Special Issue Proposal on 'Organizational Change and Public Sector Work'

Guest Editors

David Pick, Curtin University, Australia

Stephen T.T. Teo, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand (corresponding editor, stephen.teo@aut.ac.nz)

Lars Tummers, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Cameron Newton, Queensland University of Technology, Australia

New public management (NPM) refers to an ideology that underpinned public sector reform of the 1980s and 1990s (Dieffenbach, 2009; Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004; 2011). At its core was a problematisation of existing public sector institutional forms and operations for which the solution was establishing organizational arrangements within state bureaucracies that could be subjected to modern management as practiced in the private sector (Brunsson, 2012). Central to this are the ideas of steering, effectiveness, and efficiency, which proponents of NPM argue improve public administration by increasing accountability and productivity. Organizational change arising from NPM tended to be around structure, culture, strategy processes, and strategy content (Ashworth, et al., 2009). Some examples of these changes include the development of internal market-like competition, casualisation of employment, and the contracting-out of services in public hospitals, schools, and public transport.

Despite the sizeable theoretical arguments in support of NPM-inspired change, empirical research has not always produced results supporting the predicted desirable outcomes. Rather than improving performance, change has tended to create stressful environments for employees, especially arising from reductions in government funding support and tighter government requirements to do more with less. This can have significant deleterious effects on employee well-being which can in-turn negatively influence recruitment and retention. Conley (2002), for example, found that NPM reform is connected to an increasing use of temporary and insecure employment arrangements. This is clearly evident in the higher education sector where wide and deep changes to the forms and cultures of universities resulting from NPM-inspired change have significantly impacted on employees in the sector increasing job insecurity and stress (Chandler, et al., 2000).

Thoughtful assessment is then required to achieve a better understanding about NPM reform and its consequences. Of particular interest is the role managers as leaders take as agents of change (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006), developing better theoretical understandings of public sector management and governance of change, and formulating practical, evidence-based principles for implementing change (Azzone & Palermo, 2011; Cunningham & Kempling, 2009). As yet though the literature in these areas remains relatively under-developed. Kickert (2010: 490) notes that the change management literature is more focused on the private sector with little attention being paid to the way public employees react to change. A recent literature review on change management in the public sector by Kuipers, et al. (forthcoming) argue that there is a gap in the literature on change management specifically using the public administration perspective (see also Tummers, 2013; Vann, 2004). The main

aim of this special issue is to go someway way towards addressing this challenge by encouraging the development of new theoretical and practical insights about managing change in the public sector.

Authors of manuscripts submitted to this issue should focus on identifying, advancing and synthesizing knowledge about antecedents and consequences of organizational change in public sector organizations. The papers included in this special issue will address the challenges related to organizational change and employee outcomes and attitudes. This collection of research will provide the reader with an international perspective on NPM-inspired change that gives a picture of the degree to which there are commonalities of experience across nations of varying economic, social, political and cultural characteristics. We therefore invite papers about the following topics located within the broad theme of organizational change and public sector work:

- HR Policies, leadership and employee responses to organizational change

- Strategic HRM (including high performance work practices) and change management

- Personal organizational fit, public service motivation and stress

- Organizational change and misconduct behaviors

- Unintended consequences of culture change in the public sector

- Job insecurity

- Changes in the health care system and impact on employee performance outcomes

- Causes of stress before, during and after organizational change

The Guest Editors particularly encourage submissions of empirical nature, although review papers that make an original contribution are also welcome. The papers will be interdisciplinary, adopt a multi-level approach, and/or focus on contexts that have so far received little attention. Proposed abstracts (maximum 1000 words, following the usual Emerald structure for abstracts) are to be submitted by **31 September, 2013** to the corresponding editor of special issue, Stephen Teo.

The authors of accepted proposals should submit the papers via ScholarOne's Manuscript Central (http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jocm) by **30 November 2013**. Please do not forget to ear-mark them as submitted for the special issue on "Organizational Change and Public Work" edited by Stephen Teo (stephen.teo@aut.ac.nz) et al.

Full submission instructions can be found on the author guidelines site at http://www.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/author_guidelines.htm?id=jocm; please read through these instructions before submitting your paper. Articles will be between 3000 and 6000 words in length with a title of not more than eight words.

References

Ashworth, R., Boyne, G., & Delbridge, R. 2009. Escape from the iron cage? Organizational change and isomorphic pressures in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 165-187.

Azzone, G., & Palermo, T. 2011. Adopting performance appraisal and reward systems: A qualitative analysis of public sector organisational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *24*(1), 90-111.

Brunsson, N. 2011. New public organisations: A revivalist movement. In Chrsitensen, T. & Lægreid. *The Ashgate Companion to New Public Management*, Farnham, UK: Ashgate. 65-82.

Chandler, J., Barry J. & Clark, H. 2002. Stressing academe: The wear and tear of the new public management. *Human Relations*, 55, 1051-69.

Conley, H. 2002. A state of insecurity: Temporary work in the public services. *Work, Employment & Society*, 16(4), 725-737.

Cunningham, J.B. & Kempling, J.S. 2009. Implementing change in public sector organizations, *Management Decision*, 47, 330–344.

Diefenbach, T. 2009. New public management in public sector organizations: the dark sides of managerialistic 'enlightenment'. *Public Administration*, *87*(4), 892-909.

Fernandez, S. & Rainey, H.G. 2006. Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 168-176.

Hood, C. 1991. A public management for all seasons. *Public Administration*, 19(1), 3-19.

Kickert, W.J.M. 2010. Managing emergent and complex change: The case of Dutch agencification. *International Review of Administrative Sciences,* 76(3), 489-515.

Kuipers, B.S., Higgs, M.J., Kickert, W.J.M., Tummers, L.G., Grandia, J., Van der Voet, J. Forthcoming. The management of change in public organisations: A literature review. *Public Administration*.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. 2004. *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosenbloom, D.H. 2010. Public sector human resource management in 2020, *Public Administration Review*, 70(s1), s175-s176.

Tummers, L.G. 2013. *Policy alienation and the power of professionals: Confronting new policies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Vann, J. L. 2004. Resistance to change and the language of public organizations: A look at "clashing grammars" in large-scale information technology projects, *Public Organization Review*, 4(1), 47-73.