

Leading people and communities through change: the case for unlearning

Link to publication record in USC Research Bank:

<http://research.usc.edu.au/vital/access/manager/Repository/usc:28204>

Document Version:

Author accepted manuscript (postprint)

Citation for published version:

Becker, Karen; Karayan, J (2005) Leading people and communities through change: the case for unlearning. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.121-130.

Copyright Statement:

Copyright © 2005 The Authors. The author accepted version is reproduced here with permission.

General Rights:

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the USC Research Bank is retained by the author(s) and / or the copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of the Sunshine Coast has made every reasonable effort to ensure that USC Research Bank content complies with copyright legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact research-repository@usc.edu.au providing details, and we will remove the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**LEADING PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES THROUGH CHANGE: THE CASE FOR
UNLEARNING**

Karen Becker (Windeknecht)

Faculty of Business & Law
Central Queensland University

Professor John E Karayan
California State Polytechnic University
Pomona

LEADING PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES THROUGH CHANGE: THE CASE FOR UNLEARNING

ABSTRACT

Organisations impact on the community in which they operate, particularly in regionally-based organisations. Therefore, when significant organisational changes are being designed and implemented, it is critical to consider the likely impact on the community. In many cases, the individuals involved and sometimes entire communities are being confronted with changes that question their long-held beliefs and basic assumptions. In this situation, simply encouraging a “new way of doing things” is insufficient, and the more recently recognised issue of unlearning becomes particularly relevant. This paper utilises as an example two regionally-based organisations located in the same town, considers the impact of change at the individual, organisational and community level, and advocates the need for unlearning.

Keywords: unlearning, organisational change, individual change, communities, organisational behaviour

INTRODUCTION

Organisational change is often considered in both the popular and academic literature in terms of the impact it has within the boundaries of the immediate organisation (Graetz, Rimmer, Lawrence and Smith 2002; Hayes 2002). Less frequently, it is considered in terms of impact externally (Balogun and Hope Hailey 2004; Waddell, Cummings and Worley 2004), and on these occasions the focus is generally on the effect on the business community or industry sector. However, particularly in remote towns reliant on particular organisations or industries, the implications can be far reaching in terms of the impact on the community in general. This paper considers the effects of organisational change not only on the individuals within the organisation, but also on the community in which it operates. The two examples illustrating the impact of organisational change on the wider community, are taken from one location in Queensland, Australia, and offer a unique opportunity to consider the consequences of changes made within organisations on the community in general. The changes being implemented had significant impact upon the long-held beliefs and assumptions within the organisations and the community, and therefore the need for unlearning to occur as an integral part of the change is also considered.

Existing research and literature in three distinct areas provide a useful background for this research. Firstly, the general organisational change literature particularly as it relates to external stakeholders is considered. Secondly, the unlearning literature in particular provides focus to allow assessment of the relative need for unlearning in terms of the types of changes being introduced. Finally, the literature in the area of corporate citizenship provides an indication of the emphasis now being placed on considering the wider social implications of their organisational actions and changes. The case studies then provide a background and analysis of changes made in two organisations both operating within the same town in Queensland, Australia. This provides

insight into the town, the community, the impact of the industries, and the flow-on effects from introduction of change in both organisations. Finally, some conclusions are drawn relating to the consideration of unlearning at an individual, organisational and community level as an integral part of the management of organisational change.

ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE, UNLEARNING AND CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

A great deal has been written about the topic of organisational change, and it has been an area widely researched. A review of the literature in the area reveals a common approach of recognising external stakeholders as part of the change process (Ulrich and Wiersema 1989; Thompson 1996; Whitney 1998). Even this identification of external stakeholders stops short of identifying the wider community as a stakeholder, instead identifying groups such as customers, suppliers and shareholders. However, some have advocated the importance of identifying and assessing the relative power and interest of various internal and external stakeholders within a change process (Balogun and Hope Hailey 2004), leading to the assumption that if the community was identified initially as one of these external stakeholders, then an analysis of the impact of organisational change upon the community should be undertaken as an integral part of the change management process.

Many researchers have attempted to categorise change identifying the difference between incremental and discontinuous change or, sometimes referred to as continuous improvement versus radical transformation (Stace and Dunphy 1996; Abraham and Knight 2001; Pardo del Val and Martinez Fuentes 2003). Whilst it is not the intention to analyse extensively the many different terminologies used to describe categories of change, it is recognised that various types and levels of change occur within organisations.

Incremental change or continuous improvement refers to relatively small changes to an existing situation, seen as an improvement rather than a significant change or departure from current processes or systems (Stace and Dunphy 1996; Abraham and Knight 2001). This has been referred to by other researchers as first order or evolutionary change (Levy 1986; Pardo del Val and Martinez Fuentes 2003). In addition, Perrick (cited in Zaugg and Thom 2003) has offered a model of change classified as punctuated equilibrium as an alternative to continuous improvement or incremental change. It is suggested that in the process of continuous improvement, there occur periods of change punctuated by periods of stability, rather than being an ongoing evolutionary process with no periods of continuity.

Discontinuous change or radical transformation is significant change that effects generally the entire organisation and is a radical shift from current processes or systems; in effect having a large impact on the nature of the organisation (Stace and Dunphy 1996; Abraham and Knight 2001). This type of change has also been referred to as second order or transformational change (Levy 1986; Pardo del Val and Martinez Fuentes 2003). A more recently discussed term defined by Weick & Quin (1999) is that of third order change, and is defined as “question(ing) the adequacy of schemas themselves...” (Weick and Quinn 1999:363). It is suggested that the change is so radical that it challenges current organisational and societal norms and standards.

Regardless of the terminology chosen, Pardo del Val & Martinez Fuentes (2003) warn it is dangerous to consider changes in terms of absolutes; believing that they fall either in one category or another. It is more appropriate to consider type of change as falling along a continuum between two extremes. Abraham & Knight (2001) also make the important point that it is possible for the same change to fall into different categories when implemented in different organisations, hence reflecting organisational context and culture.

In addition to considering the type of change occurring, it is also important to consider the drivers of the change. Many researchers have identified categories of factors driving or at the least influencing change within organisations. These include issues such as the changing nature of the workforce and/or the workplace, technology, macro-economics, competition, social trends, politics and increasing legislation and regulation (Ulrich and Wiersema 1989; Tvorik and Boissoneau 1996; Kemelgor, Johnson and Srinivasan 2000; McDonald 2000; Schabracq and Cooper 2000; Sauser Jr and Sauser 2002). One could assume that depending on the severity and impact of this force for change, there would then be a decision made as to the nature and extent of the required change – whether it is to organisational systems, processes, structures, or a mix of these which again will determine the extent to which the wider community may be impacted.

If the focus is turned to radical transformation or discontinuous change in particular, then the relatively recent concept of unlearning becomes particularly important. Those who have used the term unlearning have used it in a number of different contexts. Some have referred to this concept in terms of individuals undergoing a process of releasing old ways and embracing new behaviours, ideas or actions (Bridges 1991; Baxter 2000; Duffy 2003), whilst others have focussed more upon organisations, as a system, releasing previous methods and approaches in order to accommodate changing environments and circumstances internal to the organisation (Hedberg 1981; Klein 1989; Hamel and Prahalad 1994). In terms of individuals unlearning, whether they be internal or external to the organisation, Newstrom (1983) advocated that the most unlearning will be required in the learning situation where the objective of the change is to replace one behaviour with another. It can be hypothesised that a change with wide-reaching impacts requiring significant unlearning both by those within the organisation and the wider community, will have more of an impact than those requiring only minor adjustments to current practices. Therefore, of these categories of

change, those classified as discontinuous in particular will present the largest challenge for a community to embrace. However, there is limited empirical research relating to impacts of change at a community level.

In the management and financial literature, there is also an emerging recognition of social impacts of organisations. The terms corporate social performance, corporate social responsibility and corporate social responsiveness have been offered although operational definitions are lacking, and those within industry are more likely to refer to the term corporate citizenship (Clarkson 1995). Particularly in relation to corporate citizenship, Clarkson (1995) identifies that management are generally accustomed to processes of stakeholder management (including those within the community who are considered stakeholders) but general social responsibility is not as clearly recognised as important by managers and drivers of change. In research conducted into corporate citizenship (Davenport 2000), three key elements were determined to indicate good corporate citizenship; ethical business behaviour, stakeholder commitment and environmental commitment. In terms of stakeholder commitment, the experts who provided data for this research clearly identified community as one of the stakeholders identifying that good corporate citizens foster a “reciprocal relationship between the corporation and the community”, and “invest in the communities in which it operates” (Davenport 2000:217). This would indicate a shift towards considering community within the context of organisational decision making.

From an economic rationalist perspective, it could be argued that organisations cannot afford to become too involved in general social issues as opposed to stakeholder management. However, they do need to strategically consider the impact of being seen as socially responsive and responsible to support other key strategies such as becoming an employer of choice and industry leader, improving brand recognition, and reducing legislative penalties. Therefore, when

considering particularly radical changes, it is argued that the consideration of broader community impacts and allowance for unlearning both within the organisation and externally will contribute to the effectiveness of these changes.

METHODOLOGY

This research focussed on an analysis of discontinuous change implemented within two organisations within the same regional community. It took an exploratory, observational case study approach. Case studies such as these allow for the generation of hypotheses on a particular phenomenon which can then be used as the basis for further research (Yin 1994). Case studies also have the ability to probe deeply complex phenomena being considered in an attempt to reach some generalisations (Burns 2000). A case study methodology was considered the most appropriate method to test previous theories put forward about the complex phenomena of unlearning, particularly in relation to the claim by Newstrom (1983) that change requiring replacement of one behaviour or belief with another will mean the importance of unlearning is extremely significant. Therefore, the aim of this research was to test whether unlearning was an issue during the implementation of discontinuous change at both an organisational and community level. The research involved the observation and analysis of the change initiatives within the two chosen organisations over a period of approximately six months and as an inductive approach was taken during this study, data collection and analysis were intertwined (Glesne 1998).

CASE STUDY COMMUNITY

The town under consideration is located in a remote, rural location in Queensland, Australia. It is situated approximately 900 km from the state's capital city, and approximately 200 km from the

region's major service centre. The railway was the first industry to initiate the establishment of a township which was gazetted in the late 1880's. It remained little more than a small service centre for a population of approximately 30 until the 1960's when leases over the coal deposits in the area were granted. Workers then moved into the area to work in these mines, housed predominantly in housing commission accommodation funded by the mining operation. Today, the town services at least 3 large black coal mines, with a number of smaller privately owned coal mining operations also in existence. It has a population of approximately 8000 and also services the surrounding rural district, with farming and grazing the main enterprises. This town, as is the case with many others in Queensland, was largely built by the mining companies operating within the area. This means that unlike mining towns in other Australian states such as New South Wales, that were established with strong rural bases prior to the advent of coal mining, this town is heavily dependent on the coal mining industry and operations for its existence.

The coal mining industry within Australia has seen large developments over the past forty years. From the original labour-intensive methods of extraction, it has now progressed to operations which are highly automated and involve a high level of technical ability. Since its inception, the industry has been heavily unionised, due in part to its origins in the underground mining environment where conditions were cramped and dangerous, leading to militant unions, and in the end transferring this culture to the open cut mining sector (Barry, Bowden and Brosnan 1998). The open cut industry has since developed more of an individualistic culture as the move from team-based production and working side by side in an underground operation was replaced by the operation on an individual basis of large pieces of machinery in large scale operations. The industry has also been traditionally male-dominated due in part to the high physical demands of the job.

The industry has been associated historically with a high level of industrial disputation generally related to wages, safety or working conditions (Productivity Commission 1999). These and many other factors have lead to a certain culture not only within the organisations but also within the communities in which they operate, as the isolation and heavy reliance upon one industry fosters certain expectations within the community at large.

The industry also has a history of marked demarcation particularly between production and engineering employees, fuelled by particularly the craft unions who would not allow other employees to be involved in even basic maintenance work (Barry et al. 1998). From the 1960's to the early 1980's the industry enjoyed high profitability and conditions such as the "coal bonus" for employees in addition to their wages was utilised, based entirely upon production outputs rather than profitability in an overall sense. Then in the mid 1980's, when the world coal market slumped, reform processes and particularly more flexible work practices became high on the corporate agenda in an effort to focus on the cost of production (Barry et al. 1998). Even in the late 1980's when award restructuring occurred, there was little headway made in terms of removing the old segregation of production versus engineering employees, and at a higher level, employees (those covered by an award) versus staff (those employed on individual contracts or salary).

Many changes within the industry have meant that both the employees, and the wider community have had to adapt to new and different circumstances. Firstly, the issue of continuous production came to the fore, as mining operations strove to increase access to equipment, and as a result, increase production (Bowden 2001). When this finally became a reality, it lead to the introduction of different shift and roster arrangements, which as a result had an impact on the community, as

they came to terms with the absence of community members overnight and on weekends, impacting not only at a personal but also a social level.

CASE STUDY ORGANISATIONS

The first organisation operating within the particular community being considered (Organisation A) is a coal mining operation employing approximately 300 people at this site, and is part of a larger diversified organisation. The challenges faced by this company reflect the previously described history of the industry in general. In the past, as in most of the coal mining operations, the organisation's approach to management was viewed as traditional, with a large divide between employees and staff, and within the employee ranks, between engineering and production employees. It had a coal bonus in place and was striving to increase production whilst containing costs. The mid 1990's saw a protracted period of unrest and strike action taken by the unions against the company. After some time, the management determined that a new approach to operating within the mine was necessary to ensure the long-term viability of the operation. With the introduction of a new management agenda of emphasis on appropriate workplace behaviours, accountability and transparency, the organisation pushed forward, attempting to change the long-held beliefs of not only the employees but also the wider community about how the mine should operate and what behaviours would be rewarded. The changes being implemented required a significant level of unlearning at the individual, organisational and community level.

At a time when the mining industry within the town was undergoing significant change, the second organisation being considered (Organisation B), a welfare organisation was also encountering a change of its own. It is just one branch of an organisation, with other offices located throughout the region, employing only a few individuals in each of these offices in roles varying from

counsellors to community housing officers. This larger regional body was a result of the amalgamation of branches all based in rural and remote locations; converting them from local, community run operations to a larger corporate entity with accompanying senior management and administrative structures located in the larger regional centre approximately 200 kilometres away. In undergoing this major change, the organisation went from a community focus to an organisational focus, with staff being expected to engage not only with their community, but with the broader organisation. This strategic change likewise, proved a challenge to long-held beliefs within the agency about its role, values and overall direction. Within this change, it is also important to note that in an organisation serving the community at such a close proximity, changes in the organisation will have ramifications on the community.

Based upon the previously described changing external environment and internal unrest, Organisation A embarked upon a strategy to reposition their organisation. The management of the organisation saw performance management as a vehicle for more widespread cultural change. The organisation also had to consider the background of mistrust and community concern due to the preceding strikes and the impact this would have on the change process. In this case, the change recipients were not just the employees, but also their families and the community, as is often the case in smaller towns.

One element of this strategy for cultural change was the removal of the previous system of reward for output on a collective basis using the “coal bonus”, and introduction of a process of individual recognition and reward, based upon participatory leadership and behavioural approaches to performance management. The successive stages of system design and implementation were observed. The initial design of this system involved representatives from all organisational levels and disciplines within the organisation. Focus groups were utilised to determine the behavioural

descriptors based upon broader behavioural components previously determined at a senior management level. The focus groups involved identification and description by the participants of behaviours within the workplace that would contribute to a more effective organisation.

The organisation then embarked upon a process of development of the managers and supervisors responsible for system implementation, as well as development of the employees to be assessed by this system. The training focussed not only on the new system but also upon why the old system was no longer effective. This training was considered critical to the successful implementation of the system as it challenged the long-held belief not only within this organisation, but across the industry in general, that outputs should be rewarded on a group basis. Observations made of the community at this same time, particularly in relation to family members and partners of employees, showed that they also held strong beliefs about performance management having been exposed for many years to the “coal bonus” approach to reward. It was therefore important that in changing this system, those within the organisation responsible for driving the change considered unlearning past approaches and behaviours and addressed them not only at the individual and work group level but also to a lesser extent within the community.

On a smaller scale, but no less significant in some respects, Organisation B at the time of this research, had recently moved to a corporate model of governance, removing the previous community-lead approach to management of the agency. With this new management came the introduction of standardised systems and centrally-controlled budgets and operating plans. No longer were the staff responsible for the overall direction of the organisation, and at times identified experiencing a loss of control. The organisation overall was struggling with lack of cohesion and complaints about management style, and the Board identified that a change in organisational culture was critical to the organisation achieving its goals.

Initially, an independent consultant was involved interviews with staff, gathering data about organisational culture and management style. The results of this analysis formed the basis of focus groups to determine specific issues for the organisation and particularly the remote branches. These focus groups then identified the areas in which either the staff or the management were having difficulty engaging with the evolving organisation.

During these focus groups, the staff reported difficulty with letting go of old forms of governance, often referring to the past as an indication of how the organisation should be managed. It was also reported that this change was impacting upon the community who were likewise struggling with interacting with the broader organisation rather than just their local branch.

ANALYSIS & LESSONS FROM THE CASE STUDIES

When conducting case analysis, it can be approached by either reviewing each case and identifying the emerging concepts, or by identifying concepts and then drawing upon the cases for illustrations of these concepts (Glesne 1998). This analysis takes the former approach in an effort to keep the cases and stories intact and to allow for emergence of themes and concepts.

Organisation A

Changes within the Organisation A affected the community and this in turn resulted in feedback into the organisation. Families unaccustomed to the individual reward and recognition process had difficulty letting go of past practices and accepting the new approach. Those involved however did appear to benefit from the training which addressed firstly the reasons for abolishing the old system, prior to the introduction of the new system. Some employees and supervisors were unable

to adjust to the new system to the extent that they left the organisation; some to move to other companies still utilising the older methods.

Also at a community level, the previous strike action within this organisation had engendered a divide within the community between those at management level, and the employees. These work issues flowed into the community with impacts identified by some employees in terms of the nature of social interaction and even impacts upon childrens' interactions within the schools in the area. The introduction of this new system of reward was seen as an opportunity to address some of the demarcation issues in the organisation, but over time, also served to address some of these social impacts in the wider community.

From this organisation, two key issues emerged from the analysis. Firstly, when a previously entrenched system fostering long-held beliefs is to be replaced, it is critical to allow sufficient time for the releasing of older methods, before or at least simultaneously with coming to terms with the new approach. Secondly, when an organisation operates within a community reliant upon its existence, the impact organisational changes may have upon the community cannot be underestimated. It was evident in this example that the organisation had to play an active role in assisting not only their direct employees, but also the community in general to understand the new approach and its implications.

Organisation B

In the case of Organisation B, the management failed to recognise in their planning of the changes, the fact that most middle managers and employees in their organisation based in rural and remote locations identified firstly with their community and secondly with the central organisation. The staff believed that first and foremost, their role was to advocate for their community and therefore

when organisational policies or procedures hindered this effort, they would not take an organisational standpoint. The staff were struggling with unlearning old ways of dealing with issues in relation to their areas of responsibility.

In this case it was clear that unless the organisation first dealt with assimilation issues, and gave their staff a sense of belonging to the wider organisation, their change efforts were doomed for failure. Secondly, because the organisation had previously had community input and involvement, it was crucial that in an ongoing sense the community remained engaged with the organisation. In terms of unlearning, attempts were made to change the approach of both the management and employees in a number of different ways. In cases such as this, where staff and the organisation as a whole are having difficulty unlearning old ways, the removal (often referred to as “exorcism”) of the leader of the organisation can serve as a catalyst for change (Nystrom and Starbuck 1984; Klein 1989). When the existing Chief Executive Officer left the organisation, a change throughout the organisation was signalled. Staff were able to consider new ways of approaching their work, taking into account both their alliances to the community and to the wider organisation. The community as a result was then able to enjoy the benefits of a larger organisation with more resources, whilst still having an agency acting as an advocate on their behalf.

The findings from this second case serve to reinforce the findings from Organisation A. As a result of this process, it was determined that insufficient attention had been paid to ensuring that the staff understood the strategic direction of the newly formed organisation, and were engaged with the organisation as a whole. It was apparent that little had been done to directly address the issue of unlearning prior to the implementation of new strategies, systems and procedures. Again, emphasising that making some allowance for unlearning prior to, or at least simultaneously with changes, will enhance the change process and increase the likelihood of success.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The examples utilised within this research provide preliminary indications that consideration of unlearning at individual, organisational and community level is important for the successful implementation of organisational change, particularly in regionally-based organisations. Whilst a case study methodology offered the most appropriate approach to this research, its limitations are noted. The possible impact of investigator bias is acknowledged, along with a cautious approach to overgeneralisation of the findings. As this is exploratory research, no scientific generalisations can be reached (Burns 2000) however the study highlights a number of key issues worthy of more extensive research.

In particular, two key conclusions have been reached that warrant further investigation. Firstly, when the community is heavily reliant upon the organisation involved for its livelihood and long-term sustainability, it is essential that this stakeholder is recognised within the change process. Whilst from an economic rationalist perspective, it could be argued that the consideration of community aspects of change fall outside the realms of responsibility of any single organisation, there is also growing evidence that behaviours relating to corporate citizenship do have benefits for the organisation. From a change management perspective, it can be argued that, particularly in isolated communities, the consideration of the community as a key stakeholder and subsequent planning for involvement in the change process can have significant benefits in terms of maintaining focus and momentum in the change effort.

Secondly, there are strong indications that recognition of the need for unlearning and its facilitation as an integral part of a process particularly involving discontinuous change may assist in the

successful transition to new behaviours. It appears that there is a great deal more to be understood in the area of unlearning, particularly in relation to its role in organisational change, and whether regionally-based organisations present change management issues in addition to those identified in this paper. Whilst unlearning is a concept being more widely discussed, there have been few studies focussing on how individuals, organisations and communities unlearn and how to assist this process in order to facilitate organisational change. Recognition is given to the need for more empirical research into the impact of unlearning ability on the implementation and acceptance of organisational change. Until this is considered, those planning and implementing change will continue to insist on adoption of new ways without giving sufficient consideration to letting go of the old.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, J. L. and D. J. Knight (2001). Strategic innovation: Leveraging creative action for more profitable growth. *Strategy and Leadership* 29(1): 21-26.
- Balogun, J. and V. Hope Hailey (2004). *Exploring Strategic Change*. Essex, Prentice Hall.
- Barry, M., B. Bowden and P. Brosnan (1998). *The Fallacy of Flexibility: Workplace reform in the open cut coal industry*. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Baxter, P. (2000). Mediation Learning: Empowering individuals and enterprises to take control of change and continuous innovation. STAC Unit, DETIR: Retrieved December 11, 2003, from <http://www.det.qld.gov.au/skillsmed/>.
- Bowden, B. (2001). Heroic Failure? Unionism and Queensland's Coal Communities. *Labour & Industry* 11(3): 73-.
- Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*. Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley.
- Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to Research Methods*. Sydney, Pearson Education Australia.
- Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. *Academy of Management Review* 20(1): 92-117.
- Davenport, K. (2000). Corporate Citizenship: A Stakeholder Approach for Defining Corporate Social Performance and Identifying Measures for Assessing It. *Business and Society* 39(2): 210-219.
- Duffy, F. M. (2003). I think, therefore I am resistant to change. *Journal of Staff Development* 24(1): 30-36.
- Glesne, C. (1998). *Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction*. New York, Longman.
- Graetz, F., M. Rimmer, A. Lawrence and A. Smith (2002). *Managing Organisational Change*. Brisbane, John Wiley & Sons.
- Hamel, G. and C. Prahalad (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Hayes, J. (2002). *The Theory and Practice of Change Management*. Hampshire, Palgrave.
- Hedberg, B. (1981). How Organizations Learn and Unlearn. *Handbook of Organizational Design*. P. Nystrom and W. H. Starbuck. London, Cambridge University Press. 1.
- Kemelgor, B. H., S. D. Johnson and S. Srinivasan (2000). Forces driving organizational change: A business school perspective. *Journal of Education for Business* 75(3): 133.
- Klein, J. I. (1989). Parenthetic Learning in Organizations: Toward the Unlearning of the Unlearning Model. *The Journal of Management Studies* 26(3): 291.
- Levy, A. (1986). Second order planned change: definition and conceptualization. *Organizational Dynamics* 15(1): 5-20.
- McDonald, J. M. (2000). Managing rapid change: From theory to practice: An invited article. *Southern Business Review* 25(2): 28.
- Newstrom, J. W. (1983). The Management of Unlearning: Exploding the "Clean Slate" Fallacy. *Training and Development Journal* 37(8): 36.
- Nystrom, P. C. and W. H. Starbuck (1984). To Avoid Organizational Crises, Unlearn. *Organizational Dynamics* 12(4): 53.
- Pardo del Val, M. and C. Martinez Fuentes (2003). Resistance to change: A literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision* 41(1/2): 148.
- Productivity Commission (1999). *The Australian Black Coal Industry Inquiry Report*, Productivity Commission. 2004.
- Sauser Jr, W. I. and L. D. Sauser (2002). Changing the way we manage change. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal* 67(4): 34.

- Schabracq, M. J. and C. L. Cooper (2000). The changing nature of work and stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 15(3): 227.
- Stace, D. and D. Dunphy (1996). *Beyond the Boundaries: leading and re-creating the successful enterprise*. Sydney, McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, J. L. (1996). Strategic effectiveness and success: the learning challenge. *Management Decision* 34(7): 14.
- Tvorik, S. and R. Boissoneau (1996). Strategic organization change in competitive markets. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* 15(1): 5.
- Ulrich, D. and M. F. Wiersema (1989). Gaining Strategic And Organizational Capability In A Turbul. *The Academy of Management Executive* 3(2): 115.
- Waddell, D. M., T. G. Cummings and C. G. Worley (2004). *Managing Organisation Development and Change: Pacific Rim 2nd ed*. Melbourne, Thomson Learning.
- Weick, K. E. and R. E. Quinn (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 361.
- Whitney, D. (1998). Let's change the subject and change our organization: an appreciative inquiry approach to organization change. *Career Development International* 3(7): 314.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research - Design and methods, applied social research methods*. Newbury Park, CA, Sage.
- Zaugg, R. J. and N. Thom (2003). Excellence through implicit competencies: Human resource management - organisational development - knowledge creation. *Journal of Change Management* 3(3): 199-211.