

12-1-2013

Individual and Organizational Responses to Changing and Challenging Conditions

Kristin Backhaus

State University of New York at New Paltz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Backhaus, Kristin (2013) "Individual and Organizational Responses to Changing and Challenging Conditions," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 10: Iss. 4, Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol10/iss4/2>

EDITORIAL

OMJ Is 10th of 84 Journals in Quality of Business Education Articles

Plus Articles in Corporate Sustainability, Dealing With Downsizing, and Endogenization

William P. Ferris¹

Editor-in-Chief

¹*College of Business, Western New England University, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA*

We were quite pleasantly surprised to read that *OMJ* achieved a ranking of 10th in a universe of 84 business education journals for the quality of our management education articles. Obviously, we publish most of our management education articles in the Teaching & Learning section, but we also have some in the First Person section. In their article entitled “Management Education Journals’ Rank and Tier by Active Scholars,” researchers Russell R. Currie and Gurupdes Pandher, writing in the journal *Academy of Management Learning & Education*’s recent June 2013 issue, surveyed the opinion of 317 “active scholars,” all of whom had written articles in the 84 journals, as to the quality, awareness, and overall impact of each journal.¹

In addition to our 10th place ranking in quality, we were 18th in awareness and impact among researchers in the field, which is quite noteworthy for a journal only in its seventh year as a quarterly. The other journals were focused entirely on education in business fields, so it is especially notable that *OMJ*, which publishes basic research articles as well as management education ones, should do so well in competition with the more specialized journals. Overall, the authors surveyed rated us a B+ journal, not at all bad for such a young journal.

We think this issue lives up to the promise of the *Academy of Management Learning & Education* article and extends it to other sections of the journal. We begin the issue with three articles in the Current Empirical Research section, and go on to an article in Teaching & Learning, as well as a book review. In “Gender and Corporate Sustainability: On Values, Vision, and Voice,” Joan L. Slepian and Gwen E. Jones of Fairleigh Dickinson University follow the lead of their university’s leadership in corporate sustainability (Fairleigh Dickinson Institute

for Sustainable Enterprise) with an article exploring gender differences with regard to sustainability values. Their survey of 925 men and women in corporate life finds that women value sustainability and environmental concerns with a greater degree of priority than men, and they tend to judge their employer accordingly. The authors go on to suggest further study of actual female participation in corporate sustainability initiatives would contribute to this line of research by potentially confirming a connection between espoused values and actual behavior.

In the second of the three empirical articles, entitled “Organizational Downsizing During an Economic Crisis: Survivors’ and Victims’ Perspectives,” Roselie McDevitt, Catherine Giapponi, and Deborah M. Houston explore differences between victims’ and survivors’ emotions, perceptions, and attributions following downsizings that they experienced. As a result of the 2007–2009 recession, many companies were forced to downsize. The authors surveyed 148 adult students taken from a sample of 540 who were studying for undergraduate degrees at a small college in North Carolina. They constructed 12 hypotheses regarding expected feelings and attributions around victim and survivor downsizings as the students reflected upon their experiences. Half of these hypotheses resulted in significant differences between victims and survivors while the rest did not. For example, victims generally felt less fairly treated than survivors and that their supervisors were less responsive to their needs and less unhappy to lay them off than was perceived by the survivors. However, surprisingly, there were no significant differences in perceptions of corporate-level communication. Understandably, victims felt less optimistic about their companies’ future and more nervous about their own than survivors did. The authors make the important point that managers who are engaged or about to be engaged in a layoff need to take special pains to mitigate the perceived violation of psychological contracts as well as causal attributions

Address correspondence to William P. Ferris, Professor of Management, College of Business, Western New England University, 1215 Wilbraham Road, Springfield, MA 01119, USA. E-mail: bferris@wne.edu

in both victims and survivors in order to mitigate further morale damage to their companies.

The third of the CER articles, “From Endogenization to Justification: Strategic Responses to Legitimacy Challenges in Contentious Organizational Fields,” by Paul-Brian McInerney, demonstrates *OMJ*'s commitment to ethnographic research as part of CER's mission. In it, the author describes his time with a nonprofit corporation from the vantage point of a volunteer process consultant who brought his laptop to the organization for 2½ years, recording exact dialogue and observation of all that he saw. The thread of the observations in his article centers on the evolution of an organizational strategy to deal with rumors, innuendoes, and what he calls “denunciations,” accusing the organization of acting more like a for-profit organization than a nonprofit. Competitors who were for-profits were concerned that they were being undercut by the prices the company was charging clients. Using institutional theory, McInerney is able to show how the process of responding to the denunciation by doing regular and highly visible outside community service in the company's name demonstrates an organization's ability to develop a strategy under constraint that allows a social entrepreneur to become an institutional entrepreneur.

A Corporate Sustainability Teaching & Learning Gem

Co-editor emeritus Steven Meisel, who was senior co-editor of our Teaching & Learning section since the journal's inception until a little over a year ago, when he semiretired from his editor's role, introduces our fourth article later in this issue. The article bookends our issue in that its subject is corporate sustainability, only this time, the teaching of it as the

cornerstone of the capstone course in most undergraduate business programs—Strategy. This article is a treasure trove of resources for anyone seeking to teach corporate sustainability (CS) or corporate social responsibility (CSR) or related topics, whether in Strategy or not. The article is entitled “Integrating Corporate Sustainability and Organizational Strategy within the Undergraduate Business Curriculum” by Jamie R. Wieland and Dale E. Fitzgibbons, and you can't afford to miss its premise, its evidence, or its lists of works cited and teaching resources. Wieland and co-author Dale Fitzgibbons, who is a member of several editorial boards, including ours, discuss the argument for CS as a stand-alone course versus incorporating it throughout the business curriculum. Their answer is that to elevate CS as centered on the stakeholder model instead of the shareholder model, it is important to put it at the center of the senior-year capstone course in the curriculum. They then report on their experience doing exactly that, complete with evidence gathered from student surveys asking students how important they feel the stakeholder CS model is at the end of the course. They also supply in their appendices more resources than a professor could possibly use in five such courses. Do not miss this article! It is emblematic of the quality in management education articles that we at *OMJ* are so proud that research now recognizes us for, and that I was proud to present at the beginning of this introduction.

NOTE

1. Currie, R. R., & Gurupdes Pandher, G. (2013). Management education journals' rank and tier by active scholars. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(2), 194–218. doi:10.5465/amle.2010.0184