

## **THE SUBJECTIVITIES OF CHANGE**

Key factors in making sense of formal change communication

Colleen E. Mills

Department of Management

University of Canterbury

Christchurch

New Zealand

**Abstract**

*The process of organisational change is an increasingly popular theme in the organisational communication literature (Lewis & Seibold, 1996). Even so few studies have examined change communication and stakeholders' responses to this communication. In particular, there continues to be a dearth of research explicating the way employees make sense of the communication that accompanies an organisational change. This is despite growing evidence that sensemaking about communication plays a key role in determining the outcome of organisational change processes. This empirical working paper presents findings from a qualitative study of a CEO succession that seeks to address this shortcoming by comparing how employees at different levels in a large public organisation make sense of formal change communication. The findings so far are suggesting significant roles for notions of role and responsibility, entitlement, leadership and engagement in workers' sensemaking about organisational communication during CEO change. They are also confirming the pervasiveness and significance of informal communication in workplace sensemaking about formal change communication. In so doing, the findings challenge the utility of instrumental and dissemination models for understanding or managing internal change communication and confirm the desirability of anticipating the complexities and subjectivities of sensemaking behaviour when planning change communication.*

**KEY WORDS:** *organisational change, change communication, formal communication, sensemaking, communication models*

**STREAM:** *Organisational and Management Communication*

## **The subjectivities of change: Key factors in making sense of formal change communication**

### **Introduction**

The process of organisational change is an increasingly popular theme in the organisational communication literature (Lewis & Seibold, 1996) yet only a handful of studies (e.g., Chin, 1996; Friedman & Saul, 1991; Weenig, 1999) have examined change communication and stakeholders' responses to this communication. In particular, there continues to be a dearth of research explicating the way employees make sense of the communication that accompanies an organisational change. This is despite a growing number of studies examining channel and media choices for communication during change management processes (e.g., Lewis, 1999; Timmerman, 2003) and evidence that sensemaking about communication plays a key role in determining the outcome of these processes (Kitchen & Daly, 2002; Lewis, 1999).

There are many forms of organisational change including restructuring, down sizing, mergers, market repositioning, the introduction of new technology, and closures. This paper considers a common and relatively straightforward type of organisational change, that of chief executive officer (CEO) succession. The significance to the organisation plus the predictability of the process makes it an excellent change process to study, particularly when the research focus is something as complex as organisational members' sensemaking processes during change.

This paper presents findings from a qualitative study of sensemaking during a CEO succession in a large public. It begins by briefly reviewing relevant sections of the change, sensemaking, CEO succession, and organisational communication literatures. It then presents and discusses four key lenses workers at different levels in the organisation applied when making sense of the formal written succession communication that occurred during the period immediately prior to their CEO's departure. The findings, while still provisional, suggest a sensemaking approach to change communication has enormous potential, not only for explaining the impact of this communication on employees, but also for revealing the cultural and operational heart of an organisation. In so doing, the paper provides valuable insights for both organisational scholars and managers interested in understanding the subjective nature of employees' realities and managing organisational change communication.

### **Organisational change**

There is an extensive body of organisational change literature dating back at least to the 1950's when change first became a popular research focus. Since then ongoing and at times radical change has become inevitable in most organisations with the result that change is now deemed to be 'the single most important issue' for managers and administrators (Nilakant & Ramnarayan, 1998). This is largely due to the magnitude of the consequences of change for both organisational members and their organisations (Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998, p. 25). Not surprisingly, then, the change literature is growing exponentially. (See Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) for a review of change theory and research in the 1990s.)

Change management models abound. (For a full review see Lewis and Seibold, 1998). A quick search reveals a plethora of books and articles detailing models such as Kotter's (1995) eight step to leading change, Kanter, Stein, and Jick's (1992) ten commandments of change, and Nilakant and Ramnarayan's (1998) seven steps for achieving discontinuous change. These models generally present organisational change as a linear process that progresses through distinct phases. The critics argue that this produces an oversimplified view of the change process and its antecedents (Abbott, 1988; Stevenson & Greenberg, 1998; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). There are some changes, however that are linear and simple yet have profound effects on the organisations that experience them. CEO change is one such change. It essentially involves three phases; a pre-CEO departure phase, the appointment phase and the establishment or post-new CEO arrival phase. While these phases may vary in length and the degree to which they overlap, the linear sequence prevails in all CEO change situations.

### **Sensemaking about organisational experience**

According to Weick (1995, p. 133) 'Sensemaking is about the enlargement of small cues. It is a search for contexts within which small details fit together and make sense.' It is more than a matter of piecing together fragments of information, however. It is also about the meaning of these fragments. According to Weick (1995, p. 132), this meaning has to do with what gets connected to what and the nature of the connections made. You could say it is not about the pieces of a mosaic alone. It is also about the glue that holds the pieces together and where they are placed.

Organisations can be viewed as sensemaking systems, constantly seeking to understand and stabilise the internal and external environments in which they exist in order to make them seem sensible and organised. Sensemaking scholars have studied many aspects of organisational life. However, much of the organisational sensemaking literature has emerged from studies of managerial sensemaking (e.g., policy making (Feldman, 1989)). Many of these studies have narrowly focussed on managers thinking with regard to difficult or problem tasks they must manage. This 'problem bias' has carried through into the studies of workers' sensemaking. Most studies of workers' sensemaking have concentrated upon work tasks or situations characterised by problems, uncertainty, ambiguity and stress (e.g., allocating budgets (Pearman, 1993) or changes (Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Ogawa, 1991)). In the managerial and organisational studies literature up until the mid 1990s, this problem and task-centred orientation was particularly noticeable (Walsh, 1995, p. 281). It reflected a pragmatic tradition of concern for performance and adaptation in the workplace and a desire to seek ways to manage these, rather than a desire to understanding employees' reality. Cummings, Long and Lewis (1987, p. 32) propose that this pragmatic, 'managerial bias' (Mumby, 1988, p. 2; Silverman, 1971; Benson, 1977) reflects organisational researchers' preoccupation with the problems inherent in co-ordinating work activities. Little wonder then that there are relatively few studies of non-managerial or non-professional workers' sensemaking. There are even fewer studies examining workers sensemaking about workplace communication and only one or two that address sensemaking about change communication.

### **Sensemaking and organisational change**

Several studies have linked sensemaking to change. Gioia and Thomas (1996) conducted a case study of a large research university followed by a quantitative study of personnel in 372 colleges and universities to examine how top management made sense of important issues associated with the changing environments in modern academia. They found that the desired future institutional image and identity were key 'lenses' used by management to make sense of organisation-level issues. These lenses led to issues being classified as strategic or political rather than the more commonly used categories of opportunities and threats.

In an earlier study of the initiation of change in a university, Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991) found that the CEO's primary roles in this change were best described as sensemaker and sensegiver. The steps in the change process were accompanied by cycles of sensemaking followed by sensegiving. These the authors termed cognition and action respectively. These findings are significant because they demonstrate the centrality of sensemaking (and sensegiving) to organisational change processes.

### **Sensemaking about CEO succession**

While there is an established literature on CEO succession planning, selection, and organisational outcomes (For a comprehensive review see Kesner & Sebor, 1994), few studies specifically address sensemaking during CEO succession. The most notable is by Ogawa (1991) who examined the sense teachers made of the succession of their principal. Group norms and the characteristics of the succession process were found to be important to the teachers' three phases of sensemaking; enchantment, disenchantment, and accommodation. This study showed how teachers' expectation that inevitably a new principal would bring change provided a lens through which the principal's actions were interpreted.

It also showed how change created issues. When these signalled that the sensemaker's personal interests might be violated they were associated with shifts in the sense made. Furthermore, when the changes were considered to be undesirable then the perpetrator, the principal, was seen to be serving his own agenda rather than that of the teachers or the school community. He was not seen to be working for the common interests and a 'him and us' attitude was accentuated.

In a companion study, Fauske & Ogawa (1987) found that detachment, fear and hope characterised pre-succession sensemaking. This sensemaking was found to be closely linked to the post-succession sensemaking reported in Ogawa's (1991) study. The pre-succession attitudes, beliefs and desires provided a framework for post-succession assessments. In particular, the persistence of the expectation that succession would bring change was linked to a pre-succession desire that the new principal would bring about positive changes.

### **Sensemaking, change, and communication**

What is particularly interesting is how few communication scholars have turned their attention to sensemaking about organisational communication during change processes

such as CEO succession. Prior to the mid-1980s the same problem orientation that predominated in the sensemaking research was evident in organisational communication research. It was generally assumed that the purpose of organisational communication research was to contribute to the understanding of organisations by uncovering causal relations. This, according to Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982, p. 116), meant that the primary task of the communication researcher was 'the linking of communication variables to organisational outcome variables, such as productivity, survival, or effectiveness.' This approach mirrored the intended audience, namely communication managers and managers generally, and their interest in the consequences of communicative behaviour. According to Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo, the result is that organisational researchers have tended to overlook the fact that not all organisational communication is about getting the job done.

Much of the organisational studies literature portrays organisational change as 'something separate from communication' (Ford & Ford, 1995). Communication is portrayed as both a tool and explanation for the outcomes of organisational change processes (Albrecht & Ropp, 1984; Fulk, Schmitz, & Steinfield, 1990; Lewis, 2000; Lewis & Seibold, 1993; Rogers, 1995; Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 1989). Ford and Ford, however, challenge this separation. They argue communication needs to be conceptualised as the substrate in which change is embedded. If we accept this perspective, it is easy to appreciate why the sense organisational members make of this communication substrate during important change processes such as CEO succession needs to be explicated. The overall study from which the data for this paper were drawn set out to do just that; to uncover the sense employees make of the substrate of CEO change.

### **The organisation**

The organisation studied operates across a large geographic region with staff aggregated in three offices and 15 depots. The bulk of employees are in the head office in a main city with the remainder in two regional offices, located in smaller centres 2-3 hours from the head office, and the 15 depots. Communication between sites is by email except for the smallest depots. These do not have internet access and rely on faxed copies of emails.

The governing body has elected members drawn from the communities in the region served by the organisation. The executive, located at the head office, consists of five directors and a CEO. Some employees have local responsibilities while others have regional responsibilities or a mix of the two. This means that the two regional offices are not miniature versions of the head office. Some employees work in teams while other work largely independently, due in part to the fact that the organisation is one deep in places. This means work-based networks vary considerably. People at the same level in the organisation can have quite different levels of contact with their superiors, peers, and subordinates.

### **Research approach**

#### **Research Questions**

The overall study sought to answer the following questions:

- a. What factors do employees take into account when making sense of CEO succession?
- b. What roles does organisational communication play in the sensemaking process?
- c. How does sensemaking vary across the stages of CEO succession?
- d. How does an employee's position in the organisation influence his/her sensemaking behaviour?
- e. How well do existing models of organisational sensemaking predict the findings of this study?

## **Participants**

The employees of the organisation cover a wide range of professional, scientific, technical, administrative, semi-skilled, and unskilled employment categories. The 33 participants reflect the reporting lines that exist across the five divisions and the organisation's dispersed facilities rather than these employment categories. The sample included 8 women and 25 men and full-time and part-time workers. Some were recent recruits while others had employment histories extending back to organisations which merged in 1989 to form the current organisation.

## **Data collection and analysis**

With two exceptions, participants were interviewed three times over the succession process and asked to describe and account for the change communication they encountered. The semi-structured interviews were taped and examined to establish the conceptual frameworks used to make sense of change communication and the way these varied across the organisation. This paper reports on the analysis of data about formal written communication in the pre-CEO departure phase. This phase commenced with the announcement of the CEO's intention to retire and finished with his departure. The formal written change communication in this phase consisted of a series of 'All Staff' emails and a newsletter from the departing CEO. (See table one).

Insert table 1 about here

## **Findings**

This section describes four key themes that have emerged from the analysis of employees' accounts of the written change communication in stage one of the succession process. These themes are the interrelated notions of role and responsibility, entitlement, leadership, and engagement that participants used as lenses through which they viewed change communication in order to make sense of it.

### **Role and responsibility**

Each interviewee expressed a distinctive view of his/her role in the organisation and the responsibilities associated with this role when making sense of organisational communication. Workers at level-one (i.e., those that report directly to the CEO) perceived their operational role as being one of leadership. This role necessitated

engaging in discussions with the CEO, elected members of the governing body and staff generally but not exclusively at the two levels immediately below, disseminating information and instructions downwards, and collecting feedback both downwards and upwards. Directly and indirectly, level-one interviewees described their role in downward communication as involving some degree of filtering or buffering between the political wing of the organisation and the operation corpus. Their notion of their role included an expectation that they would engage in two-way upward (i.e., with the CEO and governing body) and downward (i.e., with immediate reports and all staff) communication and have access to more information than they shared downwards. What was particularly interesting was that these interviewees expected these expectations to be realised during the CEO succession process. They were not.

During the pre-departure phase two-way informal exchanges between those driving the succession process (i.e., the governing body) and those at level one were reduced to a few reportedly limited informal exchanges with elected members. The formal communication between these parties was the same as for all other staff in the organisation. This restricted communication prompted an increase in informal horizontal exchanges between level-one staff. What was interesting was that this increase tended to follow existing patterns. The desire to engage other level-one employees in discussions about the succession process and its actual or perceived outcomes was not sufficient to substantially change existing informal interactional patterns.

Employees elsewhere in the organisation received the same formal succession-related communication as level-one employees. Only those who did not have computers or were located at distant sites did not receive all the All Staff emails and the newsletter. Many reported that this communication was both quantitatively and qualitatively better than they expected. Apart from those (estimated to be between 20 and 27) who responded to the call for input on CEO characteristics, the experience of employees from level two downwards compared with those at level one. For all employees formal change communication in phase one of the succession process was essentially one-way.

What differed markedly was the sense lower level employees made of this communication. In general, when asked to account for the media, channels, and content of downward communication during phase one, workers from level two and below considered it to be appropriate. When asked to explain their notions of appropriateness they referred back to their place and role in the organisation. Each worker held a clear view of what sort of communication was appropriate given his or her role and responsibilities. The further an employee was down the line of command the more one-way and top-down was deemed to be appropriate succession communication. This explains why the most surprising aspect of the written formal communication in phase one was the request to contribute three desirable CEO. This violated this expectation that change communication was on-way.

At the depots where employees could be from level four to nine in the organisation only one or two staff were linked to the head office by email formal communication. Those at the most distant levels expected succession communication to be publicly rather than

personally disseminated. The usual vehicle for this was the tea room notice board. Again these employees used their role and level in the organisation to account for this way of communicating. Only those dealing directly with the public questioned the appropriateness of their tenuous link with those issuing All Staff messages.

Taken as a whole, the data suggest that role and relationship-specific notions of appropriateness with regard to communication were key inputs into the sensemaking about the phase one formal change communication.

### **Entitlement**

When explored in more depth appropriateness was tied to a more personal theme, that of entitlement. For some employees at the levels nearest and most distant from the CEO there was a belief that the special nature of their work-related relationships entitled them to expect to engage in different change communication from others either at same level or across the organisation as a whole. Violations of this sense of were expressed variably as disappointment, frustration, hurt, or embarrassment. For instance, some level-one employees expressed frustration and disappointment with receiving only the same amount and depth of succession information as other employees. Access to privileged information was assumed to be part of their job entitlement and this assumption was justified in terms of the nature and impact of their relationship with the CEO. For some, the fact that the elected body and the secretariat were disclosing no more succession process information to the level-one staff than to lower levels was interpreted as symbolic of two things. Firstly, this was interpreted as a sign of a lack of appreciation of the operation of the executive team of which a CEO is just one member. Secondly, it was interpreted as a sign of the low value the elected members placed on the insights and wisdom level-one employees could bring to the process of CEO selection. In other words, these level-one employees considered their unique relationship with their CEO and their executive experience entitled them to expect to be formally consulted and kept informed at a more in-depth level than other staff.

At the opposite end of the line of command were employees who felt their relationship with the public entitled them to have more ready access to formal communication about the succession process. Those who first found out about the imminent departure of their CEO through the local newspaper responded with varying degrees of embarrassment and disappointment to what they saw as an inappropriate standard of organisational communication. The failure of the formal organisational communication to deliver sufficient succession information in a timely fashion was interpreted as evidence that they did not matter to the organisation. It was also interpreted as a sign that the organisation did not care that they were being 'set up' to make the organisation look bad if questioned about the succession process by members of the public.

### **Leadership**

The commencement of a CEO succession process brought to the fore beliefs about what characterises a good CEO and effective leadership. Long before the second email was received inviting staff to submit their three most desirable characteristics for a CEO, staff across the organisation were speculating about what sort of CEO they would get and

expressing their opinions about what sort of person would be most desirable. Some of this informal discussion was associated with speculation and predictions about who would apply for the position. The formal request to contribute ideas just offered a formally endorsed means for employees to do what many had been doing in informal groups and dyads across the organisation.

When the formal request to contribute arrived it was interpreted in ways which corresponded loosely with employees level in the organisation. Some, although relatively few (N=27), took advantage of the opportunity and emailed their suggestions to the consultants. Most chose not to. Some saw the request as tokenism and cynically disregarded it. Others felt they had nothing of value to offer. When the later were asked to explain how they arrived at this judgement most used the lack of contact and experience with the CEO as the basis for believing they had no valuable insights to offer the CEO succession managers.

The general pattern that emerged was one of cynicism at the upper levels of the organisation and a sense of irrelevance at the lower levels. Those nearest the CEO, more so than those two or more levels removed from the CEO, suggested that if the request for input was genuine then it should have been accompanied by a face-to-face process involving meetings with individuals or focus groups. In contrast, those more than three levels removed were most likely to question the value of anything they could offer to the process. Both groups referenced their interpretations of the request to their assessment of the impact of the CEO on their day to day activities in the organisation.

Analysis of how employees accounted for their interpretations revealed that leadership was conceptualised differently depending upon how the CEO was seen to impact on the individual employee's work life. The concepts of effective leadership of those who had regular face-to-dealings with the CEO gave prominence to dimensions of the CEO's personal interactional style. In contrast, the leadership concepts of those who did not have regular face-to-face dealings with the CEO gave more prominence to organisation-wide aspects of leadership such as direction and profile of the CEO and organisation in the community.

For example, when the first email was discussed, higher-level staff considered the departing CEO's style of interaction with elected members of the governing body in order to make sense of his decision to resign. Employees more than three levels removed from the CEO rarely did so. They interpreted the CEO's email more at face value. This is just one of a range of patterns in the data suggesting the notions of leadership drawn upon in the sensemaking process varied according to level of accessibility to the CEO. At the senior levels in the organisational leadership was portrayed as a relational process while as we moved down the levels in the organisation leadership was increasingly seen to be about more strategic activities such as decision-making, policy determination, and direction-setting. This is not to say senior staff ignored the later leadership dimensions. Their considerations about why the CEO resigned and the situation leading up to this resignation merely drew more heavily on relational observations and privileged

interpersonal information than did those of their staff. Those more removed did not have such rich social context data to draw upon.

### **Engagement**

Engagement is defined as the consequence of giving deliberate attention to someone or some thing. Employees' reported paying varying levels of attention to the succession process. Some spent little time attending to succession communication, both formal and informal. Those that reported high attention accounted for it in terms of either concern for the personal impact of having a new CEO and/or concern for the organisational impact of a change in CEO. Some people were more concerned about one type of impact while others seemed equally concerned about both. Added to the level and focus of attention employees experienced was a range of different expectations about what was an appropriate level of response to their engagement in the CEO succession process.

Workers at the most senior levels attributed their engagement to concern for both the personal and organisational impact of the CEO change. They also had an expectation that they should be able to express their engagement at a high level. (See previous section on entitlement). Their sensemaking behaviour indicated that they took for granted that it was appropriate they should express opinions about the sort of person that should succeed the departing CEO. Even so, some level-one and two staff chose not to take advantage of opportunities to openly respond to the formal succession communication.

Various accounts were given for deciding not to express engagement. So far the data analysis has generated two observations about these accounts. Firstly, there is one group among the employees with high engagement due to concerns about the potential impact a new CEO will have upon their future work experiences that explain their non-response in terms of perceptions of personal risk should they openly respond to succession communication (both formal and informal). Secondly, there is a group among those with high engagement attributed primarily to strong identification with the organisation who explain their non-response in terms of a sense of impotency. They did not see that acting upon their engagement would be fruitful. For each of these groups there were groups with equivalent engagement who did openly respond to the formal succession communication. Nearly all their responses were of an informal nature. This finding is not surprising given the limited opportunities provided by the governing body to formally respond. Informal responses included information searches using regional and national networks to determine who might apply for the CEO's position, using internal networks to ensure views about prospective CEO applicants were disseminated to those perceived to be most able to influence the selection process, and actively seeking opportunities to find out what others knew about the succession process and the positions being taken by key players on the governing body.

For some the succession process became an invigorating opportunity to exercise their investigative and analytical abilities, regardless of the degree to which they identified with the organisation and felt concern for its future. Thus engagement with the succession process was found to have personal, organisational and intellectual drivers. Regardless of what was driving the engagement the analysis is already clearly showing that, when

people were engaged by the succession process, they invested much more time and energy in making sense of the formal succession communication. Furthermore, because there were limited formal means to express this engagement, considerable informal communication about the succession process occurred across and up and down the organisation. Having said that, it is worth noting this was not nearly as pronounced as in phase two of the succession process (but this is beyond the scope of this paper).

## **Discussion**

The findings suggest that employees' interrelated notions of their roles and relationships within the organisation and effective organisational leadership, the nature of what engages their attention and how this does or doesn't get expressed, and their sense of entitlement when it comes to organisational communication are key lenses employed when making sense of written formal communication during a CEO succession process. The variance detected when comparing the sensemaking of employees across different levels with regard to these four themes highlights the inappropriateness of assuming that employees make sense of formal written communication in the same way. The data showed that the level of an employee and his/her relational history in the organisation define these key aspects in ways that create unique interpretations (i.e., sense).

Not only did the sense made of the information in a written message vary from one employee to another so did, the media used. For instance, the findings demonstrate that formal communication is interpreted by employees as evidence of the nature of their organisational relationships and the value the sender assigns to these relationships. Some concluded they were valued employees, others that they were not sufficiently valued. Such findings confirm not only the subjectivity nature of sensemaking about formal communication but also the symbolic power both message and media wield., particularly it seems, during change processes such as CEO succession.

The study is also revealing the roles informal communication has in employees' sensemaking about formal succession communication. Rather than being a response to insufficient formal communication, informal communication is proving to be an integral part of making sense of formal change communication as well as the most widespread response to the sense made of this communication. Even when the formal communication provides a lot of information about a change process as it did in this case, employees enact their sense of this communication through informal communication means. This suggests that the choice of change communication may not be a matter of informal versus formal. Rather, informal and formal should be treated as complementary parts of the communication that provides the substrate of the organisational change process. Furthermore, the choice of change communication needs to take into account the relational histories of those involved. In this case, using 'one size fits all' formal change communication indicated to some recipients a lack of appreciation of their roles, responsibilities and violated some workers' sense of entitlement. This outcome is likely to surprise the senders, particularly of emails two to five, who were likely to have selected the All Staff format and the content of these emails with a view to being inclusive and fair-handed.

Such findings encourage us to recognise the individual and level-based subjectivities of sensemaking behaviour and in so doing challenge the applicability of universal dissemination (one-way) models for managing internal change communication.

## Conclusion

The findings, while still provisional, suggest a sensemaking approach to change communication has enormous potential for revealing the cultural and operational heart of an organisation as well as explicating what Ford & Ford (1995) call the substrate of change. This study has so far revealed four key lenses employees apply when making sense of this substrate, highlighted the integral role informal communication plays in sensemaking about formal change communication, and challenged the utility of instrumental and dissemination models for understanding or managing internal change communication. Hopefully, in doing the study provides valuable insights for both organisational scholars and managers interested in understanding the subjective nature of employees' realities during change and managing organisational change communication.

## References

- Abbott, A. (1988). Transcending general linear reality. *Sociological Theory*, 6, 169-186.
- Albrecht, T. L., & Ropp, V. A. (1984). Communicating about innovation in networks of three U.S. organizations. *Journal of Communication*, 4, 78-91.
- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 293-
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (Translated by V. W. Mcgee). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Benson, J. K. (1977). Innovation and crisis in organizational analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 18, 3-16.
- Chin, L-L. (1996). Bridging the past and the future: Communication patterns in a Taiwanese organization during a time of change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas (Austin).
- Cummings, H. W., Long, L. W., & Lewis, M. L. (1987). *Managing communication in organizations: An introduction*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Fauske, J. R. & Ogawa, R. T. (1987). Detachment, fear, and expectation: A faculty's response to the impending succession of its principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23, 23-44.
- Feldman, M. S. (1991). The meaning of ambiguity: Learning from stories and metaphors. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 145-156). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 541-570.
- Friedman, S.D., & Saul, K. (1991). A leader's wake: organization member reactions to CEO succession. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 619-642.
- Fulk, J., Schmitz, J., & Steinfield, S. W. (1990). A social influence model of technology use. In J. Fulk and C. W. Steinfield (Eds.), *Organizations and Change Management*, 6(5), 15-26.

- Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 433-448.
- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 370-403.
- Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. & Jick, T. D. (1992). *The challenge of organisational change*. New York: Free Press.
- Kesner, I.F., & Sebor, T.C. (1994). Executive succession: Past, present & future. *Journal of Management*, 20(2), 327-372.
- Kitchener, P. J., & Daly, F. (2002). Internal communication during change management. *Corporate Communications*, 7(1), 46-53.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67.
- Lewis, L. K. (1999). Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organizational change: Implementers' targets, sources, and channels for communicating. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13(1), 43-75.
- Lewis, L. K. (2000). Communicating change: Four cases of quality programs. *Journal of Business Communication*, 37(2), 128-155.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1993). Innovation modification during intra-organizational adoption. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 332-354.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1996). Communication during intraorganizational innovation adoption: Predicting users' behavioral coping responses to innovations in organizations. *Communication Monographs*, 63(2), 131-157.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1998). Reconceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Communication Yearbook*, (Vol.21, pp. 93-151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mansour-Cole, D. M., & Scott, S. G. (1998). Hearing it through the grapevine: The influence of source, leader-relations, and legitimacy on survivors' fairness perceptions. *Personnel psychology*, 51(1), 25-54.
- Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Nilakant, V., & Ramnarayan, S. (1998). *Managing organisational change*. New Delhi: Response Books.
- Ogawa, R. T. (1991). Enchantment, disenchantment, and accommodation: How a faculty made sense of the succession of its principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(1), 30-60.
- Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trijillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46(2), 115-130.
- Pearman, G. (1993). The art of sensemaking: The management of meaning in the allocation of financial resources. Unpublished paper submitted as part of the requirements for a master of Arts in Sociology, University of Canterbury.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: Free Press.

- Silverman, D. (1971). *The theory of organizations: A sociological framework*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Stevenson, W. B., & Greenberg, D. N. (1998). The formal analysis of narratives of organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 24(6), 741.
- 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(3), 301-340.
- Van de Ven, A. H., Angle, H. L., & Poole, M. S. (1989). (Ed.s). *Research on the management of innovation: The Minnesota studies*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 510-540.
- Walsh, J. P. (1995). Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organizational Science*, 6(3), 280-321.
- Weenig, M.W.H. (1999). Communication networks in the diffusion of an innovation in an organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(5), pp. 1072.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

**Table 1:** Formal written change communication in phase one.

<b>Formal communication</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Sender</b>	<b>Intended audience</b>
Email 1	The CEO's resignation decision and its background.	CEO	All staff
Email 2	An outline CEO recruitment process including timeline and composition of the CEO recruitment committee.	Manager of secretariat	All staff
Email 3	Notification of consultants chosen to manage replacement process and invitation for staff submissions on 'the three characteristics they would most like to see in a new Chief Executive.'	Chairperson of governing body	All staff
Newsletter	Information about various organisational matters including a review of what had been achieved with regard to major initiatives such as the implementation of 'best practice'.	CEO	All staff
Email 4	An update on progress that reported 53 applications had been received and nine had been chosen to proceed to the next stage. Also advised 27 staff had responded to invitation to offer three desirable CEO characteristics and the departure date for the CEO.	Chairman of governing body	All staff
Email 5	Announcement of the acting CEO	Administrative assistant	All staff
Email 6	Details of date and venue of a farewell afternoon tea and presentation to departing CEO.	Executive assistant	Elected members and all staff

***Address for correspondence***

Dr Colleen Mills  
 Department of management  
 University of Canterbury  
 Private Bag 4800  
 Christchurch

New Zealand  
colleen.mills@canterbury.ac.nz