individuals do not proceed past), (2) persuasion, (3) decision, (4) implementation, and (5) confirmation (Rogers, 2000). For illustrative purposes, consider a new communication technology. According to the diffusion model, many organizational decision makers will gain *knowledge* of the technology. Whether they are *persuaded* about its merits is a function of discussions about it in their social network—both inside and outside the organization. Hence, if no one talks about it, they are not likely to be persuaded one way or another. If they discuss it, however, those conversations shape their attitudes toward the technology, which then shape their *decision* about whether to adopt it. If they adopt it, the next step is to *implement* the technology in the company. Finally, decision makers will seek *confirmation* that they made the proper decision, based on outcomes associated with and reactions to the innovation.

Communication researchers have focused primarily on the diffusion of news events, technological innovations, and new communication technologies, exploring the diffusion process among individuals, groups, and organizations (Rogers, 2003). Central questions in this line of research concern how earlier adopters differ from later adopters, how perceived attributes of an innovation (e.g., relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability) affect its rate of adoption, why the rate of diffusion increases after the development of a critical mass, and how to develop a critical mass to diffuse an innovation rapidly (Rogers, 2003).



Among recent studies, Flanagin's (2000) research concerning the social pressures facilitating adoption of an organizational Web site is an exemplar of classic diffusion research, as it considers each of these questions and highlights the applied nature of this tradition. Flanagin explored the relative impact of three factors on Web-site diffusion processes: (1) interorganizational social pressures (i.e., what an organization's competitors were doing, the organization's self-perceived visibility and status as a leader in the field, and the perceived faddishness of Web sites), (2) organizational features (i.e., size, age, and reliance on advanced technologies), and (3) perceived benefits of and impediments to establishing a Web site (i.e., enhanced profit and reputation, improved communication and information flow, and technical complexity involved in adoption). Flanagin assessed the relationship among these factors with respect to whether an organization had a Web site, were early or late adopters, and the likelihood of adoption (for those without a Web site).

Through surveying members of the regional chamber of commerce in a medium-sized West-coast U.S. city, Flanagin (2000) obtained data on 288 organizations of varying size and age, and closely representing U.S. organizational demographics in sector type (including service, retail, finance, and transportation). Fifty-six percent reported having a company Web site, whereas 44% did not. Consistent with other research, Flanagin found that organizational characteristics (Damanpour, 1987; Swanson, 1994) and perceived benefits of an innovation (Tornatzky & Klein, 1982) predicted adoption decisions. However, Flanagin found new evidence that interorganizational social pressures are key predictors as well, explaining unique variance beyond that accounted for by these other factors. Judgment about what competitors were doing (called *institutional pressure*) was the single-best predictor of Web-site adoption: If an organization believed that similar businesses owned a Web site, they were likely to have one. Other important social pressure factors were organizations' perceptions of their visibility and leadership in the field.

Among those organizations that already had a Web site, the stage at which they adopted (early or late) was positively related to how much they relied on advanced technologies (a structural feature) or whether they perceived Web sites as faddish or avant-garde (not an impediment). In addition, for current nonadopters, the likelihood of future adoption was predicted by two perceived benefits (increased communication and organizational advantage for enhanced profit and reputation), two structural features (larger size and greater reliance on advanced technologies), and, to a lesser extent, one social pressure (institutional pressure). Thus, although social pressures were critical in distinguishing adopters from nonadopters, they were not as useful in predicting the stage of adoption and the likelihood of future adoption.

Flanagin's (2000) work demonstrates the importance of social pressures at the interorganizational level in diffusion processes and adds to other research about the importance of intraorganizational communication networks in facilitating discussion about innovations, including interpersonal relationships and team membership (e.g., Albrecht & Hall, 1991; Barker, Melville, & Pacanowsky, 1993). Furthermore, this research draws attention to the importance of considering phasic influences on diffusion processes, in that early adopters may be most influenced by their organization's structural features and perceived benefits, and social pressures may explain what causes the rate of diffusion to increase after the development of the critical mass.

Research on the diffusion of innovations in organizational contexts can benefit from continued investigation of a range of different types of innovations within various types of organizational structures. For instance, the increase in "boundaryless" or network organizations provides an opportunity to explore the communication processes that underlie diffusion at a macro-organizational level. In addition, given that the majority of diffusion studies by organizational communication researchers focuses on technological innovations (Rogers, 2003), it is important to consider whether the same factors bear equal

weight in the diffusion of nontechnological innovations. For instance, what leads organizations independently and voluntarily to adopt sustainable practices? In another vein, what leads some popular management books to take on a cultlike status in certain organizational circles? This second question leads to a related critique of diffusion research, in general: a proinnovation bias in which innovations implicitly are assumed to be constructive, with the intraorganizational and interorganizational diffusion of potentially damaging innovations less often considered a topic of study (G. W. Downs & Mohr, 1976). Similarly, studying “failed” innovations may yield important findings about the diffusion process. Finally, the appropriate methods necessary to study unsuccessful innovations point to the greatest challenge for diffusion research on organizational innovations: the need to conduct longitudinal research. As Flanagan (2000) noted, most diffusion studies represent variance, rather than process, research. Gathering data at several points in time is needed to overcome the limitations associated with retrospective accounts of behaviors and feelings, as well as to investigate unsuccessful innovations that do not make it to the adoption stage. Longitudinal research also can explore time ordering among factors and their phasic influences within the diffusion cycle.

### Planned Organizational Change

Changes affecting organizations are pervasive and increasing (Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004). Organizing for continuous change, therefore, is necessary to remain open to environmental shifts (Zorn, Page, & Cheney, 2000), especially globalization forces (see Parrish-Sprowl, this volume). Planned change allows organizations to control their adaptability, become self-reflexive, envision their future, determine a strategic plan, and communicate with organizational members to embrace the necessary changes to achieve that future (Goodstein, Nolan, & Pfeiffer, 1993).

*Planned organizational change* can be defined as “change that is brought about through the purposeful efforts of organizational members as opposed to change that is due to environmental or uncontrollable forces” (Lewis, Hamel, & Richardson, 2001, p. 9). Daft (1989) identified four categories that apply to planned organizational change: technology, administration, products and/or services, and human resources. These categories range from simple minor efforts, such as altering physical space or introducing a new procedure, to complex major efforts, such as introducing an organization-wide new communication technology or merging with another organization.

Planned organizational change is an umbrella term encompassing intervention, and intervention includes implementation. Planned change assumes that organizations decide to alter current processes, operations, and outcomes to become more efficient, profitable, competitive, and so forth. Interventions into current practices are planned to solve targeted problems or to foster improvement by implementing progressive change (see Frey & SunWolf, this volume).

Numerous theoretical perspectives seek to explain the processes and outcomes of planned organizational change (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Edmondson, 1996), but they cohere within four approaches. First, *open systems* perspectives (Schein, 1987; Senge, 1990) view change in organizations as influencing a system of inputs, throughputs, and outputs, with change in internal components causing changes in other (interdependent) components (e.g., people, structures, and tasks). Second, *process* approaches to change advance the systems perspective by investigating causal relationships between interdependent components of an organization and by focusing on throughputs as processes that mediate inputs and outcomes over time. Third, *cognitive* models of change processes capture how organizational members acquire, organize, and make sense of change

(Bartunek, Lacey, & Wood, 1992), suggesting that members' interpretations of change influence the overall environment of change in an organization through processes such as feedback, resistance, and concern for others. Finally, *organizational development* theories (e.g., French & Bell, 1999; Worren, Ruddle, & Moore, 1999) view change from organizational members' perspectives; involve a process of discarding old and learning new information; and focus on culture, leadership, and communication through changes in individual members' skills and attitudes.

Typically, organizations employ individual-based or team-based "change agents" to design and implement planned organizational changes. *Change agents* are the primary implementers of change, regardless of whether they are internal to an organization (e.g., members from different levels and functions of the organization) or external constituents or implementers (e.g., consultants). Lewis and Seibold (1998) proposed that planned change entails managing communication among those involved with and affected by organizational change (leaders, change agents, employees, and stakeholders), managing information communicated in favor of the plan and responses to it, and preparing organizational members to conduct work in a manner consistent with the plan. Here, we consider research on the role of communication processes in the design, implementation, and foci of planned organizational change.

### *Design of Planned Organizational Change*

Numerous areas of research and practice are associated with the design of planned organizational change. Organizational development programs are types of planned changes that seek to improve undesirable situations by increasing the functioning of individuals, work groups, and organizations, and by aiding organizational members to sustain efforts of continuous improvement (French & Bell, 1999). In contrast to organizational development, change management (e.g., Worren et al., 1999) instills behavioral change prior to attitudinal change or even instead of organizational learning. Through *experiencing* new change, organizational members begin to understand and embrace change efforts.

Zorn et al. (2000) investigated the logics managers invoke that, in turn, shape the way they communicate about, manage, and evaluate change in organizations. Utilizing a functional–romantic–critical framework and collecting data at a local government agency, Zorn et al. found that from a *functional* perspective, change is communicated as a necessity for improvement, managed via messages encouraging staff to enact a learning organization, and is evaluated for its effectiveness in furthering an organization's interests. From a *romantic* perspective, change is communicated as necessary for strengthening core organizational values and is managed and evaluated through inspiration and the sense of bonding it promotes among organizational members. From a *critical* perspective, change is communicated as manipulation and oppression of workers, managed through domination and re-creation of a system of concertive control, and is evaluated based on the transparent acceptance of top-down decisions. Their work on the different logics underlying change management activities, thus, illuminates communicative practices associated with the *design* of planned organizational change.

### *Implementation of Planned Organizational Change*

Scholars in communication (Larkin & Larkin, 1994; Lewis, 1997, 1999), training and development (DeWine, 2001), organizational psychology (King & Anderson, 1995), and organizational behavior (Worren et al., 1999) share at least three assumptions concerning organizational change implementation. First, given that organizations constantly are

changing, change programs must promote advances that are enduring and resilient (Illback & Zins, 1995). Of course, change is not perceived the same way by all organizational members; managers, implementers, users, and stakeholders often have different needs, perspectives, and reactions (Lewis, 1997). Such differences are evident in research on power dynamics, conflicts of interest, and resistance surrounding organizational change (Frost & Egri, 1991).

The second assumption is that organizational changes differ widely in terms of causes and effects. External pressures typically trigger organizational change, but change can be a function of internal pressures, such as employee dissatisfaction. Lewis et al. (2001) used a systems view to suggest that numerous situational, psychological, structural, environmental, and cultural factors influence the design and implementation of planned organizational changes. In particular, Lewis and Seibold (1993) noted that implementation activities tend to be influenced by the scope, novelty, and complexity of the planned change, and Lewis and Seibold (1998) indicated that the political context surrounding a change effort, timing and nature of the change, employees' participation throughout the implementation, and managers' expectations, interpretations, and influence all have significant effects on the results of an implementation process. In terms of its effects, Lewis (1999) found that planned change typically disrupts organizational work and relationships by introducing new structures, values, roles, and operations, as well as by implementing the change itself (e.g., new procedures, equipment, or personnel).

Change is not always welcome by organizational members (V. D. Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994); consequently, planned change efforts often are met with resistance and failure (King & Anderson, 1995; Lewis, 2000). Research has revealed many bases of such resistance and failure. Fullan, Miles, and Taylor (1980), for instance, suggested that inadequate systematic organizational assessments and poor problem clarification, inattention to organizational readiness for change, simplistic intervention packages, and the lack of follow-up procedures are some reasons why change efforts fail. Medved et al. (2001) asserted that ownership tension, or the conflict that key players face in accepting responsibility for the problem and ownership of the change process, is inherent and critical to the success of change implementation efforts. Among the causes and effects of failure and resistance to change is the high degree of uncertainty experienced by organizational members (Markus, 1983). Illback and Zins (1995) also noted that focusing on only one group of people in an organization undermines the systemic nature of organizations and explains why organizational change efforts fail 50 to 90% of the time, especially with mergers and business unit reengineering (Lewis, 2000), downsizing (Appelbaum, Close, & Klasa, 1999), and quality improvement programs (Beer, 2003).

The third assumption is that communication is an integral factor in the success of planned organizational change efforts (Covin & Kilmann, 1990). Some view communication merely as a tool (e.g., Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2008), whereas others view it as the process by which change occurs (Poole, Van de Ven, Dooley, & Holmes, 2000), and still others view it as part of the outcomes of change (Timmerman, 2003). In general, as Lewis and Seibold (1998) concluded, communication predicts the formation of people's attitudes regarding planned changes, resistance to change programs, behavioral coping responses to innovation, and the outcomes of organizational change programs.

### *Communication Foci of Planned Organizational Change*

Researchers have focused on a wide variety of communicative practices related to planned organizational change, such as framing a change-related vision (Fairhurst, 1993a), influence of information and social interaction on employees' participation in and anxiety

toward change (K. I. Miller & Monge, 1985; V. D. Miller et al., 1994), communication channels employed by organizational members and implementers during change (Fidler & Johnson, 1984; Lewis, 1997), and use of feedback to shape proposed changes (Johnson & Rice, 1987). In particular, research on communication and planned change has focused on information related to flow (e.g., feedback loops, valence, and directionality), channels (e.g., mediated vs. face-to-face), effects (e.g., employee participation, anxiety, and resistance), and the positioning of communication as an outcome or byproduct (e.g., feedback usefulness, increased social interaction, and communication as a challenge for change agents).

Although scholars agree that involving *employees* in the change process by providing them with relevant information is an important strategy (Fulk, 1993; Rice & Aydin, 1991), K. I. Miller and Monge (1985) pointed out that the matter is much more complex than just assuming that because employees have certain needs, any opportunity they have to fulfill them will likely lead to acceptance of change efforts. Indeed, ample research shows that employees often experience anxiety and uncertainty during change; thus, they experience other needs. Openness to change is related to employees' ability to fulfill their need for achievement, have access to high-quality information, and reduce ambiguity regarding their roles (V. D. Miller et al., 1994). Hence, participating in change efforts means providing employees with information necessary to fulfill these needs and having them feel a sense of control over the consequences of changing (Lewis, 2000).

V. D. Miller et al. (1994) concluded that employees' willingness to participate in planned organizational change indicates their intention to accept change and perform their duties in a manner consistent with that change. However, one major challenge that organizations continue to face in implementing change is getting employees to accept new ways of working (Cheney et al., 2004). Lewis and Seibold (1993) proposed that employees' communicative and other behavioral responses are triggered by their concerns regarding uncertainty and differential information access, acquisition and regulation of norms, and their performance in light of the changes. Lewis (1997) found that in addition to understanding resistance and receptivity, employees' responses—such as valence (positivity vs. negativity), the decidedness or firmness of the response, and the focus of the response (self vs. others)—went beyond the typical negativity toward change reported in the literature. Furthermore, Lewis and Seibold (1993, 1996) found that organizational members search for information, consider possible alternatives to a change, persuade others to support or not support the change, and formally resist the change altogether.

Change agents' assumptions concerning the change process, their view of communication during change, and their communication-related strategies for promoting change also are important to understanding planned organizational change. First, despite possible initial resistance, change agents assume that organizational members eventually will accept a change and take on the role of change agents themselves by spreading it to coworkers (Bartunek et al., 1992) with positive effects. However, research indicates that change agents overemphasize and overanticipate problems related to change resistance, despite a high likelihood that a particular change might be *welcome* by organizational members (Lewis, 2000). Second, J. D. Ford and Ford (1995) argued that the challenges change agents confront inherently are communicative. Indeed, Lewis (2000) found that implementers rank communication among the most problematic challenges, especially because they view it as related to employee resistance and conflict as predictors of failed change efforts. Third, change agents play a central role in influencing organizational members through their interactions with them. For instance, Lewis and Seibold (1998) found a pattern of characteristics—openness and responsiveness, comfort and ambiguity, and high self-concept—related to *how* change agents promote success during implementation.



In addition, change agents use multiple communication channels to convey information to, and receive it from, different organizational groups, with Lewis (1999) reporting that the amount of information conveyed and solicited differed significantly between employees and volunteers. Change agents also distinguish between information dissemination and solicitation. They tend to use small, informal discussions and general informational meetings to promote change, and they rely on word-of-mouth to disseminate information about planned change, but resort to informal, direct channels to solicit input.

A fundamental perception that management shares with professional change agents is that planned change is necessary (Zorn et al., 2000), employee resistance will happen (Deetz, 1992), and that such resistance must be overcome, although views concerning the pervasiveness of resistance and the need to counter it have been challenged (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). Hence, managers begin to conceive of change prior to understanding its implications and take it on as an “internal campaign.” To maintain the perception of stability, managers are faced with the need to implement change and develop a discourse of flexibility and openness about it, a notion that Cheney et al. (2004) termed the “dialectic of change-constancy.” Fairhurst (1993a) described management’s primary role during implementation as an internal marketing campaign, in which managers simultaneously disseminate and “sell” change information to mold an organization’s image and values and prevent employee resistance. In focusing on communicating change to employees to influence them, V. D. Miller et al. (1994) indicated that managers often overlook the influential role that workers’ needs and their social interactions with peers have on shaping upward expectations of a planned organizational change.

Organizational communication scholars, however, largely have ignored the role of internal and external stakeholders (e.g., investors, board members, and affiliates) and their interaction with change agents and other organizational members during planned organizational change. In a notable exception, Lewis et al. (2001) found that the perceived need for communication efficiency, and for consensus building, distinguished how implementers communicated change to stakeholders in six ways: (1) disseminating information equally, (2) accepting the participation of all stakeholders equally, (3) providing access to communication based only on the exchange of a valuable stakeholder resource (*quid pro quo*), (4) providing information on a need-to-know basis, (5) constructing messages targeted at specific stakeholders (marketing), and (6) communicating as events unfolded (reactionary).

Key questions for future research on planned organizational change include: During the stages of organizational change implementation, how are members connected via their communicative behavior? How does interdependence among organizational members influence their involvement, participation, and social interaction during the stages of planned change? What influences organizational members’ perceptions of change (e.g., uncertainty, information, and involvement) and how do these perceptions influence their communicative behavior with other members? How does communication as a process influence change outcomes? How are the various dualities that are inherent in change (Seo, Putnam, & Bartunek, 2003) communicatively *managed* during planned change initiatives?

### Trends in Applied Organizational Communication Research

Applied communication scholarship, in general, has taken at least three forms, each differentiated by how the relationship between theory and practice is viewed (Seibold, 2008). First, and particularly in its earliest form, applied research has been viewed as a *parallel* type of scholarship to basic research (G. R. Miller & Sunnafrank, 1984). Bifurcated as

“practice *and* theory,” they are seen as different research avenues and frequently of different status. Second, especially during the past 2 decades, applied communication research has been seen as the *intersection* of theory and practice (Petronio, 1999). Discussed in terms such as “theory *into* practice/theory *from* practice,” they are viewed as reciprocal when the foci and paths of each intersect. Third, and increasingly of late, there are calls for and efforts at the *integration* of theory and research (Barge, 2001). Conjoined as “theory *with* practice/practice *with* theory,” their recursive and mutually transformative potential has been underscored (Seibold, 2005; regarding the role of theory in applied communication research, see Barge & Craig, this volume; Frey & SunWolf, this volume).

Applied organizational communication scholarship reflects these forms and trends, as can be demonstrated in the four longstanding areas of research that we reviewed: organizational socialization, organizational culture, diffusion of organizational innovations, and planned organizational change. We first examine these areas of applied organizational communication scholarship in terms of the parallels, intersections, and integration of theory and practice, and then focus on the contributions of an emerging fourth form of applied organizational communication research—engaged scholarship.

### ***Parallel, Intersecting, and Integrated Applied Organizational Communication Research***

A number of the studies reviewed in the four areas represent applied organizational communication research that takes only a *parallel* view of the relationship between theory and practice. For an example from each area, see Jones’s (1986) study of organizational socialization tactics and their relevance for newcomer training, Schrodtt’s (2002) report of employee identification and organizational culture, findings by Albrecht and Hall (1991) concerning the importance of intraorganizational communication networks in facilitating discussion about innovations, and research by J. D. Ford and Ford (1995) on the role of conversations in organizational change.

However, there also is applied scholarship in the four areas in which theory and practice intersect or are integrated. The *intersection* of theory and practice, again to note but one example from each area, is most apparent in Jablin and Miller’s (1990) analysis of newcomer–supervisor role negotiation processes, Hylmö and Buzzanell’s (2002) exploration of the organizational (sub)cultures surrounding telecommuting practices in a federal agency, Flanagan’s (2000) research on the social pressures facilitating organizational Web-site adoption, and Lewis’s (2000) findings concerning implementers’ reports of communication problems associated with organizational change initiatives.

Scholarship in which theory and practice are *integrated* is evident in Ashforth et al.’s (1998) research on specific organizational contexts and newcomer adjustment, Pacanowsky’s (1988) examination of empowerment as part of the organizational culture at W. L. Gore, the role of work-team membership and communication dynamics on organizational innovation described in a larger study by Barker et al. (1993), and the approach to communicating organizational change proffered by Larkin and Larkin (1994) as the intersection of their reading of longstanding theoretical findings and their successes as practitioners in ongoing organizational change initiatives.

### ***Engaged Scholarship: Contributions to Integrating Theory and Practice***

The field of communication recently has witnessed calls for (Applegate, 2002), and efforts at (Simpson & Shockley-Zalaback, 2005), an extension to the integration of theory and

practice in applied communication scholarship that moves far beyond “application” of communication theory and research (C. Downs, 1999) and past the “translation” of scholarship into practice (Petronio, 1999). This fourth form of applied communication scholarship is a more “engaged” type (e.g., Barge, Simpson, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Cheney, Wilhelmsson, & Zorn, 2002), in which theory and practice are mutually transformative and so enmeshed as to be separable mainly for reflexive and analytical purposes. *Engaged scholarship* demonstrates a dynamic, oscillating interplay between situated practices and theoretical constructs (as though they simply are the same main transportation artery). As Seibold (2005) noted, such work is characterized by

much more involvement (even immersion) by engaged scholars [that includes] close work and learning *with* stakeholders, appropriation and application of theoretical work but *eclectically so* (and not simply as a theory-testing means to researchers’ scholarship ends), and *theory shaping and (re)formulation* throughout the process. (p. 15)

Many examples of engaged scholarship exist across the field of communication (e.g., the studies in Frey & Carragee, 2007), and this form of scholarship is discussed in other chapters in this volume (e.g., Frey & SunWolf). There also are noteworthy examples of *engaged organizational communication research*, and they are becoming more prevalent. For example, in the four areas examined in this chapter, Scott and Myers (2005) studied how municipal firefighters are socialized to manage their emotions, Cheney (1995) analyzed democracy at a workers’ cooperative in Spain, Rogers (1962) described how farmers learned about new agricultural methods and changed their farming practices, and Seibold (1995) detailed the creation of team management in a new design plant. We also cited engaged research in the introduction to the chapter, such as that conducted by Fairhurst (1993a), Kirby and Krone (2002), and Pearce and Pearce (2001; see also Pearce, Spano, & Pearce, this volume).

Other compelling, engaged organizational communication scholarship includes McPherson and Deetz’s (2005) reflexive account of the “jagged evolution” of their action research with participants engaged in merged high-tech cultures in a state university system, Thackaberry-Ziegler’s ongoing work with wildland firefighters (e.g., Thackaberry, 2004), and Eisenberg’s (2005) reflexive approach to service and consulting engagements (and the importance of conscious and reflexive communication for all parties). Not only is the level of scholar immersion in all of these studies quite deep (sometimes for years) and the theory–practice relationship fluid and evolving but, at times, the research also is cocreated by scholars, practitioners, and stakeholders (Simpson & Seibold, 2008). These works and others like them (cf. Harter, Scott, Novak, Leeman, & Morris, 2006; Lucas, 2007) represent a key addition to applied organizational communication scholarship.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, we framed applied organizational communication research as investigations of communication in organizational life that answer theoretically important questions *and* illuminate significant social issues, improve practices, or redress societal problems. Noting numerous areas of such scholarship in the introduction, and representative examples in each area, we focused on four areas in which communication is especially significant: organizational socialization/assimilation, organizational culture, diffusion of organizational innovations, and communication and planned organizational change. These four areas have long histories, multimethodological foundations,

programmatically and replicated findings, breadth of theoretical perspectives, analyses that cross micro and macro levels, and many implications for practice. Especially important, as shown in the last section of the chapter, theory and practice interpenetrate in each of these areas: There are examples in which the relationship is parallel and separate, other studies in which theory and practice intersect, and still others in which theory and practice are fully integrated. We concluded with reference to the emergence of a fourth form of applied organizational communication scholarship—engaged research. If the studies in this fourth area are emulated, and if they develop a critical mass of subsequent inquiry focused on the particular theoretical puzzles and practical challenges they raise, engaged scholarship will become a mainstay of organizational communication research in the future. When that process occurs, the term *applied* organizational communication research will be redundant.

## References

- Albrecht, T. L., & Hall, B. J. (1991). Facilitating talk about new ideas: The role of personal relationships in organizational innovation. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 273–288.
- Allen, B. J. (2005). Social constructionism. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication: Theory and research* (pp. 35–54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, M. W., Walker, K. L., Coopman, S. J., & Hart, J. (2007). Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21, 172–200.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Close, T. G., & Klasa, S. (1999). Downsizing: An examination of some successes and more failures. *Management Decision*, 37, 424–436.
- Applegate, J. L. (2002, January). Communication as an engaged discipline: Seeing with new eyes and skating to where the puck will be. *Spectra*, 38, pp. 7–15.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Feminist organizational communication studies: Engaging gender in public and private. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication: Theory and research* (pp. 141–170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ashcraft, K. L., & Trethewey, A. (2004). Developing tension: An agenda for applied research on the organization of irrationality. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 32, 171–181.
- Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 465–487.
- Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 199–214.
- Ashford, S. J., & Taylor, M. (1990). Adaptation to work transitions: An integrative approach. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–39). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ashford, S. J., & Tsui, A. S. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 251–280.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Saks, A. M. (1996). Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 149–178.
- Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1998). Socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of organizational context. *Human Relations*, 51, 897–926.
- Barge, J. K. (1994a). *Leadership: Communication skills for organizations and groups*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Barge, J. K. (1994b). Putting leadership back to work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 8, 95–109.
- Barge, J. K. (2001). Practical theory as mapping, engaged reflection, and transformative practice. *Communication Theory*, 11, 5–13.
- Barge, J. K. (2004). Reflexivity and managerial practice. *Communication Monographs*, 71, 70–96.
- Barge, J. K., & Schlueter, D. W. (2004). Memorable messages and newcomer socialization. *Western Journal of Communication*, 68, 233–256.

- Barge, J. K., Simpson, J. L., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (Eds.). (2008). Toward purposeful and practical models of engaged scholarship [Special forum]. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 36, 243–297.
- Barker, J. R., Melville, C. W., & Pacanowsky, M. E. (1993). Self-directed teams at XEL: Changes in communication practices during a program of cultural transformation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 297–312.
- Bartunek, J. M., Lacey, C. A., & Wood, D. R. (1992). Social cognition in organizational change: An insider-outsider approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28, 204–223.
- Becker, J. A. H., & O’Hair, H. D. (2007). Machiavellians’ motives in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35, 246–267.
- Beer, M. (2003). Why total quality management programs do not persist: The role of management quality and implications for leading a TQM transformation. *Decision Sciences*, 34, 623–642.
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (Eds.). (2000). *Breaking the code of change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2002). Building on the past: Enacting established personal identities in a new work setting. *Organization Science*, 13, 636–652.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bridges, W. (1995). *Jobsift: How to prosper in a workplace without jobs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Broome, B. J. (1995). The role of facilitated group process in community-based planning and design: Promoting greater participation in Comanche tribal governance. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *Innovations in group facilitation: Applications in natural settings* (pp. 27–52). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Bullis, C., & Bach, B. W. (1989). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in organizational identification. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 273–293.
- Buzzanell, P. M., & Meina, L. (2005). Struggling with maternity leave policies and practices: A poststructuralist feminist analysis of gendered organizing. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 33, 1–25.
- Casey, M. K., Miller, V. D., & Johnson, J. R. (1997). Survivors’ information seeking following a reduction in workforce. *Communication Research*, 24, 755–781.
- Chao, G., O’Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 730–743.
- Cheney, G. (1995). Democracy in the workplace: Theory and practice from the perspective of communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23, 167–200.
- Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, T. E., Jr., & Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections, practices*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Cheney, G., Wilhelmsson, M., & Zorn, T. E., Jr. (2002). 10 strategies for engaged scholarship. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 92–101.
- Clampitt, P. G. (2009). *Communicating for managerial effectiveness* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Covin, T. J., & Kilmann, R. H. (1990). Participant perceptions of positive and negative influences on large-scale change. *Group & Organization Management*, 15, 233–248.
- Daft, R. L. (1989). *Organization theory and design* (3rd ed.). St Paul, MN: West.
- Damanpour, F. (1987). The adoption of technological, administrative, and ancillary innovations: Impact of organizational factors. *Journal of Management*, 13, 675–688.
- Deetz, S. A. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S. G. (1999). Challenging “resistance to change.” *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 25–41.
- DeWine, S. (2001). *The consultant’s craft: Improving organizational communication* (2nd ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s Press.
- DiSanza, J. R. (1995). Bank teller organizational assimilation in a system of contradictory practices. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9, 191–218.



- Downing, J. R. (2007). No greater sacrifice: American Airlines employee crisis response to the September 11 attack. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35, 350–375.
- Downs, C. (1999). Challenges for the application of organizational communication. In P. J. Salem (Ed.), *Organizational communication and change* (pp. 243–258). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Downs, G. W., Jr., & Mohr, L. B. (1976). Conceptual issues in the study of innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 700–714.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1996). Three faces of Eden: The persistence of competing theories and multiple diagnoses in organizational intervention research. *Human Relations*, 49, 571–595.
- Eisenberg, E. M. (2005). Creating clearings for communication. In J. L. Simpson & P. Shockley-Zalabak (Eds.), *Engaging communication, transforming organizations: Scholarship of engagement in action* (pp. 113–125). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Eisenberg, E. M., & Riley, P. (2001). Organizational culture. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 291–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Employee Tenure in 2004. (2004, September 21). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved July 29, 2007, from [http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/tenure\\_09212004.pdf](http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/tenure_09212004.pdf)
- Employee Tenure Summary. (2006, September 8). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/tenure.nr0.htm>
- Fairhurst, G. T. (1993a). Echoes of the vision: When the rest of the organization talks total quality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6, 331–371.
- Fairhurst, G. T. (1993b). The leader–member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 321–351.
- Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). *Discursive leadership: In conversation with leadership psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fairhurst, G. T., Rogers, L. E., & Sarr, R. A. (1987). Manager–subordinate control patterns and judgments about the relationship. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 10, pp. 395–415). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Sarr, R. A. (1996). *The art of framing: Managing the language of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fidler, L. A., & Johnson, J. D. (1984). Communication and innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 704–711.
- Flanagin, A. J. (2000). Social pressures on organizational Website adoption. *Human Communication Research*, 26, 618–646.
- Flanagin, A. J., & Waldeck, J. H. (2004). Technology use and organizational newcomer socialization. *Journal of Business Communication*, 41, 137–165.
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 541–570.
- Ford, W. S. Z., & Etienne, C. N. (1994). Can I help you? A framework for the interdisciplinary research on customer service encounters. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7, 413–441.
- Forward, G. L. (1999). Encountering the nonprofit organization: Clergy uncertainty and information-seeking during organizational entry. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 22, 190–213.
- French, W. L., & Bell, C. H., Jr. (1999). *Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organization improvement* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Frey, L. R., & Carragee, K. M. (Eds.). (2007). *Communication activism* (2 Vols.). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Frost, P. J., & Egri, C. P. (1991). The political process of innovation. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 229–295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., & Martin, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Reframing organizational culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fulk, J. (1993). Social construction of communication technology. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 921–950.

- Fullan, M., Miles, M. B., & Taylor, G. (1980). Organization development in schools: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 121–183.
- Gibson, M. K., & Papa, M. J. (2000). The mud, the blood, and the beer guys: Organizational osmosis in blue-collar work groups. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28, 68–88.
- Goodstein, L. D., Nolan, T. M., & Pfeiffer, J. W. (1993). *Applied strategic planning: A comprehensive guide*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gruman, J. A., Saks, A. M., & Zweig, D. I. (2006). Organizational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 90–104.
- Harris, T. E., & Nelson, D. E. (2008). *Applied organizational communication: Theory and practice in a global environment* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harter, L. M., Scott, J. A., Novak, D. R., Leeman, M., & Morris, J. F. (2006). Freedom through flight: Performing a counter-narrative of disability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 34, 3–29.
- Hartline, M. D., & De Witt, T. (2004). Individual differences among service employees: The conundrum of employee recruitment, selection, and retention. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 3(2–3), 25–32.
- Hecht, M. L., & Parrott, R. (2002). Creating a departmental culture for communication grants. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30, 382–392.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hess, J. A. (1993). Assimilating newcomers into an organization: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 189–210.
- Holder, T. (1996). Women in nontraditional organizations: Information-seeking during organizational entry. *Journal of Business Communication*, 33, 9–26.
- Hylmö, A., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2002). Telecommuting as viewed through cultural lenses: An empirical investigation of the discourses of utopia, identity, and mystery. *Communication Monographs*, 69, 329–356.
- Illback, R. J., & Zins, J. E. (1995). Organizational interventions in educational settings. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 6, 217–236.
- Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 679–740). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jablin, F. M. (2001). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 732–818). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jablin, F. M., & Miller, V. D. (1990). Interviewer and applicant questioning behavior in employment interviews. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4, 51–86.
- Johnson, B. M., & Rice, R. E. (1987). *Managing organizational innovation: The evolution from word processing to office information systems*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 262–279.
- Kim, T.-Y., Cable, D. M., & Kim, S.-P. (2005). Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person–organization fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 232–241.
- King, N., & Anderson, N. (1995). *Innovation and change in organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Kirby, E. L., & Krone, K. J. (2002). “The policy exists but you can't really use it”: Communication and the structuration of work–family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30, 50–77.
- Kramer, M. W. (1993). Communication and uncertainty reduction during job transfers: Leaving and joining processes. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 178–198.
- Kramer, M. W., Callister, R. R., & Turban, D. B. (1995). Information-receiving and information-giving during job transitions. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 151–170.
- Kramer, M. W., & Miller, V. D. (1999). A response to criticisms of organizational socialization research: In support of contemporary conceptualizations of organizational assimilation. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 358–367.

- Kramer, M. W., & Noland, T. L. (1999). Communication during job promotions: A case of ongoing assimilation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 335–355.
- Larkin, T. J., & Larkin, S. (1994). *Communicating change: How to win employee support for new business directions*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levy, P. E., Albright, M. D., Cawley, B. D., & Williams, J. R. (1995). Situational and individual determinants of feedback seeking: A closer look at the process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62, 23–37.
- Lewis, L. K. (1997). Users' individual communicative responses to intraorganizationally implemented innovations and other planned changes. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10, 455–490.
- Lewis, L. K. (1999). Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organizational change: Implementers' targets, sources, and channels for communicating. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 43–75.
- Lewis, L. K. (2000). "Blindsided by that one" and "I saw that one coming": The relative anticipation and occurrence of communication problems and other problems in implementers' hindsight. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28, 44–67.
- Lewis, L. K., Hamel, S. A., & Richardson, B. K. (2001). Communicating change to nonprofit stakeholders: Models and predictors of implementers' approaches. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 5–41.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1993). Innovation modification during intraorganizational adoption. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 322–354.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1996). Communication during intraorganizational innovation adoption: Predicting users' behavioral coping responses to innovations in organizations. *Communication Monographs*, 63, 130–157.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1998). Reconceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: A review of literature and research agenda. In M. E. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 21, pp. 93–151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lucas, K. (2007). Problematic providing and protecting: The occupational narrative of the working class. In W. DeGenaro (Ed.), *Who says? Working-class rhetoric, class consciousness, and community* (pp. 180–199). Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Markus, M. L. (1983). Power, politics, and MIS implementation. *Communications of the ACM*, 26, 430–444.
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McPherson, J., & Deetz, S. (2005). A high-tech organizational change initiative in the public sector: Theory engaged in practice. In J. L. Simpson & P. Shockley-Zalabak (Eds.), *Engaging communication, transforming organizations: Scholarship of engagement in action* (pp. 79–98). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Medved, C. E., Morrison, K., Dearing, J. W., Larson, R. S., Cline, G., & Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2001). Tensions in community health improvement initiatives: Communication and collaboration in a managed care environment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 137–152.
- Miller, D., & Desmarais, S. (2007). Developing your talent to the next level: Five best practices for leadership development. *Organization Development Journal*, 25, 37–43.
- Miller, G. R., & Sunnafrank, M. J. (1984). Theoretical dimensions of applied communication research. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 255–263.
- Miller, K. I. (2007). Compassionate communication in the workplace: Exploring processes of noticing, connecting, and responding. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35, 223–245.
- Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. (1985). Social information and employee anxiety about organizational change. *Human Communication Research*, 11, 365–386.
- Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. (1987). The development and test of a system of organizational participation and allocation. In M. L. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 10, pp. 431–455). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Miller, V. D. (1996). An experimental study of newcomers' information seeking behaviors during organizational entry. *Communication Studies*, 47, 1–24.

- Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 92–120.
- Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 22, 59–80.
- Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., Hart, Z., & Peterson, D. L. (1999). A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 24–48.
- Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (2001). Socialization in organizations and work groups. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 69–112). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 557–589.
- Morrison, E. W. (1995). Information usefulness and acquisition during organizational encounter. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9, 131–155.
- Morrison, E. W., & Bies, R. J. (1991). Impression management in the feedback-seeking process: A literature review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 522–541.
- Morrison, E. W., & Cummings, L. L. (1992). The impact of diagnosticity and performance expectations on feedback seeking behavior. *Human Performance*, 5, 251–264.
- Murphy, B. O. (1995). Promoting dialogue in culturally diverse workplace environments. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *Innovations in group facilitation: Applications in natural settings* (pp. 77–93). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Myers, K. K. (2005). A burning desire: Assimilation into a fire department. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18, 344–384.
- Myers, K. K. (2006). Assimilation and mutual acceptance. In J. H. Greenhaus & G. A. Callanan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of career development* (pp. 31–32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Myers, K. K., & McPhee, R. D. (2006). Influences on member assimilation in workgroups in high-reliability organizations: A multilevel analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 32, 440–468.
- Myers, K. K., & Oetzel, J. G. (2003). Exploring the dimensions of organizational assimilation: Creating and validating a measure. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 438–457.
- Pacanowsky, M. E. (1988). Communication and the empowering organization. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 11, pp. 356–379). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Parker, P. S. (2001). African American women executives' leadership communication within dominant-culture organizations: (Re)conceptualizing notions of collaboration and instrumentality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 42–82.
- Pearce, K. A., & Pearce, W. B. (2001). The Public Dialogue Consortium's school-wide dialogue process: A communication approach to develop citizenship skills and enhance school climate. *Communication Theory*, 11, 105–123.
- Petronio, S. (1999). "Translating scholarship into practice": An alternative metaphor. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 87–91.
- Poole, M. S., Van de Ven, A. H., Dooley, K., & Holmes, M. E. (2000). *Organizational change and innovation processes: Theory and methods for research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rice, R. E., & Aydin, C. (1991). Attitudes toward new organizational technology: Network proximity as a mechanism for social information processing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 219–244.
- Riley, P. (1993). Arguing for "ritualistic" pluralism: The tension between privilege and the mundane. In S. A. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 16, pp. 112–121). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Rogers, E. M. (2000). Reflections on news event diffusion research. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77, 561–576.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Rosenfeld, L. B., Richman, J. M., & May, S. K. (2004). Information adequacy, job satisfaction and organizational culture in a dispersed-network organization. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 32, 28–54.

- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). Proactive socialization and behavioral self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 301–323.
- Scheibel, D. (1994). Graffiti and “film school” culture: Displaying alienation. *Communication Monographs*, 61, 1–18.
- Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Sloan Management Review*, 12, 3–16.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). *Process consultation: Vol. 2. Lessons for managers and consultants*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schrodt, P. (2002). The relationship between organizational identification and organizational culture: Employee perceptions of culture and identification in a retail sales organization. *Communication Studies*, 53, 189–202.
- Scott, C., & Myers, K. K. (2005). The socialization of emotion: Learning emotion management at the fire station. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 33, 67–92.
- Seibold, D. R. (1995). Developing the “team” in a team-managed organization: Group facilitation in a new plant design. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *Innovations in group facilitation: Applications in natural settings* (pp. 282–298). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Seibold, D. R. (2005). Bridging theory and practice in organizational communication. In J. L. Simpson & P. Shockley-Zalabak (Eds.), *Engaging communication, transforming organizations: Scholarship of engagement in action* (pp. 13–44). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Seibold, D. R. (2008). Applied communication research. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication* (Vol. 1., pp. 189–194). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Seibold, D. R., Kudsi, S., & Rude, M. (1993). Does communication training make a difference? Evidence for the effectiveness of a presentation skills program. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 111–131.
- Seibold, D. R., & Shea, C. (2001). Participation and decision making. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 664–703). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Seo, M., Putnam, L. L., & Bartunek, J. (2003). Dualities and tensions of planned organizational change. In M. S. Poole & A. Van de Ven (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational change* (pp. 73–107). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Morley, D. D. (1994). Creating a culture: A longitudinal examination of the influence of management and employee values on communication rule stability and emergence. *Human Communication Research*, 20, 334–355.
- Sias, P. M., & Wyers, T. D. (2001). Employee uncertainty and information-seeking in newly formed expansion organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 549–573.
- Simpson, J. L., & Seibold, D. R. (2008). Practical engagements and co-created research. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 36, 265–279.
- Simpson, J. L., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Engaging communication, transforming organizations: Scholarship of engagement in action*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Smith, F. L., & Keyton, J. (2001). Organizational storytelling: Metaphors for relational power and identity struggles. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 149–182.
- Smith, R. C., & Eisenberg, E. (1987). Conflict at Disneyland: A root-metaphor analysis. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 367–380.
- Steward, B. (2000). Changing times: The meaning, measurement and use of time in teleworking. *Time and Society*, 9, 57–74.
- Stohl, C. (1986). The role of memorable messages in the process of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly*, 34, 231–249.
- Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: Communication and dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 349–407.



- Strang, D., & Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 265–290.
- Sultan, F., & Farley, J. U., & Lehmann, D. R. (1990). A meta-analysis of applications of diffusion models. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, 70–77.
- Swanson, E. B. (1994). Information systems innovation among organizations. *Management Science*, 40, 1069–1090.
- Teboul, J. C. B. (1995). Determinants of new hire information-seeking during organizational encounter. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 305–325.
- Teboul, J. C. B. (1999). Racial/ethnic “encounter” in the workplace: Uncertainty, information-seeking, and learning patterns among racial/ethnic majority and minority new hires. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 10, 97–121.
- Thackaberry, J. A. (2004). “Discursive opening” and closing in organizational self-study: Culture as trap and tool in wildland firefighting safety. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17, 319–359.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Timmerman, C. E. (2003). Media selection during the implementation of planned organizational change: A predictive framework based on implementation approach and phase. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 301–340.
- Tornatzky, L. G., & Klein, K. J. (1982). Innovation characteristics and innovation adoption implementation: A meta-analysis of findings. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 29, 28–45.
- Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20, 148–185.
- Trujillo, N. (1992). Interpreting (the work and talk of) baseball: Perspectives on ballpark culture. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 350–371.
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Scarpello, V. (1990). The matching model: An examination of the processes underlying realistic job previews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 60–67.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 7, 19–36.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1., pp. 209–264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Volkema, R. J., Bergmann, T. J., & Farquhar, K. (1997). Use and impact of informal third-party discussions in interpersonal conflicts at work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 11, 185–216.
- Wagoner, R., & Waldron, V. R. (1999). How supervisors convey routine bad news: Facework at UPS. *Southern Communication Journal*, 64, 193–210.
- Waldeck, J. H., Seibold, D. R., & Flanagin, A. J. (2004). Organizational assimilation and communication technology use. *Communication Monographs*, 71, 161–183.
- Waldron, V. R. (2000). Relational experiences and emotion at work. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (2nd ed., pp. 64–82). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Witmer, D. F. (1997). Communication and recovery: Structuration as an ontological approach to organizational culture. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 324–349.
- Worren, N. A. M., Ruddle, K., & Moore, K. (1999). From organizational development to change management: The emergence of a new profession. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 273–286.
- Zorn, T. E., & Gregory, K. W. (2005). Learning the ropes together: Assimilation and friendship development among first-year medical students. *Health Communication*, 17, 211–231.
- Zorn, T. E., Page, D. J., & Cheney, G. (2000). Nuts about change: Multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public sector organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 515–566.