Corporate Communications: An International Journal

Article information:

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

Paul Nelissen, Martine van Selm, (2008),"Surviving organizational change: how management communication helps balance mixed feelings", Corporate Communications: An International Journal, Vol. 13 Iss 3 pp. 306-318 http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13563280810893670

Deborah J. Barrett, (2002),"Change communication: using strategic employee communication to facilitate major change", Corporate Communications: An International Journal, Vol. 7 Iss 4 pp. 219-231 http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13563280210449804

Philip J. Kitchen, Finbarr Daly, (2002),"Internal communication during change management", Corporate Communications: An International Journal, Vol. 7 Iss 1 pp. 46-53 http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13563280210416035

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

Speaking of change: three communication approaches in studies of organizational change

Catrin Johansson
Department of Media and Communication, Mid Sweden University, Sundsvall, Sweden, and

Mats Heide
Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of the present review of communication approaches to organizational change is to identify and further develop the range of perspectives available in the literature and to present a framework on communication and change that could underpin future research.

Design/methodology/approach – Research on communication, narratives, stories and discourse, which have mapped new terrain in the study of organizational change, is reviewed and discussed.

Findings – The authors conclude that despite the vast academic and popular change literature, communication approaches to change still remain underdeveloped and communication scholars are, with few exceptions, remarkably absent in the field. Three challenges for the future are proposed, that researchers of communication and organizational change need to consider.

Originality/value – This paper provides a comprehensive literature review in the field of communication during organizational change. By integrating these studies in a new framework of communication as tool, process and social transformation, the authors offer a new foundation for theory building in this area. Further development and integration of these three different communication approaches is suggested, which would offer better conditions for research and practice to embrace the complex processes of organizational change.

Keywords Organizational change, Communication, Change management, Emergent strategy

Paper type Literature review

The relationship between communication and organizational change has attracted increased attention from scholars and practitioners during the last decade. Repeatedly, scholars have stated that communication and change is a subject field that is very important to develop (Jones *et al.*, 2004; Taylor *et al.*, 2001). In spite of this, communication research in this field has rarely been subject to reviews and efforts in finding theoretical paradigms guiding the research (Lewis and Seibold, 1998). This paper aims to fill this gap by presenting a review and critique of existing communication approaches in studies on organizational change.

Change is often driven by conditions in the surrounding environment, but is also triggered by needs within organizations. The dynamic and global environment in

which modern organizations operate is imprinted by increasingly keen competition. A prerequisite to survive is to continually scan and adapt to the environment, according to systems theory. In order to cope with competition, technological developments and customer demands, managers seek different solutions and tools to manage the unstable, rapidly changing, and never predictable situation.

In the literature on change management there is a powerful bias towards change that is rarely questioned (Sturdy and Grey, 2003; Zorn *et al.*, 1999; Zorn *et al.*, 2000). Not surprisingly, one of the most frequent occurring management responses to changes in the surrounding environment is to radically change their organizations through reengineering, restructuring, or downsizing, or to introduce a new management system (Zorn *et al.*, 2000). Hence, organizational change processes are often seen as "strengthening sauna baths" – the more frequently recurring, the better. However, there is evidence that the radical programmes of restructuring, that managers initiate, often lead to turmoil (Newell *et al.*, 2001). Recent research shows that many organizational change initiatives fail due to shortcomings in the internal communication (Barrett, 2002; Elving, 2005; Lewis, 2000); Beer and Nohria (2000) claim that up to 70 percent of major change projects fail.

Many writers have emphasized the important role of communication in change processes (Daly *et al.*, 2003; Elving, 2005; Ford and Ford, 1995; Kotter, 1990; Lewis and Seibold, 1998). Communication and organizational change are inextricably linked processes, according to Lewis (1999). However, despite the vast literature on the importance of communication to organizing (Putnam and Cooren, 2004; Taylor and Robichaud, 2004; Taylor and van Every, 2000), communication scholars seem to be absent in the field.

Organizational scholars have acknowledged the importance of communication processes in explanations for organizational change processes, but have focused primarily on the invention, design, adoption, and responses to planned changes. Communication perspectives have largely ignored the means by which change programs are installed and by which users come to learn of such programs (Lewis and Seibold, 1998). Lewis and Seibold reviewed major areas of research on implementation of planned organizational change. The authors conclude that research on change implementation is wanting of a communication perspective, which would enhance understanding of implementation activities. They argue for a reconceptualization of the implementation of planned organizational change as a communication-related phenomenon (Lewis and Seibold, 1998, p. 94).

The purpose of the present review of communication approaches to organizational change is to fill this gap by identifying and further developing the range of perspectives available in the literature and to present a framework on communication and change that could underpin future research. Our review will extend and update the review of the field performed by Lewis and Seibold (1998), and explore the development in the field during the last decade. We conclude by suggesting avenues for future communication research that address organizational change processes.

A meta-theoretical reflection

Sometimes scholars openly discuss their assumptions, and their views on ontology and epistemology, sometimes these are more hidden. Particularly, researchers working within a dominant perspective neglect metatheoretical discussions. This is probably

due to the fact that within dominant perspectives core assumptions are seen as self-evident (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Nevertheless, assumptions on change and on communication affect the whole research process from formulating research questions, to material collection and interpretation of results. Weick (1998) has observed that the main barrier to new thinking on organizational change is researchers' ontological and epistemological commitments. Among organizational researchers there is a general need for a more reflective attitude to the ontology and its consequences on the result. Thus, it is critical to recognize from which perspective, or with which approach different studies are generated. This is even more so in a multi-disciplinary area like communication and change.

Planned or emergent organizational change

Since the mid 1980s, there has been a cascade of practitioner literature that offers simple recipes for a successful management of change (Carnall, 2003; Hayes, 2002; Paton *et al.*, 2000). In these books, organizational change processes are portrayed as linear, developing through certain stages. Probably the most well-known model in the field of organizational change is Lewin (1951) three-steps model (unfreezing, changing, and refreezing). Elrod and Tippett (2002) present an overview of existing models of change, a majority of which follow Lewin's model. Hence, stage models are still popular; recently Kotter and Rathgeber (2006) presented an eight-stage model on how to manage change successfully.

From a rationalistic perspective, organizational change can be managed as a planned process with a transparent agenda. However, March (1981) stated that the majority of changes can be derived from everyday activities, and that most organizational changes result from stable, routine processes. This reasoning is supported by Orlikowski's (1996, p. 65) study which shows that organizational change is: "an ongoing improvisation enacted by organizational actors trying to make sense of and act coherently in the world". Change is here seen as ongoing modifications in everyday work. In this vein, Weick and Quinn (1999, p. 1217) request scholars to focus on "changing" instead of "change" in order to appreciate that change never stops and that change is hardly determinate and causal.

Any change program is continually modified and adapted by organizational actors. In this way, there is support for considering change as a continually ongoing process. Change programs open up for, and trigger, ongoing changes, all of which are not anticipated (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). To sum up the discussion above, we recognize two different approaches to organizational change processes: a traditional approach aiming to describe and explain planned change processes, and, an emergent approach aiming to understand organizational change processes (Barnett and Caroll, 1995; Ströh and Jaatinen, 2001; van de Ven and Poole, 2005; Weick and Quinn, 1999).

Perspectives on communication

In the field of organizational communication, there has been an ongoing discussion of different research perspectives over the years (Heide *et al.*, 2005; Krone *et al.*, 1987; Putnam and Pacanowsky, 1983; Putnam *et al.*, 1996; Redding and Tompkins, 1988). Probably the most widespread and well-known classification consists of the functional, interpretive and critical perspectives (Putnam, 1983). In the functional perspective, communication is viewed as a tangible substance that flows upward, downward,

and laterally within the organization (Doolin, 2003). Content and meaning of messages play a secondary role, since meaning is assumed to reside in the message. The aim of research is often to uncover effective ways of communicating. This view has been criticized for simplifying communication to transmission of messages (Axley, 1984; Carey, 1988; Varey, 2000). In the interpretive perspective, a meaning-centred view of organizational communication is adopted. Social reality is constituted through the words, symbols, and actions that members invoke. Stories, myths, rituals, and language use are not simply reflections of organizational meanings; they are the ongoing processes that constitute organizational life (Putnam, 1983, p. 40). The aim is to generate insights and to seek understanding. In the critical perspective, the basic outlook is the same as in the interpretive perspective, but the aim of research is social change: to free individuals from sources of domination and repression.

Three approaches: tool, process and social transformation

We initiated our qualitative literature review by searching and collecting research articles published between 1995 and 2007. This time period was chosen partly since we wanted to embrace the more recent research, partly since Lewis and Seibold's (1998) review ends with articles published in 1995. The search was delimited to the keywords organizational change and communication, and resulted in 230 hits. We reduced the number of articles by reading the summaries and excluding articles that either were articles in trade journals or did not treat the subject. After this procedure, approximately 100 articles remained, which we read thoroughly. Shortly, we found articles with a more traditional realist epistemology and "alternative" articles. Additional reading and discussing gradually resulted in three different approaches of communication during organizational change:

(1) communication as a tool;

(2) communication as a socially constructed process; and

(3) communication as social transformation (Table I).

These approaches will be discussed in the following sections.

	Tool	Process	Social transformation
Epistemology	Realist	Constructivist	Constructivist
Goal of research	Effectiveness	Understanding	Awareness
Metaphor of organizations	Rational system	Sensemaking system	Political system
Change	Planned	Emergent	Emergent
Communication	Tool for transmission	Interpretation	Constitutive
Management	Managing change	Managing understanding	Managing change through communication
Illustrative literature	DiFonzo and Bordia (1998) and Daly *et al.* (2003)	Ford and Ford (1995) and Stensaker and Falkenberg (2007)	Anderson (2005) and Francis (2007)

Table I.
Three communication approaches in organizational change studies

Communication as a tool

Many writers, not at least the probably best-selling author in the field – Kotter (1990, 1996), stress the vital role of communication in change processes. In a recent article, Lewis *et al.* (2006) analyzed some of the best-selling books in the USA on change management. They concluded that all emphasized the importance of communication in change processes. There was also, according to Lewis *et al.*, a great coherence between popular press books and scholarly conclusions regarding communication in change processes. In general, both genres stressed the importance of:

(1) wide participation in the change process to make organizational members feel more included, committed and in control of the situation;

(2) wide dissemination of information together with openness, early notification and discussion possibilities; and

(3) communication about vision and purpose of the change process in order to provide justification.

But, Lewis *et al.* (2006) criticize the tendency of the advice in the practitioner literature to be underspecified, acontextual and to be unfamiliar with underlying theoretical literature.

In this approach we have identified, although implicitly, a supposition that implementation problems will disappear if and when organizational members are offered information and thereby understand the change and their role in the process. Thus, communication is reduced to a tool for declaration and explanation of the planned change, often with a focus on the "what, when, who, and how", and as a way to transport organizational member's feedback of their attitudes and feelings. The realist epistemology is dominant within this approach, researchers understand organizations as rational systems and their goal is to increase the effectiveness of the planned change processes.

An issue that has received a lot of attention in this approach is resistance to change. A frequent notion is that "effective communication" will reduce or even overcome resistance to change in the organization and willingness to change will evolve. For example, Sillince (1999) states that: "The problem which managers face during organizational change is how to motivate people to see it as desirable and necessary, so that they become willing participants rather than saboteurs". Elving (2005) explores the relation between communication and the creation of readiness for change, which is seen as a prerequisite for effective change. Elving maintains that one goal of communication during a change process is to prevent or reduce resistance to change, and thereby lay the foundation of an effective implementation. Another goal, Elving asserts, is to reduce people's uncertainty of their future situation, and thereby create readiness for change.

Also DiFonzo and Bordia (1998) emphasize the relation between communication and uncertainty. They claim that successful programs of change communication depend on the accurate management of uncertainty associated with change, since poor or insufficient information will initiate rumours and gossip. Consequently, DiFonzo and Bordia are of the opinion that more and accurate information will reduce people's perception of uncertainty, and proactively establish and maintain trust. Similar reasoning can be found in an article by Bordia *et al.* (2004), where the authors conclude that a systematic communication program ensure the possibilities to lessen employee

uncertainty and increase their understanding of control and job satisfaction. They emphasize that if employees have been involved in the change process, they will also feel more in control of the result. A comparable conclusion is drawn by Daly *et al.* (2003), who focus on the importance of internal communication during organizational change. Harkness (2000) pinpoints that measuring the effectiveness of internal communication during a change initiative is vital to emphasize the importance of communication to management, and to ensure that it remains on their agenda. According to Harkness, employee's satisfaction with internal communication has hardly changed since the 1970s, and this can be explained by the absence of effective tools to measure communication. Consequently, the general recipe that is offered for a successful change program is to keep employees well informed.

Scholars within this approach have also focused on organizations' external communication during change. Crises may be significant change-inducing events, suggest Seeger *et al.* (2005) who analyzed the external communication of the CEO of a bond-trading firm following the 9/11 attacks, aimed at creating a post-crisis discourse of renewal. In television and print media, the CEO had the opportunity to frame the meaning of the event. He framed a vision of the firm's future, offered specific commitments, and generated support from a wide variety of stakeholders. Thus, conclude Seeger *et al.*, the discourse of renewal creates an opportunity after a crisis to fundamentally re-order the organization. Palmer *et al.* (2004) studied letters to shareholders, analyzing how an organization attempted to manage the impressions of shareholders during times of change to reassure that the organization's changes were both necessary and successful in their outcomes. The authors suggest that internally and externally oriented change conversations differ, the former characterized as operational and the latter as supportive.

In the referred research, concrete or practical advice or strategies to practitioners is principally missing. We are mainly told that the way in which management communicates with the employees during a change initiative largely influences the outcome. There are, nonetheless, some examples of efforts to propose communication strategies of effective internal communication. Goodman and Truss (2004) demonstrate that both process and content of a communication strategy are crucial to the outcome. They especially stress the importance of the timing of change messages, the matching of communication strategies to the employee profile, the use of appropriate media, flexibility, and the minimization of uncertainty.

In this approach of organizational change, communication is recognized as a critical tool to inform, create understanding and change people's attitudes and behaviour. However, the most serious criticism to research within this approach is the absence of ontological and epistemological reflection. Accordingly, the fundamental relationship between communication and organization, i.e. that organizations are produced maintained and reproduced through communication, is seldom discussed. As a consequence, communication is still treated as a phenomenon existing in isolation from the organizational context.

Communication as a socially constructed process

In this approach change is understood as a phenomenon that occurs within communication (Ford and Ford, 1995), and the focus is on understanding and sensemaking. A change process takes place in a context composed of human

interactions and communication, which produce and reproduce people's social reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). This means that a planned change process can be regarded as an occasion when new social realities are produced through communication (i.e. an emergent perspective on change). Communication is thus the very medium within which change takes place (Ford and Ford, 1995). Speech acts are performative, which means that they change the social reality, which stands in opposition to the common understanding that communication only reports or represents something already existing (Austin, 1962). For example, a promise, an order or the naming of something forms an action, occurrence or event, which produces a new reality different from the reality prior to the speech act.

Organizational change processes are always dependent of the situation, unpredictable and non-linear, which is a result of people's understanding and sensemaking processes (Balogun and Johnson, 2005). When an organizational change initiative is presented to employees, they immediately try to make sense of it and understand the potential effects for themselves, their colleagues and department, and for the organization as whole. Hence, sensemaking processes ensue and might resolve uncertainties and ambiguities following a planned change program (Balogun and Johnson, 2005). These sensemaking processes are fundamental for the outcome of the planned change, since sensemaking is a significant process of organizing (Weick *et al.*, 2005). Sensemaking is, however, not a prerequisite for the choice of alternative actions. Rather, sensemaking is about the interplay of action and interpretation. People make sense by acting thinkingly (Weick *et al.*, 2005). People think when they act, test and experiment, since they then can see and understand what it all means. Further, sensemaking is a social process that occurs through communication. When a new complex situation arises, for example a planned change initiative, people immediately start to talk about it in order to understand it, make sense of the situation and produce a plausible account. Thus, a situation that constitutes a base for action is talked into existence (Taylor and van Every, 2000). Dixon (1997) emphasizes that the most powerful change interventions occur at the level of everyday conversation. As people in an organization have different backgrounds, interests, experiences, education, positions and so forth, they will also make sense of the very same situation in multiple ways. Research by Stensaker and Falkenberg (2007) indicates that sensemaking at the individual level shape the aggregated reaction at the organizational level, and that the change initiative and the individual responses mutually interact and influence each other over time.

When a change initiative is implemented, it is producing a new reality through communication (Ford and Ford, 1995). Hence, change takes place and is realized by communication. An evident example of this approach is Tsoukas and Chia (2002), who advocate a process-oriented approach to organizational change and more focus on the role and importance of communication in organizational change processes. According to Tsoukas and Chia an organization must be seen as an emergent property of change. Here, change is seen as something that proceeds continually when organizational members act, communicate and improvise to fulfil their tasks, in order to be attentive to an ever-changing world. Even if organizations are forced by external factors or subject to a management initiated and planned change program, there is no full control of how an organization, i.e. the organizational members, locally will respond and adapt to change. Scholars within this approach are interested in how individuals make sense of change initiatives and how their perception and understanding affect the final result (Alvesson and Sveningson, 2008; Mills, 2003).

Several scholars within this approach understand organizational change from a narrative approach, since stories make sense of changes (Weick, 1993). Organizations, as well as individuals, become who they are by telling stories about themselves and living those stories (Bruner, 1986). Narrative is a form of communication that is important in sensemaking processes and learning, since stories help people structure their experience. Narratives have a role as inscriptions of early performance and scripts and staging instructions for coming performance. In sensemaking processes different narratives are important sources for people's understanding. For human beings, narratives are natural ways to communicate (Fisher, 1984). When people tell stories about their experience they do not simply repeat or duplicate stories. Rather, it is a conscious or unconscious filtering and sorting with the aim to make their life and experience meaningful and understandable.

Ford *et al.* (2002) state that different background conversations create different contexts, and consequently different realities that frame a certain change initiative. Background conversations are products of people's direct and indirect experience and manage the way they understand what is said and what is unsaid. Departing from this social constructionist perspective, resistance to change can be seen as a function of different background conversations (Ford *et al.*, 2002). The authors suggest that a solution to deal with background conversations is reinvention, where the focus is on reframing and creating a new context, not to change what is. Through dialogue and conversations people can examine underlying assumptions and expectations. Instead of regarding resistance as something that must be overcome, it can be considered as a conversation that can be altered in communication (Ford *et al.*, 2002).

In an organization, several narratives will always exist, explanations and interpretations to what has happened and what is going on (Humphreys and Brown, 2002). For example, Bean and Hamilton (2006) found multiple and contradictory interpretations to a firm's downsizing. When downsizing or any other planned organizational change occur, employees search for discourses that offer them material to understand and make sense of what is happening. With the insight of the occurrence of multiple narratives, it is from an organization perspective in times of change, management's task to construct a discourse of coherence (Araujo and Easton, 1996). Sensegiving provided by managers through storytelling is a key input in the member's sensemaking processes (Maitlis and Lawrence, 2007; Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991; Dunford and Jones, 2000). Dominant narratives are authored and transmitted by managers, and these narratives constitute an important interpretation frame for organizational members. Managers have "declarative powers" (Taylor and van Every, 2000, p. 143) to set a planned change going.

A critique of texts on change communication within this approach is the absence of concrete methods and advice on how practitioners could use and take advantage of communication during change. One exception is the article "Building trust in times of crisis" (Langer and Thorup, 2006). Change communication based on a storytelling approach will result in further frustration, claim the authors. They apprehend storytelling as a management tool to discipline the corporate body with monophonic communication (Boje, 2001). Langer and Thorup believe that organizational change processes must comprise dialogue with employees to succeed. They stress the importance of conducting a polyphonic approach to story-telling in change communication based on co-productive methods. The main conclusion of Langer and Thorup is that change communication is not followed by rapid results. Change processes and change communication take time – there is no such thing as a quick fix.

Communication as social transformation

As we have seen, an increasing number of researchers establish communication as the very medium within which change occurs. Researchers that see communication as social transformation do this as well, but they extend this line of research by closely examining the relationship between communication and action. Furthermore, they add the dimension of power and dominance, and thus highlight the struggle and negotiation of meanings in the communication processes where change is socially constructed. A framework for linking interactions and action during organizational change is proposed by Beech and Cairns (2001). The authors argue that ideal types of how organizational members experience reality(ies): as a single reality, as a multilayered reality, as multiple realities or as no such thing as reality, may represent a tool for reflective management practice. Accordingly, they discuss managerial strategies of grappling successfully with complexity and ambiguity.

Organizational members' understanding of a new organizational reality was reinforced in a New Zealand hospital, through members reproducing the discursive practices of managers, and thereby accepting their legitimacy (Doolin, 2003). Here, the concept of "ordering narrative" was employed to analyze the discourse of clinical leadership. The discursive and relational aspects of the clinical leadership narrative also became embodied in a variety of material forms, including information systems and their inscriptions. The strength of the ordering narrative approach lies in its treatment of reality as simultaneously social, technical and discursive, concludes Doolin (2003). Narratives always have political, social, or economic advantages to certain organizational ideologies claims Deetz (1992), who talks of discursive closure.

Within this approach, discourse theory offers critical insights into the dynamics of change in the form of "multi-layered conversations", drawing attention to the collaborative and discursive processes by which individuals construct their knowledge and understanding of their organizational world (Francis and Sinclair, 2003; Ashcraft, 2005; Chreim, 2006; Coupland *et al.*, 2005; Garrety *et al.*, 2003). Whilst an ideal may be that people can make sense of strategic change through a coherent narrative that is credible for all parties, actors are making sense of situations differently, and are impacting on each others sense-making processes, according to Beech and Johnson (2005). Mueller and Carter (2005) demonstrate the interdependencies of micro, meso and macro discourses.

Researchers focus in particular on how social change is negotiated and performed through discourse. Furthermore, discourse can be situated in patterns of power that reflect socially constructed norms of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. And organizations are regarded as political sites, where different organisational groups struggle for their meaning (Mumby, 2004). In this way links among discourse, identities, and emotions are highlighted (Garrety *et al.*, 2003).

Francis (2007) explores the role of the Human Resource Development (HRD) function in shaping organizational change. In particular, the paper focuses on how processes of social construction are associated with changes in key "authors" emerging within competing organizational discourses. Francis found two coexisting and overlapping managerial discourses, labelled as "control" and "empowerment". The creative use of metaphors of the HR director helped to build a new language for change that challenged the dominance of the control discourse in ways that created an emotional and positive response. However, counter rhetoric among line managers who

favoured a "command and control" style of managing soon challenged the logic of generating enhanced worker participation. Francis demonstrates how discourses create and challenge existing power relations and become sites of struggle where different groups compete to shape the social reality of HRD.

Leaders' stories were used strategically to accomplish discursive closure, or the suppression of conflict, conclude (Leonardi and Jackson, 2004; Deetz, 1992). This discourse then worked against open and reflective communication about organizational processes, which in turn may constrain organizational change. Employing the concept of framing, Chreim (2006) distinguishes between individual frames, managerial frames and institutional discourses that constitute a context that enables and constrains individual framing.

The approach of Heracleous and Barrett (2001) linked discourse and its context, and was useful in making sense of the multiple perspectives of stakeholder groups and their interaction during change. Their study included change over time and multiple levels of analysis (communicative actions and deep structures). The authors were able to discern patterns in communicative actions, as well as the "hidden" assumptions, understandings and values, that underlie, guide, and legitimate these communicative actions. They were also able to trace shifts at these levels over time and relate them to contextual factors. Discursive clashes at both the deep structure levels and communicative action levels, among stakeholder groups were found, which could explain their lack of common ground on which to base a dialogue. The authors conclude that any change is intertwined with simultaneous continuity at deeper levels, thus change may only occur at the communicative level, and there might be little real change to the deep structures of either group of actors. Exploring the discourses of stakeholder groups can help change leaders realize why certain groups do not seem to be able to talk to and understand each other.

This difference between a surface level of communication and a deeper level of change is also discussed and illustrated by Ashcraft (2005) in her study of occupational identity and change among commercial airline pilots. Here, overt consent and reframing constituted a form of resistance. When organizational members talk about thinking one thing and doing/saying another they are simultaneously cooperating with management and resisting the unitarist assumption of shared goals and legitimate management authority state Coupland *et al.* (2005). Here, employee expectations of shared interests that were largely unmet, increased the potential for future cynicism.

A recent theme in the literature on discourse and change is the relationship between changing discourses in different times and settings, but also between written and spoken discourse. Thus, intertextual analysis has become an area where researchers examine how concepts and meanings become developed, transformed, fragmented and changed across multiple sites and occasions (Anderson, 2005). In this way, the current text becomes part of future contexts and texts. This has political implications as some contributions are highlighted and legitimated and others are minimized and constrained. Dominant meanings become reinforced or modified; contested meanings may work themselves into the dominant discourse patterns or may struggle to become widely adopted.

According to Anderson (2005), intertextual analysis builds on the social constructionist approach by recognizing that the organization consists of a variety of multiple texts that may be brought to bear on the current context. In his study he

demonstrates how organizational members merge voices from the past through the use of represented discourse. He proposes that organizational change occurs when people temporarily stabilize the organization through the voicing of current practices – what people take to be the enduring patterns that happen over time. It is the translation between past, present and future discourses that allows organizational members to make the transformation from past to future organizational meanings, and to achieve organizational change.

Moreover, writing has been shown to serve as a textualizing practice that documented, fixed, and stabilized ideas developed in conversation (Anderson, 2004). In the translation from conversation to written text, individual experiences are converted into public and permanent representations of organizational reality. Writing in this way helps to stabilize organizational reality to enable change to occur.

In this approach of organizational change, communication is seen as constitutive of change at the same time as it is multi-layered and contains conflicting levels of understanding. The outcome of the change process is the result of negotiations of meaning. However, while many researchers value the contributions of discourse approaches and discourse analysis, some point to the problems as well.Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) state that sometimes "discourse analysis tends to overemphasize the importance of the inconsistency, variation, and context dependency of speech acts". The authors argue that it is also important to draw attention to the relative capacity of language to convey insights, experiences, and factual information, and its capacity to clarify phenomena.

Another common critique is that discourse analysis sometimes is myopic – researchers see only the language and not the context. Similar arguments are commented by Fairclough (2005) who argues that a commitment to discourse analysis in organizational studies entails neither a reduction of organizations to organizational discourse, nor a reduction of organizational analysis to the "organizing" that goes on in organizational processes. Fairclough favours a realist approach, which distinguishes organizational process and agency from organizational structures, and focuses research on the relations and tensions between them.

The reviewed literature in the approaches of communication as social transformation set out to explore the link between language and behaviour, or rather how change is accomplished through the negotiation of competing discourses. This promising line of study is still in its infancy and needs further development in the future.

Conclusions

The research area of communication and change is difficult to review because it is multidisciplinary. We have reviewed and discussed recent research on communication, narratives, stories and discourse, which have mapped new terrain in the study of organizational change. After having read and related a number of publications, we are inclined to agree with Caldwell (2005, p. 109)that most of the knowledge articulated within the competing and diffuse disciplinary paradigms and discourses relevant to agency and change in organizations today lack a cumulative logic. One of the reasons why theory building is difficult is that the discursive processes by which change evolved within these cases are unique (Francis and Sinclair, 2003). However, by integrating these studies in a new framework of communication as tool, process and

social transformation, we offer a new foundation for theory building in this area. We would like to stress that these approaches are not mutually exclusive and do not show clearly-defined boundaries but overlap one another. In particular, researchers that we have placed in the process and social transformation approaches depart from the same ontological and epistemological assumptions.

All three approaches – communication as a tool, process and social transformation – have strengths and weaknesses (Table II).

The challenge for future research is to consider these strengths and weaknesses, and to further develop the study of change through communication in a search for a common corpus of research findings. We believe that a fruitful way to do this might be to integrate parts of different approaches in new studies. Although, we do not think that "the whole picture" or "the truth" ever will be captured (Deetz, 2000). The approaches are rather like flashlights – only certain parts of the room will be seen clearly (Cheney, 2000). Also the different ontological assumptions behind each approach influence how we understand change and communication (Palmer and Dunford, 2008). The value of our review lies in the prospect of shaping the future research agenda in the field on the basis of our knowledge of research accomplishments on communication and change up to now. Along this line, we propose three challenges for the future that researchers of communication and organizational change need to consider.

The first challenge is to question and develop the concepts often employed in the tool approach of effective change and resistance to change. These concepts also imply a management bias. What is meant by effective and by whom, and what does resistance signify? If we consider the complexity of communication, as shown in approaches of process and social transformation, we clearly need new tools for change communication – where dialogue and participation are important ingredients.

The second challenge is to further develop our understanding of sensemaking processes. There is an interesting tension between organizational members' background conversations and existing dominant narratives – or front stage communication by organizational leaders. Since we now know that change is enacted in background conversations, the link between these levels of communication ought to be more thoroughly explored.

The third challenge is to continue studying patterns linking communicative actions and hidden expectations, assumptions, understanding and values, that underlie, guide and legitimate these communicative actions. Combining the verbal with the non-verbal could give us more insight in how change is socially shaped and transformed. Also pursuing intertextual analysis in order to examine how concepts and meanings develop across time and space would be fruitful.

	Tool	Process	Social transformation
Strength	Endeavour to improve communication on change in organizations	Enhanced understanding of how change is accomplished	Display the complexity of communication processes during change
Weakness	Communication is viewed in isolation from its organizational context	Neglect power dimensions of organizations	Absence of advice on how to improve communication

Table II.
Strengths and
weaknesses

In future studies we think practical implications following research results need to be more elaborate. This is important to consider, since we experience a widening gap between research and practice. Thus, we want to urge researchers interested in improving change communication to draw conclusions from the empirical case studies relating how organizational members experience their organizational reality(ies), and offer practitioners less rational and more realistic models and tools for planned organizational change and reflective management practice.

We conclude by observing that despite the vast academic and popular change literature, communication approaches to change still remain underdeveloped and communication scholars are, with few exceptions, remarkably absent in the field. We hope this situation will change.

References

Alvesson, M. and Kärreman, D. (2000), "Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research: challenges, responses, consequences", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 36, pp. 136-58.

Alvesson, M. and Sveningson, S. (2008), *Changing Organizational Culture: Cultural Change Work in Progress*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Anderson, D.L. (2004), "The textualizing functions of writing for organizational change", *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, Vol. 18, pp. 141-64.

Anderson, D.L. (2005), "'What you'll say is …': represented voice in organizational change discourse", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 63-77.

Araujo, L. and Easton, G. (1996), "Strategy: where is the pattern?", *Organization*, Vol. 3, pp. 361-83.

Ashcraft, K.L. (2005), "Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 19, pp. 67-90.

Austin, J.L. (1962), *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford University Press, London.

Axley, S.R. (1984), "Managerial and organizational communication in terms of the conduit metaphor", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9, pp. 428-37.

Balogun, J. and Johnson, G. (2005), "From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: the impact of change recipient sensemaking", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26, pp. 1573-601.

Barnett, W.P. and Caroll, G.R. (1995), "Modeling internal organizational change", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 21, pp. 217-36.

Barrett, D.J. (2002), "Change communication: using strategic employee communication to facilitate major change", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 219-31.

Bean, C.J. and Hamilton, F.E. (2006), "Leader framing and follower sensemaking: response to downsizing in the brave new workplace", *Human Relations*, Vol. 59, pp. 321-50.

Beech, N. and Cairns, G. (2001), "Coping with change: the contribution of postdichotomous ontologies", *Human Relations*, Vol. 54, pp. 1303-25.

Beech, N. and Johnson, P. (2005), "Discourses of disrupted identities in the practice of strategic change: the mayor, the street-fighter and the insider-out", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 31-47.

Beer, M. and Nohria, N. (2000), "Cracking the code of change", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 78, pp. 133-41.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966), *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Boje, D.M. (2001), *Narrative Methods for Organizational and Communication Research*, Sage, London.

Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D. and DiFonzo, N. (2004), "Uncertainty during organizational change: is it all about control?", *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 13, pp. 345-66.

Bruner, J. (1986), *Actual Minds, Possible Words*, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979), *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*, Gower, Aldershot.

Caldwell, R. (2005), "Things fall apart? Discourses on agency and change in organizations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 58, pp. 83-105.

Carey, J.W. (1988), *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Carnall, C.A. (2003), *Managing Change in Organizations*, Prentice Hall, Harlow.

Cheney, G. (2000), "Interpreting interpretive research: toward perspectivism without relativism", in Corman, S. and Poole, M.S. (Eds), *Perspectives on Organizational Communication: Finding Common Ground*, Guilford, New York, NY, pp. 3-45.

Chreim, S. (2006), "Managerial frames and institutional discourses of change: employee appropriation and resistance", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 27, pp. 1261-87.

Coupland, C., Blyton, P. and Bacon, N. (2005), "A longitudinal study of the influence of shop floor work teams on expressions of 'us' and 'them'", *Human Relations*, Vol. 58, pp. 1055-81.

Daly, F., Teague, P. and Kitchen, P. (2003), "Exploring the role of internal communication during organisational change", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 8, pp. 153-62.

Deetz, S. (2000), "The a priori of the communication community and the hope for solving real problems", in Corman, S. and Poole, M.S. (Eds), *Perspectives on Organizational Communication: Finding the Common Ground*, Guilford, New York, NY, pp. 105-12.

Deetz, S.A. (1992), *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Development in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.

DiFonzo, N. and Bordia, P. (1998), "A tale of two corporations: managing uncertainty during organizational change", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 37, pp. 295-305.

Dixon, N.M. (1997), "The hallways of learning", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 25, pp. 23-34.

Doolin, B. (2003), "Narratives of change: discourse, technology and organization", *Organization*, Vol. 10, pp. 751-70.

Dunford, R. and Jones, D. (2000), "Narrative in strategic change", *Human Relations*, Vol. 53, pp. 1207-26.

Elrod, P.D. II and Tippett, D.D. (2002), "The 'Death Valley' of change", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 273-91.

Elving, W.J.L. (2005), "The role of communication in organisational change", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 10, pp. 129-38.

Fairclough, N. (2005), "Discourse analysis in organization studies: the case for critical realism", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26, pp. 915-39.

Fisher, W.R. (1984), "Narration as a human communication paradigm: the case of public moral argument", *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 51, pp. 1-22.

Ford, J.D. and Ford, L.W. (1995), "The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 541-71.

Ford, J.D., Ford, L.W. and McNamara, R.T. (2002), "Resistance and the background conversations of change", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 105-21.

Francis, H. (2007), "Discursive struggle and the ambiguous world of HRD", *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol. 9, pp. 83-96.

Francis, H. and Sinclair, J. (2003), "A processual analysis of HRM-based change", *Organization*, Vol. 10, pp. 685-706.

Garrety, K., Badham, R., Morrigan, V., Rifkin, W.D. and Zanko, M. (2003), "The use of personality typing in organizational change: discourse, emotions and the reflexive subject", *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, pp. 211-35.

Gioia, D.A. and Chittipeddi, K. (1991), "Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 433-48.

Goodman, J. and Truss, C. (2004), "The medium and the message: communicating effectively during a major change initiative", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 217-29.

Harkness, J. (2000), "Measuring the effectiveness of change: the role of internal communication in change management", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 1, pp. 66-73.

Hayes, J. (2002), *The Theory and Practice of Change Management*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Heracleous, L. and Barrett, M. (2001), "Organizational change as discourse: communicative actions and deep structures in the context of information technology implementation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44, pp. 755-78.

Humphreys, M. and Brown, A.D. (2002), "Dress and identity: a Turkish case study", *The Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 927-52.

Jones, E., Watson, B., Gardner, J. and Gallois, C. (2004), "Organizational communication: challenges for the new century", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 54, pp. 722-50.

Kotter, J.P. (1990), *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*, The Free Press, New York, NY.

Kotter, J.P (1996), *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Harvard, CA.

Kotter, J.P. and Rathgeber, H. (2006), *Our Iceberg Is Melting: Changing and Succeeding under Any Conditions*, Macmillan, London.

Krone, K.J., Jablin, F.M. and Putnam, L.L. (1987), "Communication theory and organizational communication: multiple perspectives", in Jablin, F.M., Putnam, L.L., Roberts, K.H. and Porter, L.W. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 18-40.

Langer, R. and Thorup, S. (2006), "Building trust in times of crisis: storytelling and change communication in an airline company", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 371-90.

Leonardi, P.M. and Jackson, M.H. (2004), "Technological determinism and discursive closure in organizational mergers", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 615-31.

Lewin, K. (1951), *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.

Lewis, L.K. (1999), "Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organizational change. Implementers' targets, sources, and channels for communicating", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 13, pp. 43-75.

Lewis, L.K. (2000), "Communicating change: four cases of quality programs", *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol. 37, pp. 128-56.

Lewis, L.K. and Seibold, D. (1998), "Reconceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: a review of literature and research agenda", in Roloff, M.E. and Paulson, G. (Eds) *Communication Yearbook*, Vol. 21, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 93-151.

Lewis, L.K., Schmisseur, A.M., Stephens, K.K. and Weir, K.E. (2006), "Advice on communicating during organizational change: the content of popular press books", *The Journal of Business Communication*, Vol. 43, pp. 113-37.

Maitlis, S. and Lawrence, T.B. (2007), "Triggers and enablers of sensegiving in organizations", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50, pp. 57-84.

March, J.G. (1981), "Footnotes to organizational change", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 26, pp. 563-78.

Mills, J.H. (2003), *Making Sense of Organizational Change*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Mueller, F. and Carter, C. (2005), "The 'HRM project' and managerialism: or why some discourses are more equal than others", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 369-82.

Mumby, D. (2004), "Discourse, power and ideology: unpacking the critical approach", in Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C. and Putnam, L.L. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, Sage, London, pp. 237-58.

Newell, S., Robertson, M. and Swan, J. (2001), "Management fads and fashions", *Organization*, Vol. 8, pp. 5-15.

Orlikowski, W.J. (1996), "Improvising organizational transformation over time: a situated change perspective", *Information Systems Research*, Vol. 7, pp. 63-92.

Palmer, I. and Dunford, R. (2008), "Organizational change and the importance of embedded assumptions", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 19, pp. S20-S32.

Palmer, I., King, A.W. and Kelleher, D. (2004), "Listening to Jack: GE's change conversations with shareholders", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 593-614.

Paton, R., McCalman, J. and Paton, R. (2000), *Change Management: A Guide to Effective Implementation*, Sage, London.

Putnam, L.L. (1983), "The interpretive perspective: an alternative to functionalism", in Putnam, L.L. and Pacanowsky, M.E. (Eds), *Communication and Organization: An Interpretive Approach*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 31-54.

Putnam, L.L. and Cooren, F. (2004), "Alternative perspectives on the role of text and agency in constituting organizations", *Organization*, Vol. 11, pp. 323-33.

Putnam, L.L. and Pacanowsky, M. (Eds) (1983), *Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.

Putnam, L.L., Phillips, N. and Chapman, P. (1996), "Metaphors of communication and organization", in Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage, London, pp. 375-408.

Redding, W.C. and Tompkins, P.K. (1988), "Organizational communication – past and present tenses", in Goldhaber, G.M. and Barnett, G.A. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 5-33.

Seeger, M.W., Ulmer, R.R., Novak, J.M. and Sellnow, T. (2005), "Post-crisis discourse and organizational change, failure and renewal", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 78-95.

Sillince, J.A.A. (1999), "The role of political language forms and language coherence in the organizational change process", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 20, pp. 485-518.

Stensaker, I. and Falkenberg, J. (2007), "Making sense of different responses to corporate change", *Human Relations*, Vol. 60, pp. 137-77.

Ströh, U. and Jaatinen, M. (2001), "New approaches to communication management for transformation and change in organisations", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 6, pp. 148-66.

Sturdy, A. and Grey, C. (2003), "Beneath and beyond organizational change management: exploring alternatives", *Organization*, Vol. 10, pp. 651-62.

Taylor, J.R. and Robichaud, D. (2004), "Finding the organization in the communication: discourse as action and sensemaking", *Organization*, Vol. 11, pp. 395-413.

Taylor, J.R. and van Every, E.J. (2000), *The Emergent Organization: Communication as Its Site and Surface*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Taylor, J.R., Flanagin, A.J., Cheney, G. and Seibold, D.R. (2001), "Organizational communication research: key moments, central concerns, and future challenges", in Gudykunst, W. (Ed.) Communication Yearbook, Vol. 24, Sage, London, pp. 99-137.

Tsoukas, H. and Chia, R. (2002), "On organizational becoming: rethinking organizational change", *Organization Science*, Vol. 13, pp. 567-83.

Weick, K.E. (1993), "The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: the Mann Gulch disaster", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 38, pp. 628-52.

Weick, K.E. (1998), "Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis", *Organization Science: A Journal of the Institute of Management Sciences*, Vol. 9, pp. 543-56.

Weick, K.E. and Quinn, R.E. (1999), "Organizational change and development", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp. 361-86.

Weick, K.E., Sutcliffe, K.M. and Obstfeld, D. (2005), "Organizing and the process of sensemaking", *Organization Science*, Vol. 16, pp. 409-22.

Zorn, T., Christensen, L.T. and Cheney, G. (1999), *Do We Really Want Constant Change? Beyond the Bottom Line*, Berrett-Koehler-Publishers, San Francisco, CA.

Zorn, T.E., Page, D.J. and Cheney, G. (2000), "Nuts about change: multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public sector organization", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 13, pp. 515-66.

Further reading

Heide, M. and Simonsson, C. (2005), *Kommunikation & Organisation* (*Communication & Organization*), Liber, Malmö.

Tsoukas, H., Ven, A.H. and Poole, M.S. (2005), "Alternative approaches for studying organizational change", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26, pp. 1377-404.

Varey, R.J. and critical, A. (2000), "review of conceptions of communication evident in contemporary business and management literature", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 328-40.

About the authors

Catrin Johansson (PhD Uppsala University) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Media and Communication at Mid Sweden University. Her research belongs to organizational communication and public relations, focusing communication between managers and employees; communication on change; and roles, status and legitimacy of PR practitioners. Her work

appears in journals such as Nordicom Review and Public Relations Review. She co-authored the first Swedish textbook on organizational communication (together with Mats Heide and Charlotte Simonsson). She has initiated and arranged Communiqué – a Swedish research conference on organizational communication. Catrin Johansson is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: Catrin.Johansson@miun.se

Mats Heide (PhD Lund University) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Lund University. His research interests include organizational communication, change communication, crisis communication, knowledge management and ICT. He has co-autored three books in Swedish on organizational communication and strategic communication. He and Catrin Johansson are currently working on a book on change communication directed to practitioners.

This article has been cited by:

1. George G. Panigyrakis, Antigone G. Kyrousi. 2015. Color effects in print advertising: a research update (1985-2012). *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **20**:3, 233-255. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

2. Paul Lawrence. 2015. Leading Change – Insights Into How Leaders Actually Approach the Challenge of Complexity. *Journal of Change Management* **15**, 231-252. [CrossRef]

3. Anne-Marie Søderberg. 2015. Recontextualising a strategic concept within a globalising company: a case study on Carlsberg's 'Winning Behaviours' strategy. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* **26**, 231-257. [CrossRef]

4. Al Selvin, Simon Buckingham Shum. 2014. Constructing Knowledge Art: An Experiential Perspective on Crafting Participatory Representations. *Synthesis Lectures on Human-Centered Informatics* **7**, 1-119. [CrossRef]

5. Paula Matos Marques Simoes, Mark Esposito. 2014. Improving change management: how communication nature influences resistance to change. *Journal of Management Development* **33**:4, 324-341. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

6. Vilma L. Luoma-aho, Mirja E. Makikangas. 2014. Do public sector mergers (re)shape reputation?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* **27**:1, 39-52. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

7. Judy McKay, Peter Marshall, Nick GraingerRethinking Communication in IT Project Management 4315-4324. [CrossRef]

8. Jacquie L'Etang. 2013. Public Relations: A Discipline in Transformation. *Sociology Compass* **7**:10.1111/soc4.v7.10, 799-817. [CrossRef]

9. Emanuele Invernizzi, Stefania Romenti, Michela Fumagalli. 2012. Identity, communication and change management in Ferrari. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **17**:4, 483-497. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

10. Kaisa Airo, Heidi Rasila, Suvi Nenonen. 2012. Speech as a way of constructing change in space. *Facilities* **30**:7/8, 289-301. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

11. Christina Grandien, Catrin Johansson. 2012. Institutionalization of communication management. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **17**:2, 209-227. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

12. Stakeholder Interactions: Storying and Framing 233-259. [CrossRef]

13. Lars Silver. 2009. Perspectives on organisational change. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **14**:4, 369-388. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

14. Mark van Vuuren, Wim J.L. Elving. 2008. Communication, sensemaking and change as a chord of three strands. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **13**:3, 349-359. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

15. Angelo Camillo, Loredana Di PietroManagerial Communication in the Global Cross-Cultural Context 1265-1287. [CrossRef]