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ABSTRACT

An inherent characteristic of any organization is managing change. Whether the organization likes it or not, it must change to stay pertinent in a competitive environment. The art of managing changes can be differed between surviving and thriving in an industrial environment. Change can be an era of stimulating opportunities for some and a time of thrash, distraction or menace for others. The primary determinant of success of change is not only meeting a milestone, but ensuring employees’ skill to settle in and work successfully and competently in the new-fangled atmosphere. Every organization must need to bring into line the performance of their employees in order to execute change copiously in an organization. Aligning personnel and managerial performance administration systems steadily shifts the industrial culture and drives new manners in support of the change vision.

INTRODUCTION

The first and foremost evident definition of —change management is that the term refers to the art of creating and managing change. The purpose of this paper is to provide a broad overview for people to grip with change management for the opening time. In case of experienced people, this paper helps to reflect upon their experience in structured way. One meaning of change management is “make changes in a planned and systematic way”. In other words change management means “the
response to changes over which the organization exercises little or no control. Roughly in all cases, the course of change is indulged independently from the specifics of the circumstances. It is capability in this duty of managing the common process of change that is laid to assert by proficient change managers. This article implies about the organizational tools that helps the organizational individuals to utilize those tools which make successful personal transitions resulting in the realization and adoption of change.

CHANGE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

Many articles are dedicated to categorizing change aspects from both the external and internal locations. As organizations face the energetic, changing environment, they are required to become accustomed, change and in some cases, totally renovate their organization culture. Past research scrutinizes environmental factors that stimulate organizations to change in response to external environmental pressure and prospects and focus on environmental factors that may motivate organizations to transform towards change (Kotter, 1996; Lawrence, 1990; Hedberg, Nystrom and Starbuck, 1976) showing that there are many motivating forces that elicit the need for change. The most widely-stated sources come from macro-environmental issues such as major monetary and supporting changes, industrial advances, rapid extension in the global market and altering demographic and social constitution (George and Jones, 2002).

When an institution is going in the course of change, it is an instant for organization to put into effect the leadership. They should become the role models for the rest of the employees and reveal deeds that express what is anticipated from human resources in relation to the change. This would be unfalling with social learning theory (Bandura, 1986; Miller and Dollard, 1941) and the perception that populace learn through surveillance of others. Also during a time of managerial change, management needs to send optimistic messages about the change itself. On one level, affirmative verbal corroboration from management that the organizational change is enviable and favorable will accelerate employees’ acceptance to gain knowledge of the change. On an additional level, this will induce employees in a path of change. While this ploy does not fall under a learning theory, it is an imperative motivational loom for administration to occupy during organizational change segments as a means of arranging the foundation for new wisdom and changes in manners to take place. Robbins (2005) highlights the reality that several class of fortification is necessary to create changes in deeds, so organization needs to be very energetic during change phases to introduce strengthening tactics. One method to use that does not cost funds is verbal reinforcement. Verbal reinforcement of behaviors that robust into the organizational change will increase worker replication of those new change behaviors. Over time, old manners will confidently become quenched. They are reinstated with new behaviors. It really depends on the intensity of the organizational change taking place as to what type and how powerful reinforcement needs to be. The indispensable point is that fortification of some sort is an essential for change to take place in the entity. An organization can change its constitution and strategy by merely writing new regulations and measures, but the workers are not going to change pretty as easily. That is where the relation between education theories and organizational change really is and where fortification comes in as a crucial part of organizational alteration. Whether it is positive or negative, some reinforcement is going to have to be set into place for employees to fruitfully acclimatize to changes in the organization (Robbins, 2005).
UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

In recounting the psychology of change, the publication *Field Theory in Social Science* identifies three phases of process change: unfreezing (overcoming inertia and dismantling the existing mindset), implementation (when the change occurs—typically a period of confusion) and refreezing (the new mindset is crystallizing and a comfort level is returning at previous levels).

Change must be pragmatic and achievable. The teamwork of all stakeholders is a substance of inevitability. Instead of forcing a change, it is healthier to make sure that a sensible figure of stakeholders procures into the change and the progression of effecting the change. Criticism should be buoyant from the proponents and opponents of the change and should be impartially analyzed. Every change process should embark on asking at least four basic questions:

**WHAT NEEDS TO BE CHANGED?** Change should not be initiated into an organization just for the sake of it. Changes can be tempted from inside the organization or external of it. In either case, the problem of what to change is significant. The question is best responded when the restrictions of the current process are identified. The answer to this question should be capable to deal with why the change is necessary.

**TO WHAT SHOULD IT BE CHANGED?** It is solitary thing to know that there is a need to upshot changes in the present system, but an extra decisive question is to what it should be tainted. Change cannot be vindicated if the organization does not know an enhanced option to the present system/process. The proposed change must tender better payback to the system than the existing system does.

**HOW SHOULD THIS CHANGE HAPPEN?** This problem is as pertinent as the first two queries. Some admirable process changes (that lucratively answer the first two questions) end as failures, and all the administration instant and reserves are shattered because the question of how to make the change ensue was not suitably addressed. Whatever loom is adopted to achieve the change must address the fear of how to ensure no or negligible interruption to the structure and must upshot the change at a nominal cost.

**HOW CAN THE CHANGE BE SUSTAINED?** This issue may be the most serious of the four. The question, if accurately answered, justifies the perception at the back of change. The three preceding questions might be responded correctly, but if the question of how to prolong the change is not well addressed, all the pains are simply a waste in the lengthy run. This is the phase where many methods of changes countenance chaotic storms and, when they fall short, it is said they were “not able to plunk the assessment of an instant.

FOUR BASIC CHANGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

(See the Bennis, Benne & Chin reference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical-Rational</td>
<td>People are rational and will follow their self-interest — once it is revealed to them. Change is based on the communication of information and the proffering of incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative-Reeducative</td>
<td>People are social beings and will adhere to cultural norms and values. Change is based on redefining and reinterpreting existing norms and values, and developing commitments to new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-Coercive</td>
<td>People are basically compliant and will generally do what they are told or can be made to do. Change is based on the exercise of authority and the imposition of sanctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental-Adaptive</td>
<td>People oppose loss and disruption but they adapt readily to new circumstances. Change is based on building a new organization and gradually transferring people from the old one to the new one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACTORS IN SELECTING A CHANGE STRATEGY

In normal course of business, there is no single change strategy. We should select the best mix of strategies for better results. In your mix of strategies, a decision may be affected by numerous factors. Some of the more important ones follow.

- **The Stakes**: High wagers squabble for a mix of all four strategies. When the wagers are high, nothing can be left to prospect.
- **Scope and Scale**: This can vary from the trivial —tuning of a process within a unit to the complete renovation of the intact institution. The bigger the scope and scale, the additional probable an extensive jumble of strategies will be required with Power- Coercive playing a central role.
- **Target Population**: Large populations argue for a mix of all four strategies, something for each one so to speak.
- **The Time Frame**: Short time frameworks argue for a Power-Coercive strategy. Longer time frames argue for a mix of Empirical-Rational, Normative-Reductive and Environmental-Adaptive strategies.
- **Expertise**: Having available ample expertise at making change argues for several mix of the strategies outlined above. Not having it obtainable argues for dependence on the power-coercive strategy.
- **Dependency**: This is a typical double-edged weapon. If the institution is reliant on its people, management's capacity to sway or endure is limited. Conversely, if populace were reliant upon the organization, their capacity to combat or refuse to accept is limited. (Common enslavement roughly indicates a constraint for several stage of concession).

NEED FOR MANAGING CHANGE IN AN ORGANIZATION

ENSURE THE NEED

Managerial leaders must make sure and convincingly communicate the need for change. Research indicates that the realization of planned change generally requires that the cream of the crop verify the need for change and persuade other members of the organization and important external stakeholders that it is necessary (Armenakis, Harris, and Feild 1999; Burke 2002; Judson 1991; Kotter 1995; Laurent 2003; Nadler and Nadler 1998). The process of convincing individuals of the need for change often begins with crafting a compelling vision for it. A vision presents a picture or image of the future that is easy to communicate and that organizational members find appealing (Kotter 1995); it provides overall direction for the change process and serves as the foundation from which to develop specific strategies for arriving at a future end state. Some research on private organizations indicates that it is easier to convince individuals of the need for change when leaders craft a vision that off ers the hope of relief from stress or discomfort (Kets de Vries and Balazs 1999). Nadler and Nadler (1998) even suggest implanting dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs in order to get members of the organization to embrace change. To convince individuals of the need for and desirability of change and to begin the process of “unfreezing” the
organization, Armenakis, Harris and Feild (1999) suggest employing effective written and oral communication and forms of active participation among employees. The public-management literature contains evidence of the importance of determining the need for change and persuasively communicating it through a continuing process of exchange with as many stakeholders and participants as possible (Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Rossotti 2005; Young 2001). For instance, Kemp, Funk, and Eadie (1993) and Bingham and Wise (1996) conclude that successful implementation of new programs depends on top management’s ability to disseminate information about the change and convince employees of the urgency of change. Denhardt and Denhardt (1999) describe how effective local government managers verify the need for change through “listening and learning” and then communicate those needs in ways that build support for change. Researchers have also noted public sector leaders’ efforts to take advantage of mandates, political windows of opportunity, and external influences to verify and communicate the need for change (Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Harokopus 2001; Lambright 2001; Rossotti 2005).

PROVIDE A PLAN

Managerial leaders must develop a course of action or strategy for implementing change. Convincing the members of an organization of the need for change is obviously not enough to bring about actual change. The new idea or vision must be transformed into a course of action or strategy with goals and a plan for achieving it (Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Carnall 1995; Judson 1991; Kotter 1995; Lambright 2001; Nadler and Nadler 1998; Young 2001). This strategy serves as a road map for the organization, offering direction on how to arrive at the preferred end state, identifying obstacles, and proposing measures for overcoming those obstacles. As Kotter (1995) explains, the basic elements of the vision should be organized into a strategy for achieving that vision so that the transformation does not disintegrate into a set of unrelated and confusing directives and activities. Two aspects of a course of action that appear crucial for organizational change in the public sector include the clarity or degree of specificity of the strategy and the extent to which the strategy rests on sound causal theory. Policy implementation analysts have long noted the importance of clear, specific policy goals and coherent causal thinking about the linkage between the initiative to be implemented and the desired outcomes (Bishop and Jones 1993; Grizzle and Petti john 2002; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989; Meier and McFarlane 1995). Specific goals help ensure that the measures implemented in the field correspond with the formal policy by limiting the ability of implementing officials to change the policy objectives and providing a standard of accountability. As Bingham and Wise (1996) and Meyers and Dillon (1999) discovered, policy ambiguity can sow confusion, allowing public managers to reinterpret the policy and implement it in a fashion that brings about few of the changes that policy makers intended (see also Montjoy and O’Toole 1979). Finally, a mandate for change based on sound causal theory helps eliminate inconsistent or conflicting directives that can undermine efforts to implement change. Rossotti (2005) shows how he and others leading major organizational changes at the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) set forth a clear, well-conceived, well-organized plan for the change process.

BUILD INTERNAL SUPPORT FOR CHANGE AND OVERCOME RESISTANCE

Managerial leaders must build internal support for change and reduce resistance to it through widespread participation in the change process and other means. Students of major organizational changes typically report that successful leaders understand that change involves a political process of developing and nurturing support from major stakeholders and organizational members. Individuals
in organizations resist change for a variety of reasons (Kets de Vries and Balazs 1999) — for example, some ideas for change are simply ill conceived, unjustified, or pose harmful consequences for members of the organization. Even assuming a well-justified and well-planned change initiative, however, leaders must build internal support and overcome resistance. How can they do so? Several researchers have observed that a crisis, shock, or strong external challenge to the organization can help reduce resistance to change. Van de Ven (1993) explains that because individuals are highly adaptable to gradually emerging conditions, a shock or stimulus of significant magnitude is typically required for them to accept change as inevitable. In a similar vein, Kotter warns managers against the risk of “playing it too safe” and noted that “when the urgency rate is not pumped up enough, the transformation process cannot succeed” (1995, 60). He even observed that in a few of the most successful cases of organizational change, the leadership manufactured crises (see also Laurent 2003; Thompson and Fulla 2001). For many decades, social scientists have emphasized the value of effective and ethical participation, as well as other means, in supporting group and organizational change and in lowering resistance to it (Coch and French 1948; Lewin 1947). More recently, experts have further explored ways of reducing resistance to change. Judson (1991) identifies a variety of tactics that managers can employ to minimize resistance to change, including threats and compulsion, criticism, persuasion, inducements and rewards, compromises and bargaining, guarantees against personal loss (e.g., offering job security or retraining to employees), psychological support, employee participation, ceremonies and other efforts to build loyalty, recognition of the appropriateness and legitimacy of past practices, and gradual and flexible implementation of change. With the exception of threats, compulsion, and criticism, which can have counterproductive effects and further increase resistance, he argues that these approaches can be effective at reducing resistance to change (see also Kets de Vries and Balazs 1999). A “dual approach” that creates pride in the organization’s history and past success while arguing for a new way of doing things seems also to be effective at reducing resistance to change. The scope of participation is also important. Widespread participation in the change process is perhaps the most frequently cited approach to overcoming resistance to change (e.g., Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Young 2001). Many scholars who focus on private organizations have asserted that planned change requires extensive participation by members at multiple levels of the organization during all stages of implementation (Bunker and Alban 1997; Greiner 1967; Johnson and Leavitt 2001; Nadler and Nadler 1998; Pasmore 1994). The literature indicates that involving organizational members helps reduce barriers to change by creating psychological ownership, promoting the dissemination of critical information, and encouraging employee feedback for fine-tuning the change during implementation. Participation presents a particularly important contingency in the public sector. As Warwick (1975) asserts, career civil servants, who are allegedly motivated by caution and security, can use the frequent turnover among top political appointees to their advantage by simply resisting new initiatives until a new administration comes into power. However, their participation in the stages of change can help reduce this kind of resistance. Rossotti (2005), for instance, recounts a continuous process of meetings with all types of stakeholders — frontline employees, union leaders, taxpayers and taxpayer groups, managers, Treasury Department executives, members of Congress, and others (see also Denhardt and Denhardt 1999; Poister and Streib 1999). Goldsmith (1999, 68ff.), too, describes how employee “empowerment” played a key role in his change efforts as mayor of Indianapolis. Interestingly, Kelman’s (2005) analysis of the federal procurement reform process suggests that one should avoid overestimating change resistance. A significant number of employees welcomed reforms, and their support needed only to be “unleashed”. Buttressing Kelman’s point,
Thompson and Sanders’s (1997) analysis of change within the Veterans Benefits Administration suggests that success may require bottom-up participatory elements, such as delegating decision making to middle management and granting frontline workers greater discretion to implement changes. They note, however, that top management still must play a critical role by encouraging and rewarding innovation and expressing support for the change. Successful implementation of organizational change, therefore, often resembles a hybrid combining elements of lower-level participation and direction from top management. Even widespread participation, however, does not offer a magic bullet for overcoming resistance to change (Shareef 1994). Bruhn, Zajac, and Al-Kazemi (2001) advise that participation should be widespread and span all phases of the change process, but they stress that leaders must take participation seriously, commit time and effort to it, and manage it properly. The failure to do so can be counterproductive, leading to wasted time, morale, and resources (see also Quinn 2000). Bryson and Anderson (2000) make a similar observation in their analysis of large-group methods used to diagnose problems and implement changes in organizations.

ENSURE TOP-MANAGEMENT SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT

An individual or group within the organization should champion the cause for change. Top management support and commitment to change play an especially crucial role in success (Burke 2002; Carnall 1995; Greiner 1967; Johnson and Leavitt 2001; Kotter 1995; Nadler and Nadler 1998; Yukl 2002). Some studies of organizational change stress the importance of having a single change agent or “idea champion” lead the transformation. An idea champion is a highly respected individual who maintains momentum and commitment to change, often taking personal risks in the process (Kanter 1983). Policy-implementation scholars have offered evidence of how a skillful and strategically placed leader or “fixer” can successfully coordinate the behavior of disparate actors and overcome obstacles by leveraging close personal ties and pursuing informal avenues of influence (Bardach 1977; O’Toole 1989). Other authors have stressed the need to have a guiding coalition to support the change. A guiding coalition is a group of individuals who lend legitimacy to the effort and marshal the resources and emotional support required to induce organizational members to change (Carnall 1995; Kets de Vries and Balazs 1999; Kotter 1995; Yukl 2002). Kotter asserts that one or two managers often launch organizational renewal efforts, but “whenever some minimum mass is not achieved early in the effort, nothing much worthwhile happens” (1995, 62). Whether it occurs in the form of a single change agent or a guiding coalition, considerable evidence indicates that top-management support and commitment play an essential role in successful change in the public sector (Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Berman and Wang 2000; Bingham and Wise 1996; Denhardt and Denhardt 1999; Harokopus 2001; Hennessey 1998; Kemp, Funk, and Eadie 1993; Lambright 2001; Laurent 2003; Rainey and Rainey 1986; Thompson and Fulla 2001; Young 2001). Barzelay’s (2001) analysis of New Public Management reforms in various nations, for instance, reports that Aucoin (1990) attributes the failure of these reforms in Canada to a lack of support from cabinet ministers, who simply did not care much about the reforms. Finally, in the public sector, top-management support for change often requires the cooperation of top-level career civil servants in addition to politically appointed executives. Moreover, the need for leadership continuity and stability raises particular challenges in the public sector because of the frequent and rapid turnover of many executives in government agencies compared to business executives. This may explain why, contrary to stereotype, many significant changes in government need to be — and have been — led by career civil servants (Holzer and Callahan 1998).
BUILD EXTERNAL SUPPORT

Managerial leaders must develop support from political overseers and key external stakeholders. Organizational change in the public sector also depends on the degree of support from political overseers and other key external stakeholders. The impact of these actors on the outcome of change efforts stems in part from their ability to impose statutory changes and control the flow of vital resources to public organizations. Political overseers can influence the outcome of planned change by creating and conveying a vision that explains the need for change, as well as by selecting political appointees who are sympathetic to the change and have the knowledge and skills required for managing the transformation. As Golembiewski (1985) suggests, attaining support from governmental authorities and political actors involves serious challenges, given the constraints imposed by the political context in which public organizations operate. Public agencies often have multiple political masters pursuing different objectives, and politically appointed executives often have very weak relationships with career civil servants. Despite these challenges, public managers implementing change in their organizations must display skill in obtaining support from powerful external actors. Public policy scholars have observed the impact of support from political overseers or sovereigns on the outcome of policy implementation (Goggin et al. 1990; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989). They are now joined by more recent studies of public sector reform that have begun to stress the importance of external political support (Berman and Wang 2000; de Lancer Julnes and Holzer 2001; Wallin 1997). Berry, Chackerian, and Wechsler (1999) note that the governor’s high level of commitment and support for particular reforms in Florida had a substantial influence on the degree of implementation (see also Chackerian and Mavima 2000). Changes that could have been implemented quickly and cost-effectively seemed to generate more support from elected officials than those with higher implementation costs and those requiring much more effort and time to implement. Support from other key external stakeholders figures prominently in successful change efforts (Abramson and Lawrence 2001; Denhardt and Denhardt 1999; Harokopus 2001; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989; Rossotti 2005; Wallin 1997). Thompson and Fulla (2001) conclude that the interest group environment acted as an important determinant of agency adoption of National Performance Review (NPR) reforms, with strong interest group opposition to an agency’s NPR reforms constraining change. Conversely, Weissert and Goggin (2002) found that proceeding to implementation without garnering the support of interest groups can speed up the implementation process, albeit at the cost of dissatisfaction and criticism.

PROVIDE RESOURCES

Successful change usually requires sufficient resources to support the process. A fairly consistent finding in the literature is that change is not cheap or without trade-offs. Planned organizational change involves a redeployment or redirection of scarce organizational resources toward a host of new activities, including developing a plan or strategy for implementing the change, communicating the need for change, training employees, developing new processes and practices, restructuring and reorganizing the organization, and testing and experimenting with innovations (see Burke 2002; Mink et al. 1993; Nadler and Nadler 1998). Failure to provide adequate resources in support of a planned change leads to feeble implementation efforts, higher levels of interpersonal stress, and even neglect of core organizational activities and functions. Boyne’s (2003) review of research, for example, found that “resources” is one of the important factors for improving public services (and hence, bringing about change). Rossotti (2005) heavily invested resources in major changes at the IRS and expressed regret that he had not sought at the outset stronger assurances of...
budgetary support for the reforms from Treasury Department officials. Policy implementation scholars have long recognized this need for adequate resources to implement policy changes (Goggin et al. 1990; Matland 1995; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989; Montjoy and O’Toole 1979). Ample funding is necessary to staff implementing agencies and to provide them with the administrative and technical capacity to ensure that they achieve statutory objectives. Similarly, students of recent administrative reforms have observed that resource scarcity can hinder organizational changes (Berry, Chackerian, and Wechsler 1999; Bingham and Wise 1996; Chackerian and Mavima 2000; Kemp, Funk, and Eadie 1993). As Chackerian and Mavima (2000) discovered in their analysis of government reform in Florida, resource munificence becomes even more complex when multiple organizational changes are implemented as part of a comprehensive reform agenda. The authors found that multiple organizational changes interact with one another, causing synergies and trade-offs. For example, the pursuit of multiple changes that demand modest amounts of similar resources can lead to synergies, increasing the likelihood that all changes will be implemented successfully. The pursuit of multiple changes that require large amounts of similar resources, on the other hand, tends to result in trade-offs. Trade-offs, in turn, result in winners and losers, with low-cost changes taking precedence over or even displacing more costly ones.

INSTITUTIONALIZE CHANGE
Managers and employees must effectively institutionalize and embed changes. To make change enduring, members of the organization must incorporate the new policies or innovations into their daily routines. Virtually all organizational changes involve changes in the behavior of organizational members. Employees must learn and routines these behaviors in the short term, and leaders must institutionalize them over the long haul so that new patterns of behavior displace old ones (Edmondson, Bohmer, and Pisano 2001; Greiner 1967; Kotter 1995; Lewin 1947s). Doing so, however, is not easy. Armenakis, Harris, and Feild (1999) have developed a model for reinforcing and institutionalizing change. According to the model, leaders can modify formal structures, procedures, and human resource management practices; employ rites and ceremonies; diffuse the innovation through trial runs and pilot projects; collect data to track the progress of and commitment to change; and engage employees in active participation tactics that foster “learning by doing”. Judson (1991), too, strongly emphasizes the need to collect data and monitor the implementation process to keep managers aware of the extent to which organizational members have adopted the change. Evaluation and monitoring efforts should continue even after the change is fully adopted to ensure that organizational members do not lapse into old patterns of behavior. The evidence, however, is mixed regarding the optimal pace for institutionalizing change. Some experts underscore the need to adopt change gradually or incrementally on a small scale in order to build momentum and to demonstrate the benefits of change (Armenakis, Harris, and Feild 1999; Cohen and Eimicke 1994; Greiner 1967; Kotter 1995; Rainey and Rainey 1986). Others have argued that a rapid pace of change can overcome inertia and resistance (Tushman and Romanelli 1985). Small-scale or gradual implementation, however, may pose more of a challenge in the public sector than in business because frequent shifts in political leadership and short tenures for political appointees can cause commitment for change to wane.

CONCLUSION
The aspects and intentions presented in this piece of writing should serve not as a road diagram but as a scope for practitioners seeking to find their way accompanied by the continuous,
constant, and exigent pressures for change they face daily. Researchers should examine the interactive effects of such factors using research blueprints and techniques that treat the opportunity of a possibility approach to implementing organizational change seriously. Especially useful would be the employment of multivariate numerical procedures and large-sample data sets of institutions at different levels of organizations both public and private sectors. Another immediate research need involves refining the general propositions offered here, synthesizing the various theories underlying them, and testing rival propositions. In the process, researchers must confront the challenge of analyzing the relationship between the content and process of change and such organizational outcomes as performance. Some designs will be very challenging and expensive, but researchers should seek ways to conceive and execute them, possibly through consortia of researchers (e.g., Huber and Glick 1993) and proposals for large research grants. Such an effort would be timely, important for both practice and theory building, and long overdue.
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