

Knowledge Area Module 6:
Organizational Change Models

Student: Malcolm Scott Sotebeer Malcolm.sotebeer@waldenu.edu

Student ID # 328215

Program: PhD in Management & Decision Sciences

Specialization: Leadership & Organizational Change

KAM Assessor: Dr. David Banner david.banner@waldenu.edu

Faculty Mentor: Dr. Robert Levasseur robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu

Walden University

November 22, 2009

ABSTRACT

Breadth

Knowledge Area Module VI provides a platform to explore and critically address theories, models, and applications related to organizational development and change. The Breadth section considers classical and contemporary discussions around organizational change and development theory as processes. Scholars in this review include Lewin, Senge, and Kotter. The key objective is to critically review, compare, and contrast various contemporary theories against the framework of Lewin's change model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing.

ABSTRACT

Depth

The Depth section analyzes a specific organizational change model, the Burke Litwin model. This process model specifically takes into consideration both transformational and transactional dynamics involved in organizational change and the parallel relationship to transformational and transactional leadership principles. The Burke Litwin model is compared, contrasted, and synthesized against contemporary, scholarly literature regarding organizational change and development. In that context, this section of the KAM also seeks to bring contemporary focus and application to the theoretical backdrop of Lewin's seminal process model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing theory as developed in the Breadth section.

ABSTRACT

Application

The Application section addresses change and development issues in a public sector, regional government organization using the change models and development theories discussed in the Breadth and Depth sections. The Application further addresses the business, political, and organizational issues emerging from the transformation from an appointed to an elected leadership structure. The case study critically evaluates the challenges, obstacles, and strategies for integrating change management principles and practices into an “institutionalized” public sector culture as a reorganization initiative. The design of the discussion provides the elected leader and management staff with change management and organizational development perspective and implementation concepts that could be applicable in a future, election driven leadership transition.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
BREADTH	6
AMDS 8612: model of organization change and development	6
Kurt Lewin’s Backdrop for Change Theory	6
Cultural Change	7
Cultural change process.....	8
Reeducation.....	9
Reeducation, values, and group engagement.....	11
Facilitating groups to achieve reeducation	12
Psychological Aspects of Change	13
Time perspective, morale, and the group	15
Time perspective and goals.....	16
Leader influence.....	18
Immediacy, reality, and action.	19
The Role of Learning	20
Conclusions: the Foundation for a Change Theory	22
Lewin’s Change Theory: Unfreezing, Moving, and Refreezing	24
Context and Environment.....	25
Group values, standards, and individual resistance.	26
Change as the group objective	27

Group Decision Influence on Moving and Change Permanency	28
Obstacles, challenges, and applications	29
Conclusions: Lewin's Model.....	30
Contemporary Theory in the Context of Unfreezing, Moving, and Refreezing	32
Contemporary Views and Unfreezing	33
Resistance to change.	35
Contemporary Views and Moving.....	37
Kotter's eight stage model.....	37
Galpin and transformational change.....	38
Judson and behavior modeling.....	39
Contemporary Views and Refreezing	41
The power of culture.....	42
Communication, learning and result.....	44
Breadth Synthesis	45
DEPTH.....	47
AMDS 8622: CURRENT RESEARCH MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT	47
Annotated Bibliography	47
Literature Review Essay	78
Burke Litwin Model.....	79
Process modeling	80
Sequence and process.....	82

Transformations and transactions	83
Transactions and change managers	84
Culture and climate	86
The role of causation.....	87
Causation, culture, and the individual	89
Environment	91
Anchoring change	92
Change Leadership.....	94
Transformational and transactional leadership.....	95
Behavioral modeling and shaping.....	98
Leadership failure factors	99
Change Readiness, Resistance, and Learning	100
Learning frameworks	100
Resistance and learning	101
Psychological safety.	102
Appraisal.....	103
Readiness and commitment model.....	104
Depth Synthesis	105
APPLICATION	108
AMDS 8632: APPLICATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MODELS	108
Organizational Background.....	108

From Appointed Manager to Elected Official	109
Change by Public Election.....	109
Historical perspective	110
Change and Government	112
Change Dynamics	114
Changing power structure	116
Magnitude and scope	117
Discussion	118
Followers and Change.....	119
Readiness.....	121
The issue of coping	123
Resistance	125
Commitment.	128
Leadership	130
Leadership and motivation.....	133
Application Synthesis.....	135
Theoretical perspective.....	137
Implications and considerations	139
References	142

BREADTH

AMDS 8612: MODEL OF ORGANIZATION CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

The Breadth section builds around a central theme and discussion of Kurt Lewin's change model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing. The overarching objective is to critically review, compare, and contrast various contemporary theories against the framework of Lewin's model. The analysis progresses through three areas: (a) a review of Lewin's key theories that develop the premise of his change model, (b) a discussion of the change model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing in the context of Lewin's framing arguments and (c) a comparative discussion of Lewin's work next to selected contemporary theorists.

Kurt Lewin's Backdrop for Change Theory

Born of German Jewish descent, Kurt Lewin (1890-1947) was a pioneering social psychologist who evolved and groomed his early observations, theories, and research against the backdrop of an emerging Nazi Germany (Allport, 1948). He later spent nearly 15 years of his life in the United States, where he developed the groundbreaking Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Allport, 1948).

To arrive at the objective of this section, a cursory review of Lewin's broader work is necessary to establish first a thematic framework for the central discussion of organizational change theory. The man never wrote a textbook, but rather, conveyed all of his theories and thinking through an ongoing series of articles and monographs (Allport, 1948). Understanding the flow and integration of Lewin's early views on psychology and sociology helps to establish a foundation for his change model. There is obvious thematic and theoretical repetition in

progressing through the series of Lewin papers. However, the repetition helps to ground Lewin's logic and provide an emerging clarity to the unfreezing, moving, and refreezing change theory (G. Lewin, 1948). Lewin's wife, Gertrude, who also edited the 1948 edition of the published compilation *Resolving Social Conflicts*, noted that the repetition across a series of papers provided a "unifying thread" to the theories and concepts that anchored Lewin's work (G. Lewin, 1948, p. 11).

Most notably, Lewin integrated group behavioral and social theory with individual behavioral theory to evolve his contribution to the field of social psychology (Allport, 1948). Through the various editions and iterations of Lewin's work, contributors (Allport, 1948, G. Lewin, 1948, and Cartwright, 1951) note a central theme that ties individual behavior and the individual's "perceptions, feelings, and actions" in the same group characteristics where he or she belongs (Allport, 1948, p.5). As this discussion progresses, the lines between individual and group behavior blur and then morph into a certain logic around interrelated behaviors of groups and individuals in change environments and situations.

Cultural Change

Allport (1948) noted that one of the key threads in Lewin's work was an insistence on the role of "democratic" leadership in group behavior, function, and culture. Lewin's wife framed the focus in the context of an unending search for the theoretical rationalization of human behavior (G. Lewin, 1948, p. 11). Intertwined with those ideas is perhaps the period reality of the world's most profound dictatorship. It is arguable that the evolution and emergence of Nazi Germany

combined with Lewin's heritage were intense drivers behind his search for a more clear explanation for leader and follower behavior, and ultimately the rationalization of extreme cultural change. It may well explain the belief that "the culture of individuals or small groups can be changed deeply in a relatively short time" (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 41).

Lewin (1948, 1951) also proposed that introducing different forms of leadership could change social dynamics, including inducing leadership training that could move someone from an autocratic to a more democratic style. However, the variables of an existing culture such as education, politics, values, and religion, weigh on the prospect of cultural change in the context of moving significant groups and ultimately may lead a cultural or any significant group change back to its original state (Lewin, 1948, 1951). This observation amounts to an early discussion of the challenges behind any kind of organizational change and the concept of refreezing which will be discussed later (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Cultural change process. Against the backdrop of cultural and social chaos in Germany, Lewin (1948, 1951) established important contrast between normalcy in cultural change and evolution and the hopelessness of cultural genocide emerging from an aggressive and extremist autocracy. The position seems to represent an acknowledgement that theoretical application was not relevant to fanatical individual and group behavior outside of social or psychological principles of the period. However, benchmarked against the extreme, Lewin (1948, 1951) posits that cultural change can be accomplished by: (a) addressing change as a more ethereal principle or global condition, not a collection of "things", (b) aligning the group change with the change of the

group's power base, (c) changing the leadership to expedite the change of the power base, (d) supporting the leader change by reeducating the group members in a parallel style of followership, (e) supporting the leader's necessity to use the power role to help facilitate the parallel followership, (f) changing power relations in the group from top to bottom, regardless of the group and leadership hierarchy size, (g) training leaders away from autocratic styles, (h) accepting and believing that change is needed by acknowledging the failure of the previous condition, and (i) understanding that larger, more significant changes are more likely to be sustainable as small changes will likely result in a return to the old equilibrium state (Lewin, 1948, 1951, pp. 43-44).

Lewin (1948, 1951) saw culture as a flowing and fluid system that exists as a state of equilibrium. Broadly, equilibrium translates to those norms and customs that provide the checks and balances for group and individual behaviors, or the accepted culture. To affect change, Lewin (1948, 1951) asserts that it is necessary to disrupt the existing equilibrium while simultaneously establishing a new equilibrium (p. 43).

Reeducation

Lewin (1948, 1951) asserted that the criminal and the honest individual possess the common thread of having evolved to their condition by way of the circumstances of life and the influences of the group where they evolve from. As a process, the circumstances are equal to the point that individuals acquire differences in conduct; they do not inherit their behaviors (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 48). Lewin (1948, 1951) equates these "divergences" from established social behavior or norms to a conflict between actual reality and alternative, perceived reality. In the

normative state, the individual thus relies on the group to define what reality is and the group exerts a certain amount of social pressure on the individual to conform (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Logically, this extends to a range of conduct and beliefs where the group's pressure and influence can define the individual regardless of the individual's personal position. If we accept the beliefs of the group as fact, generally we will not question the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 49).

Progressing through these concepts lead to a theory that evolving to prejudice and illusion is no different than the processes that lead to socially normal perceptions and ideals (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Where the values of the group influence the individual, the defining parameters are group culture and environment, along with previously mentioned social, political, and religious variables. This social and psychological phenomenon evolves to the parallel relationship between reeducation and cultural change and the corresponding processes necessary to achieve change (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 49).

Lewin (1948, 1951) rationalizes the reeducation theory by comparing the necessary changes for one to transition from a carpenter to a watchmaker. To successfully transition, the individual must abandon the beliefs, values, and standards of carpenters as a group, moving to the cultural system, including behaviors and thinking, of watchmakers (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The individual must move from one system to another and anchor their total being in the new culture. To achieve reeducation, the individual is necessarily affected by three processes that include: (a) changes in cognitive structure (the way we see physical and social worlds), (b) changes or alterations in values (attraction and resistance to group values and standards), and (c) changes in

motoric action (the degree of control over physical and social movements) (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 50). Realistically, Lewin (1948, 1951) submits that achieving such changes through reeducation is not an obvious or automatic process, especially where firmly established beliefs and prejudices anchor the individual or group's value system and culture.

Reeducation, values, and group engagement. Challenges abound in the reeducation process as realities such as deeply engrained prejudices and deep seeded sentiments do not necessarily respond to knowledge or learning in the change process (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 52). This is significant because Lewin (1948, 1951) further suggests that actual conduct may not rise to the level of desired change if deep rooted personal sentiments impede actual reeducation. An individual may outwardly display the expectation, but may not be emotionally attached to the actual change, thus creating a personal conflict and tension that does not help the cause. The issue of changing sentiment can be mitigated or even achieved if individuals become engaged in the actual problem (change) being addressed (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Changes in conduct or action are a result of changes in perception. The chain of perceptual process creates an action ideology that initiates a change or alteration in behavior (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Constructively, this progression of personal changes of action, values, and social perception, as the actualization of individual cultural change, is a cornerstone for successful reeducation or permanent change (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 53). The pathway to this outcome is clearly not that simple.

Absent a personal, internalized, and individualized acceptance about the need for change, individual loyalty to the old cultural system may create resistance or even a hostile reaction to any new values or other changes (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Additionally, changing hearts and minds one point at a time creates opportunity for both resistance as well as the opportunity to fall back into more comfortable norms, values, and cultural behaviors (Lewin, 1948, 1951, pp. 53-54). Lewin (1948, 1951) uses the analogy of an individual forcibly moved from his native country to another and into another culture. It is logical to extend this analogy to imposed reeducation where the individual or even group members feel threatened by the involuntary assignment of a new cultural system (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 53). Hostile reactions may become imminent and complicated when considering the divergent nature of imposed reeducation versus free choice (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Hostility and natural resistance may be mitigated to some extent and acceptance advanced in the reeducation process when leadership provides the opportunity for: (a) free expression, (b) shared ideas, (c) informal exchange, (d) avoidance of pressure, and (e) generally a more emotionally stable environment to deal with the cultural change issues (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The art of the process is to be able to successfully change the culture of the individual while minimizing the natural resistance to a process, change itself. A complete and realized reeducation or cultural change characterizes a successful change outcome (Lewin 1948, 1951).

Facilitating groups to achieve reeducation. The group's role in fostering individual reeducation success is dependent in part on the individual's ability to attain a sense of belonging

(Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 55). The power of creating a sense of belonging by the group establishes an environment where the individual is willing and able to accept new beliefs, standards, and values (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The likelihood of reeducation increases significantly when the team ideal is established and the newly acculturated become the firmly converted around a new set of commonly shared values (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 55). As a progressive process of change, the reeducation principle can impact behaviors. This occurs when new values and beliefs become the core perceptions of the individual and the acceptance of new values link inextricably to the integration with a new group, a new role, and new facts and knowledge (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

The conscious role of the group in accepting and acculturating members is an important principle going forward in the discussion of change process and contemporary theory. As a theory of change, Lewin's (1948, 1951) reeducation process implies that affecting group culture and values, and subsequently behavior, provides a basis to move individuals towards accepting changes by advancing their beliefs to align with the central beliefs of the group they belong to. Expanding the theory, concepts such as level of aspiration, intelligence, frustration, ranges of success and failure, and other individualized goals integrate with the respective standards of the group that the individual belongs to or aspires to belong to (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 59). This social and psychological framework for change is a hallmark of the early Lewin writing, defining the importance and focus around the group role as an influential collection of individuals with commonly held values and beliefs (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Psychological Aspects of Change

Lewin (1948, 1951) positioned hope as a critical psychological state and element of the individual's overall perspective. Defined as an expectation of a future state where reality matches an individual's wishes, hope is relevant when considering the affect of morale as a condition of hope in a change scenario (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 80). This "psychological future" rarely corresponds with reality and seldom aligns with outcomes that eventually happen (Lewin, 1948, 1951). However, in the context of change, it is possible to correlate past and present time and events with what may or may not actually occur as a future state. Lewin (1948, 1951) recognized this phenomenon as time perspective. At any point in time, actions, emotions, and individual morale, including aspirations, hopes and dreams, depend on time perspective and can translate to interpretation of an environment, including change (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Correlations to leadership attributes such as persistency and hopefulness are discussed in the context of morale and ultimately, successful change when time perspective is considered. Lewin (1948, 1951) notes that individuals will persist at overcoming challenges and even pain as long as there is the possibility or perception of a horizon with a desired outcome (Lewin, 1948, 1951, pp. 82-83). Persistency relates directly to the value of a specific goal and the outlook that a given goal presents for some point out in the future time horizon (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Looking at time perspective relative to morale and related to successful reeducation and cultural change, there are three predictive factors that indicate how soon an individual will quit on given barriers: (a) the psychological strength of the goal—and how badly it is desired, (b) the individual's belief in a probability that the goal can be achieved, and (c) the degree of personal

initiative or drive to the goal (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 83). Lewin (1948, 1951) notes that a way to bolster persistence and morale is to highlight the successes of past experiences.

Reinforcing past success, even if unrelated to current challenges, is a method to teach individuals to persist and persevere with less emotional involvement in the effort (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Considering the most basic issues of change, individual morale in the context of time perspective is an important concept in understanding degrees of resistance or acceptance. As a contemporary thought, Lewin's (1948, 1951) discussion of time perspective and morale suggest that managing and sustaining complex changes is possible by supporting individual or group expectations, regardless of the amount of time required to fully realize the actual change.

Time perspective, morale, and the group. Group morale depends on time perspective in the same way that it applies to individuals (Lewin, 1948, 1951). A significant difference exists, however, in how individuals acting collectively as members of the group respond as opposed to individuals acting alone. Imminent danger felt by an entire group results in a reaction by the entire group, thus influencing the behavior and dependent response of individuals around the environment created or even perceived by the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951). As the group moves, so do the individuals. Group morale moves in much the same way, thus validating the importance of time perspective as a group principle (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

While the individual may set personal goals to the outer bounds of their individual ability, the group may have a more limiting or expanding role given the opportunity to establish its own time horizon (Lewin, 1948, 1951). It is logical to extend this thought to its direct effect on

individual morale and ultimately, change. Goal setting, initiative, productivity, security, and belongingness all become part of a “cognitive structure” that has situational influence on individual morale, behavior, and values (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 85). Increased conflict and tension may result, which Lewin (1948, 1951) observed could positively produce heightened enthusiasm and improved performance.

This particular analysis was developed before the attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941. Lewin (1948, 1951) wrote a postscript specifically to address the affect that bringing the nation into war had on the collective morale of citizens as a group. The reality of war significantly increased morale in the United States and demonstrated that morale moved inversely to the level of difficulty of a situation when clear goals exist. In this case, the goal was to win the war (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 92). The observation provided clarity to the relationships between levels of circumstances and morale. Lewin (1948, 1951) posited that the attack provided a definitive condition that served to eliminate the conflicts of uncertainty (will we be attacked?).

The result was a new and definite objective, a unifying belief in final success, and the realism of great difficulties, collectively creating a new and heightened level of morale (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The attack evolved Lewin (1948, 1951) to the observation and conclusion that long term efforts (extend time perspective) required that group members remain focused on the entire task and the final objective in order to sustain a high level of morale (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 93).

Time perspective and goals. The relationship of individual and group goal setting is an important principle in Lewin’s theoretical model in establishing the connection between the

individual and the group's overall influence. We do not set our goals to the lowest common denominator or the path of least resistance. Daily and lifelong goals are driven by: (a) personal value systems and ideologies, (b) the group or groups we belong to, and (c) the common tendency to raise our level of aspiration to the upper limits of our ability (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 86). Goals integrate with our desires and wishes for outcomes we believe can or will occur on a future horizon; our return for the investment in persistence, determination, and commitment (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Definitions of success and failure vary greatly between individuals and groups.

How high we set the bar in relation to realistic and acceptable achievement is a crucial component of morale with a logical nexus to implementing change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Lewin (1948, 1951) asserts that developing and maintaining realistic, achievable, and high goal levels that are also expandable is a core component of sustainable, positive morale. Additionally, the group standards will directly affect the height of the individual's goal setting, including the goals set by other groups that exist above and below (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 86). The broader context of individual morale is a social psychological issue of group goals and group standards (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Lewin (1948, 1951) posited that it is possible to focus a group on setting higher goals and standards around the premise that individuals will aspire to and set their personal goals to the highest level of their ability. In the context of complex change, the theory implies that it may be possible to attain group consensus around new goals and standards that would align with the higher end of group members' personal aspirations and capabilities.

Leader influence. In autocratic group structures, the leader drives the organization and its policies and goals and therefore drives the goals and actions of the individual members (Lewin, 1948, 1951). This scenario defines the entire time perspective as the horizon of time and therefore the functional existence of the members, as established by the autocratic leader. The significance of this observation is that individuals submit to the leader and do not necessarily take any ownership in any aspect of the group as they have no say in how the group functions to attain goals. Morale is measurably lower (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Lewin (1948, 1951) advocated for the freedoms created by a more democratic group structure, including engagement and interaction with leaders where members actively participate in goal development. The outcome is a defined time perspective that facilitates the attainment of goals set above previous expectations and personal beliefs. Positive leader time perspective results in high leader and group morale, modeled by achievable goals and positive values and beliefs identified as a “circular dependency” (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 89). President John F. Kennedy’s 1961 public challenge to put a man on the moon before the end of that decade suggests a contemporary example of the potential magnitude of influence of the leader’s setting a time perspective for followers (Stern, 2009. Web site, HomeOfHeroes.com. http://www.homeofheroes.com/presidents/speeches/kennedy_space.html).

An entire nation embraced the Kennedy commitment and goal where a clear objective, time horizon, and call to action were articulated by the leader.

The balance of this premise is realized where the leader and members are able to jointly arrive at goals reasonably above the current state but realistic enough to help ensure their attainment and a measurable step forward (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The implications for leading, facilitating, and managing change are evidenced in this theory by way of the leader and follower relationship. Lewin implies clearly the requirement for a consensus on achievable goals that are attainable in a timeframe that produces escalating results, all at the highest level of morale.

Immediacy, reality, and action. Considering the significance of time perspective relative to scope and magnitude provides insight into change concepts in terms of manageability, reasonableness, and reality. Lewin (1948, 1951) discussed the necessity to consider scope from the point of reference of a 10 year old (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 91). The child sees the world in short timeframes and establishes values and beliefs, in relative terms, that are almost instantly defined by immediate surroundings including family, direct contact groups, school relationships, and his or her “gang” (Lewin, 1948, 1951). These are manageable influences and learning in their timeframe, and evolve and change as the child grows and changes. Conversely, the adult world of politics, as a single conceptual example, is far too broad, complex, and “overpowering” for the same 10 year old to consider (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 91). Time horizon therefore is a process of evolving reality development. There is a relationship to the child’s view of time perspective that may favorably apply to adults throughout their lives in given situations and circumstances. Practically, it may be as simple as managing change in identifiable and attainable steps, goals, and escalating successes with the final goal clearly fixed at the end of each step (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

At the other end is the abstract conceptualist who considers the world in perfect and idealistic terms. The individual refuses to take action that might diminish the perception of a perfect outcome, thus igniting the conflict of what is versus what should be (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Most significantly, Lewin (1948, 1951) theorized that the conflict of present reality against a wished for future state tends to paralyze the individual. The resultant mental state and behavior keeps them from accepting the unsatisfactory present and ultimately from acting positively on the immediate and available means to reach the more desirable future (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 91). The very weight of the dilemma creates a barrier that can derail the goals, especially in the context of change. The emerging cynic becomes the obstructionist who provides resistance masked as intellectual discussion (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

In the end, beliefs grounded in a realistic psychological future drive group and individual morale which in turn fuel the drive to the desired end. Outcome oriented actions inspire the group and individuals to do what is necessary to change the current situation, replacing autocratic leaders and behaviors along the way (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Motivation and morale are high, anchored by the realization and acceptance that the greatest challenges and obstacles are surmountable. The time horizon is attainable, conclusive, and mutually accepted. The commitment to the outcome is established and shared (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

The Role of Learning

A broad discussion of learning concepts plays a role in the overall process of change, whether social, political, cultural, individual, or organizational (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Relevant

areas include learning related to motivation and learning related to cognition (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 217). Changes in cognitive structure directly relate to the individual's psychological present, past, and future as well as individual hopes, desires, and wishes (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 228). The motivational learning condition relates to a change in needs or the means to obtain needs (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 223).

Learning is also characterized as a process of change distinguished as specific types of change: (a) a change in cognitive structure (knowledge), (b) a change in motivation (liking or disliking), (c) a change in group belongingness or ideology (adaptation into a culture), and (d) a voluntary action to control the body's muscle system (including speech and self control) (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 216).

Related to change, the types of learning such as motivation, cognitive structure, and belongingness and ideology, help to establish a relationship between learning and time perspective (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 222). Time perspective plays a role in learning as individual behavior can align with a vision of hope for the future and some concept of the past, rather than a focus or concern for the implications of immediate circumstances (Lewin, 1948, 1951). By broadening ones view through changing their time perspective, Lewin (1948, 1951) theorizes that individual happiness and morale are improved. This is a change in cognitive structure (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 228). The theory suggests that learning and understanding the bigger picture, or the long term view, may contribute to a more meaningful participation in the change process required to achieve or reach a desired end.

Distinguishing between autocratic and democratic learning environments is the difference between being imposed on and actually having to participate to learn (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 223). A democratic learning processes requires that: (a) one has to participate rather than passively accepting being imposed upon, (b) one has to adopt certain likes and dislikes, or valences, values, and ideologies, and (c) one has to learn techniques that will help to facilitate the learning (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Additionally, the level of aspiration, or the difficulty to attain the goal set by an individual, is a considerable factor in the learning process (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 227).

Past and present successes and failures also contribute to the level of effort and commitment that an individual will make to reach a new goal (Lewin, 1948, 1951). It is easy to relate the concept to the senior employee who has “done it all,” and who may not be willing or will actively resist adopting changes based on past experiences, successes, and failures. The challenges of learning, or reeducation, are significant in such an example and have clear implications in the discussion of organizational change models.

Conclusions: the Foundation for a Change Theory

It is impossible to ignore the tremendous influence that two world wars and the personal experience of the Jewish persecution likely had on Kurt Lewin’s study, theories, and views in the field of social psychology. While the work often referenced existing research and scholarly study, Lewin (1948, 1951) managed to inject a direct correlation between social science and the extremism that marked his native land and heritage. It may be invaluable to this work that research, theory, and historical reality intertwine to develop the theoretical basis of social,

political, and cultural change. As such, the fragile morale of a nation and the world at war gives relevance to critical theories that Lewin (1948, 1951) developed around time perspective, leadership, beliefs, standards and value systems, cultural influence and relevance, democracy, and the power of motivated and focused groups.

In Lewin's social psychological construct, entire lost nations forge a foundation to establish the theoretical parameters of change, including the difficulties and challenges of unlocking, moving, and reestablishing individuals and groups in firmly rooted values, cultures, and belief systems. Principles such as reeducation, in a contemporary context, suggest a certain political incorrectness and may even be socially offensive today based on socialist, communist, and cold war history. However, in the arena of affecting behavior to induce a more global change, reeducation presents a tangible concept that positively correlates with learning and conduct relating to the individual acceptance of new systems of values and beliefs (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

There is a certain rigidity presented in the process of unlocking beliefs, using group social power to transplant individuals' belief systems to a new space, and anchoring the individual's acceptance in a new cultural system. However, Lewin (1948, 1951) establishes the emotional or human connection to change mechanics in early discussion of the inseparability of hope, morale, and time perspective. The psychological connection evolves with change execution, providing a critical human foundation. Hope matters, and the relevance of enthusiastically believing in the desired outcome in an acceptable timeframe sets the stage for the formal exploration and discussion of Lewin's unfreezing, moving, and refreezing change model.

Lewin's Change Theory: Unfreezing, Moving, and Refreezing

Lewin's (1948, 1951) change model revolves around three critical phases: (a) unfreezing, which is a process of disengaging groups and individuals from firmly established norms, beliefs, and behaviors in the form of an existing equilibrium state, (b) moving, which involves establishing a new equilibrium state, and (c) refreezing, the most challenging phase, which requires that the new equilibrium state be made permanent.

As a process model, it is critical to identify and discuss key principles of each stage of the change model in order to understand the progression and assumptions. The development of permanent change takes hold in the earlier discussion of the power of the group in terms of its effect on the behaviors, beliefs, values, and attitudes of its individual members (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The comfort zone that exists as the group atmosphere is the foundation for the group's equilibrium, where the culture of the group is reasonably established and consistent. As a continuum, the group moves and evolves and thus is able to move and evolve the individual members.

Actually moving to the new change state assumes that the unfreezing process has been achieved and implies that the group as a majority and decision making body is in agreement to make the change. The group at large, as well as leaders, have accepted and are prepared to function at a new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Refreezing, or sustaining the move at a new level then becomes the last critical challenge. As previously discussed, Lewin (1948, 1951) argues that individuals and any group will naturally gravitate back to old norms and cultural behaviors if the

organization fails to expend energy on making the change sustainable and permanent. While execution of the unfreezing and moving processes may mitigate resistance and other barriers, powerful variable forces, which Lewin (1948, 1951) defines as a “force field,” loom as key threats to change reversion if the refreezing process fails or lacks proper attention and commitment.

Prior to engaging in a comparative analysis of contemporary theory, it is important to explore in this final section, the key environmental factors that contribute to the Lewin model. Those areas include: (a) the group decision principles that shape the process, (b) intended behavioral outcomes, and (c) those variables that provide socializing perspective around Lewin’s change theory.

Context and Environment

Creating change requires moving the equilibrium state from its present level to a newly desired level (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 326). Because of the importance of the atmosphere of the group as a totality of circumstances, simply trying to reach a goal does not suffice as the means to attaining permanent change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Groups, subgroups, value systems, power structures, relations, etc., all make up the “constellation” of components and variables critical to affecting change (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 327). Combined with behaviors and beliefs, Lewin (1948, 1951) presented the condition as customs or social habits. All of these elements potentially represent roadblocks to actually achieving change in terms of moving from an existing level to a new level.

Social habit is powerful, and not independently or readily movable because of the effect of a greater force than the actual change (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 327). Social habit creates inner resistance, a stronger force which tends to freeze or hold the group equilibrium at its current, constant state (Lewin, 1948, 1951). To overcome the inner resistance and move to a new level then requires the “unfreezing” of social habit to the degree that the group and the present level can be moved (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 327). Unfreezing, therefore, implies that some additional force or effort (other than the change itself) is required to alter any number of the components that keep the group at a constant level and directly contribute to the inner resistance (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Group values, standards, and individual resistance. The value systems of the group provide insight into the behavior of the individual within the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Group standards become the guidance and behavioral perimeter for individual members. The group level, relevant to social habits and group norms, then defines the individual’s standards where it assumes that the individual wants to be positively affiliated with the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The group standards guide the level of change resistance that the individual is willing to assert in accordance with the group level of intensity behind any given standard (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 329). The social value of the group standards directly relate to the level of resistance that the individual member will demonstrate for any effort to move away from those standards (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Powerful social habits as strongly held group values then represent the most difficult standards to “unfreeze” or move individuals away from (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 329).

The power of the value that an individual may place on a group standard that emerges as a driving factor of individual resistance is a significant consideration. To mitigate or unfreeze the effect of the group standard, Lewin (1948, 1951) theorized that it was possible to diminish the value of the standard or habit of the group directly (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 329). The technique of “group carried” change works by way of the premise that individuals organized as a group can be moved or changed more readily as a collective, rather than trying to change members one at a time (Lewin, 1948, 1951). If the group standard moves, the individual is more likely to move with it and any individual resistance is minimized or eliminated all together. And if the group standards are unchanged, individuals will increasingly resist any changes that force them away from the group’s existing values and standards (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 329).

Change as the group objective. Lewin (1948, 1951) sought to distinguish group objectives and change goal setting from the actuality of creating permanent change. As discussed earlier, both group and individual performance will fall back to the previous equilibrium state after an initial effort to move through new objectives. The missing link is establishing permanency and at a new level related to group standards as the critical objective of the change effort (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 330). This principle is the cornerstone of Lewin’s (1948, 1951) change theory as he identified the process as: (a) unfreezing the present level, (b) moving to the new level, and (c) (re)freezing the group at the new level, establishing a new permanency of the change and level.

The impact of resistance related to the individual’s value placed on the group’s standards is a powerful and significant variable and potential barrier to change (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Related to unfreezing present levels, resistance can be both complicated and variable depending on individual case circumstances (Lewin, 1948, 1951). To be implemented effectively, the unfreezing process may require creating an emotional reaction or involvement to get group or individual attention, engagement, and execution (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 330). The same emotion generating theory is held for refreezing, or establishing and holding the permanency of a new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Freezing at a new level creates a new equilibrium that, to be successful, must not be allowed to regress to the old level (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Group Decision Influence on Moving and Change Permanency

A key principle of Lewin's change theory revolves around group decision making relative to creating and sustaining permanency. Citing data obtained from various social experiments, Lewin (1948, 1951) posited that a procedure methodically designed to engage, educate, and involve groups in decisions would create permanent change more successfully than attempts to change individuals independently (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 331). In the three step process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing, the group decision procedure to engage, educate, and involve members, moves the level or standard of the group forward, creating a safe haven for individuals to realign with the new standard. When a successful move effort is implemented, individual behavior tends to stabilize around the new group standard when they have been engaged in the change or move to the new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Group decisions also have the effect of providing individuals with a mechanism to separate their personal preferences from the group effort, allowing them to function more as a "group

member” (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 333). Another favorable effect of group decision centers on the relationship between motivation and action. A highly charged lecture or speech may motivate group members, but it does not drive actions necessary to achieve change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Motivation is bridged to action by way of the decision process, or acceptance of the new objective of reaching and sustaining or freezing the change at a new level. The decision process further supports the freezing effect in that it represents a commitment of the individual to the change decision as well as a commitment to the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 334).

Obstacles, challenges, and applications. The group decision procedure is not a blanket assumption, however, as care must be taken to consider and review individual situations and cases (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Dependence on highly valued standards held by the group is the primary reason that individual efforts fail due to resistance. The individual simply holds to the values that they are most comfortable with and resists change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Additionally, the global culture where the group exists can inhibit the group from achieving a desired change to a new level. This situation requires some level of isolation, referred to as creating “cultural islands,” until the change is frozen at the new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

As has been discussed, the issue of the variables related to the equilibrium state is complex. While the decision process contributes to the freezing effect, there are many other factors, social forces, and social fields, which have significant weight in establishing permanency at a new level. These same variables also contribute significantly to the theories and understanding of resistance to change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). One of the key theories about the drivers of

resistance to change revolves around the individual value given in relation to group standards (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 334). In this context, the theory provides analytical capacity for addressing issues regarding the effect of: (a) social forces and social fields, (b) resistance and equilibrium states, (c) the process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing a level, and (d) the impact of group procedures on changing individual attitudes or conduct (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 334).

Given the totality of any individual situation, Lewin (1948, 1951) asserted that the analytical process and resources were applicable to a broad range of “cultural, sociological, economic, and psychological aspects of group life.” The toolbox is a platform to analyze various social and change environments, including: (a) production lines, (b) work teams and individual workers, (c) changes of individual ability, (d) group standards, and (e) interactions between groups, individuals, and between individuals and groups (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The significance of this analytical breadth is the capability to address a variety of problems and challenges related to change and the forces of resistance to change across a broad and significant spectrum of variables and circumstances (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Conclusions: Lewin's Model

From the change implementation perspective, Lewin's (1948, 1951) application of social and psychological theory offers a valuable “toolbox” of concepts that reinforce the three step process of change. While not implying a requisite order, some of the significant socio psychological tools supporting change theory, applicable to individuals and groups, are: (a) hope

as the representation of an attainable psychological future that anchors critical beliefs such that current equilibrium can be unfrozen, (b) time perspective as the mechanism that drives morale, value systems, and creates the backdrop for moving to an attainable and sustainable change, and (c) learning as the reeducation mechanism to create permanency around a new level of values, beliefs, and standards (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

As a progression of thought, the collective development work leading to the change theory of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing, revolves around several critical themes. These themes develop a foundation of assumptions as the theoretical basis for the social environment and state where change can occur. The theoretical platforms suggest generally that: (a) group culture as a system of values, represents a state of equilibrium that establishes the root belongingness and commitment of the individual, (b) attempting to change the values and beliefs of individuals one at a time is a failure proposition as the individual will revert back to the group's equilibrium state, (c) the power of the value given to standards and beliefs by the individual controls the force of the individual's resistance to change, (d) changing the standards of the group is the means to unfreeze and move the individual to a new group level, and (e) engaging, educating, and involving groups in change decisions is critical to establishing permanency to change, or refreezing at a new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Retrospectively, Lewin (1948, 1951) establishes in change theory, an overarching sense of causal relationships that embody the interaction of variables between groups and individuals as members of groups. Support for the logic evolves theoretically around behavioral responses tied

thematically to Lewin's in depth study and research in the field of social psychology (Cartwright, 1951). The tools and theories developed and presented here as a cursory overview, provide a foundation for going forward to compare and contrast contemporary theory.

Contemporary Theory in the Context of Unfreezing, Moving, and Refreezing

This section explores Lewin's three step change process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing in relation to contemporary theorists and scholars . Given a limited scope of theoretical exposure here, change theory seems to track with Lewin's (1948, 1951) core concepts around change processes and the social and psychological aspects that have some universal characteristics. A thematic congruity emerges around: (a) behavior, (b) group cultures as belief systems, values and standards, (c) learning, (d) time perspective, (e) resistance, and (f) psychological states and emotions such as hope that drive morale as a functional parameter of change.

By comparison, extremely diverse concepts exist in leadership theory across a progression from early trait, "born to and born with" and social class concepts to behavioral, situational, and complex transformational models. Many of these models and theories have divergent and often conflicting views. In this context, Lewin's influence on contemporary approaches to change models and management is noteworthy for a basic continuum of agreement around the fundamental themes mentioned to this point.

Not to oversimplify, Poole and Van der Ven (2006) note that theories of organizational change can be complex and may include layers of different methods to execute (p. 375). Given

diverse circumstances, they do, however, synthesize critical components of relationships, time, space, goals, and behavior. From a macro level review of theory and their own theoretical work, this global observation provides some measure of continuity to hold the change discussion together as an historical evolution (Poole & Van der Ven, 2006). These concepts indicate a root system in Lewin's (1948, 1951) social and psychological approach to change. To that more common end, change theory requires an understanding of the complexities of the role of people, segregated socially and functionally as groups and individuals, in the change process (Poole & Van der Ven, 2006).

Contemporary Views and Unfreezing

Habits, customs, norms, standards, and values all describe fields that hold groups in place, or in a state of equilibrium (Lewin, 1948, 1951). The group systems are the variable but constant forces that hold individuals in place and often resistant to change mechanisms if the individual is affected while the group around them remains static (Lewin, 1948, 1951). That present condition may represent complacency at all levels and an obstacle that prevents the development of the necessary urgency to unfreeze the current equilibrium (Kotter, 2006). If leaders are not sufficiently motivated, for example, followers stay connected to the status quo and existing group level, rendering unfreezing at the individual level next to impossible, as the individual will quickly revert to the previous state or simply hold in place (Lewin, 1948, 1951). In this scenario, change fails before it even gets started, emphasizing the importance of the need to "unfreeze" the equilibrium state for the group as a mechanism to neutralize individual resistance and move to a new level or state (Kotter, 2006; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Kotter (2006) cites eight common errors that prevent a change from evolving. Five of these underscore the relevance of the theory of unfreezing: (a) allowing too much complacency, (b) failing to develop a coalition or group to move forward, (c) failing to have a vision, (d) failing to communicate the vision, and (e) allowing obstacles to block the effort to move to a new level. The issue of vision aligns with the psychological factors Lewin (1948, 1951) notes as critical to an individual and group's time perspective, affecting key group and individual conditions or states such as morale and hope.

Lewin (1948, 1951) advocates focusing on the group as the mechanism to unfreeze beliefs, customs, habits, norms, and values. As such, the group becomes a complex cultural system where the interrelationships of the members provide the foundation for the behaviors necessary to change the group's equilibrium (Senge, 1990). Established beliefs and cultural norms also provide the benchmark for assessing the strength of group attitudes about change (Judson, 1991). This is an important aspect in determining the real and perceived threat to the established group culture and thus the overall effort required to unfreeze the group level (Judson, 1991 p. 31). A strong group system represents a strong culture, which intensifies the individual resistance to any effort to move away from the group culture (Senge, 1990; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Understanding the structural foundation of the group as a cultural system produces the insight necessary to unfreeze and ultimately change group behavior (Senge, 1990). For unlocking the group level, an understanding of structural patterns of behavior within the group answers the

question of what causes patterns of behavior so that those patterns can actually be changed (Senge, 1990, p. 52-53).

Resistance to change. The topic of resistance has supported countless and voluminous studies (O'Toole, 1996). It is a central theme across all of the sources cited and is probably one of the most if not the most critical issues around the broader topic of unfreezing and ultimately executing change. Resistance at all levels has the potential to prevent unfreezing from occurring, and therefore, stop a change process before it gets out of the gate.

Judson (1991) attributes individual resistance to change more to the perception of threats in relation to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In terms of the scale or intensity of resistance, individuals will push back more fiercely to change as the threat intercepts with their most basic personal needs, such as safety and security (Judson, 1991, p. 34). Another model characterizes the reasons for individual resistance in a hierarchical, psychological pyramid of: (a) not willing, (b) not able, and (c) not knowing (Galpin, 1996, p. 43). Learning provides a solution to address the issue of not knowing (Galpin, 1996, p. 44). While the least of Galpin's (1996) issues in the pyramid, the importance of learning in the unfreezing and moving process is supported more actively in other learning models such as those presented by Lewin (1948, 1951) and Senge (1990).

O'Toole (1996) noted that resistance requires a macro social and historical context of understanding to properly address it in change management. Agreeing with Lewin (1948, 1951), O'Toole (1996) emphasizes that the first order of understanding must come from separating the

behaviors of individuals from group behavior and culture where change and resistance are concerned. An historical view provides a social context around great leaders of change who were “rejected in their genius,” supplanted by the norms that society as a group holds in place (O’Toole, 1996, p. 165). While focused on the actions and outcomes around leaders, the issue of change in this perspective must be turned inward to society and the masses who would not, did not, or could not “listen, learn, and act” (O’Toole, 1996, p. 166).

A discussion of Churchill, for example, and his repeated efforts to warn Great Britain and the world about the inevitable Nazi threat, provides a proper example of the leadership challenges around change in the face of extremely powerful and established cultural norms, standards, and beliefs of large groups (O’Toole, 1996). It is likely that automobile and banking industry cases will emerge in the current domestic economic environment to fit this very example and model.

The overarching discussion is fundamental to the social psychologist’s view that Lewin (1948, 1951) held and based his three stage model of change on. Failing to recognize the bright line between the mindset and behavior of the individual inside and outside of the group and the ultimate power of the culture and belief system of the group impairs the appreciation for the function of resistance. Thus, the understanding of the strategic approach to unfreezing a level or state sufficient to change the behavior of the individual as a member of the group is also inhibited (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Both Judson (1991) and Senge (1990) argued in support of this concept from a systems perspective, noting that it is a fatal flaw of change management to ignore the resistant power that

groups hold in a given state of equilibrium and their direct effect on individual members in isolation. Successful unfreezing, therefore, requires a consensus approach to addressing the values, beliefs, and culture of the group as a system of individuals, giving them a new level or state of equilibrium to aspire to that is uniquely supported by the group (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Judson, 1991; Senge, 1999; O'Toole, 1996).

Contemporary Views and Moving

The process of moving is the process of implementing the change itself. It requires moving the group to a new level, which distinguishes the theory established by Lewin (1948, 1951). A critical identifier of the process is that all aspects of the change require the group's engagement in the decision process as a group "procedure" (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Contemporary theories of change execution include multi-step processes that generate energy and a level of motivation sufficient to overcome inertia or the current state of equilibrium (Kotter, 1996). Theorists considered here propose change mechanisms and processes that have common themes aligned with Lewin's three step model. Varying theory lines connect to the actual execution and act of advancing the change objective, prefaced by unfreezing actions and approaches and the end goal of institutionalizing, or creating permanency in the refreezing stage.

Kotter's eight stage model. Kotter's (1996) change model, for example, identifies an eight stage implementation process or a movement that includes: (a) establishing urgency, (b) creating a leadership coalition, (c) developing vision and strategy, (c) communicating the change vision, (d) empowering broad action, (e) generating near term successes, (f) harnessing gains to produce

more change, and (g) anchoring (freezing) the new level in the culture. The issue of urgency relates to Lewin's (1948, 1951) discussion of the potential need to jolt the group to initiate the unfreezing process and move the group to action into a new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 330).

The early stages of creating urgency through communicating the change vision convey the unfreezing actions of the model. Narrowly, the actual execution merely sets the change in motion by creating action steps, where the focus quickly transitions to the proactive mechanisms of sustaining the momentum and permanently anchoring the change (Kotter, 1996). The rationale behind this model is to engage a transformational process that builds and feeds upon itself once the learning process around the vision is established and promoted across the group (Kotter, 1996). The actual initiation of the change, the move stage, is more of a transition point between a great deal of group preparation and a critical focus on institutionalizing the change effort.

Galpin and transformational change. In a transformational change model, establishing the need for change is the initiating mechanism to begin the process of unfreezing the current level (Galpin, 1996). The model engages a process built around a strategic change and a grassroots change theory. The strategic process is the initial, high level effort to develop and establish the change model for the group through technical evaluation processes and analysis (Galpin, 1996). The "soft side" of the strategic process defines the need parameters and evolves the vision (Galpin, 1996, p. 2). The grassroots side of Galpin's (1996) change model focuses entirely on the execution of the change and ultimately driving the change deep into the organization.

The nine step transformational change model is comprised of: (a) establishing the need to change, (b) developing the vision for change and moving it out, (c) evaluation and analysis of the current environment, (d) generating recommendations, (e) create the execution detail, (f) test the recommendations, (g) prepare for the rollout, (h) rollout the change program, and (i), measure, reinforce, and refine the changes (Galpin, 1996). The steps of establishing the need all the way through preparing the rollout as execution detail indicate a lengthy and methodical unfreezing process. Once the testing begins, the model moves from a strategic change process to the grassroots process of driving the effort into the organization. A noteworthy and interesting departure is positioning the need for change before any evaluation of the current situation as a reaction to a variety of potential internal and or external forces (Galpin, 1996, p. 5).

The move state is simply the eighth step of actually rolling out the change followed by a strong, enduring process to anchor the change in the organization (Galpin, 1996). In this model, actually moving or changing has been meticulously evaluated, sold, and tested before being implemented such that transitioning to creating permanency occurs quickly after the change is implemented. While a departure from other contemporary models, the process reinforces the importance placed by Lewin (1948, 1951) on firmly establishing the new level for the group through a group development process.

Judson and behavior modeling. A more behaviorist approach to change suggests that success happens by understanding and framing change process around Maslow's higher order needs of esteem and self actualization (Judson, 1991). Through this model, moving occurs

through a process of adjusting behavioral dynamics (Judson, 1991). In simpler, systemic steps, successful change occurs by: (a) analyzing and planning the change, (b) broadly communicating and creating participation, (c) gaining broad acceptance for the required change in behavior, (d) transitioning to the new condition or state (moving), and (e) consolidating the new conditions and institutionalizing them in the environment (refreezing) (Judson, 1991, pp. 166, 167). The behavioral construct comes from a view of the social, psychological, and operational effects of change, in agreement with Lewin's (1948, 1951) social psychologist approach and perspective (Judson, 1991, pp. 16, 17).

Judson (1991) posits that the key to change success comes from a deep understanding of the behavioral implications of resistance. As a proactive strategy, the ultimate counterbalance and most powerful tool to overcome resistance is participation as a modifying means to create buy in, unfreeze behaviors and attitudes, and move the change process (Judson, 1991, p. 128). Two key concepts of the model tie gaining acceptance for the behaviors required to execute change with a transition to a new condition (Judson, 1991). This behavioral learning process drives the group to a new level or state of equilibrium, facilitated by the act of implementing the change itself (Judson, 1991).

Lewin's (1948, 1951) model strongly advocates for group participation in decision making as the core strategy to moving and raising the group state of equilibrium. Senge (1990) contributes agreement around the participation argument through his advocacy of the disciplines of shared vision and team learning in particular. Similarly, structure, defined as a system of

interpersonal relationships, supports the foundational argument around the importance of group decision making on influencing successful change behaviors (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Senge, 1990).

Emphasis on addressing resistance, establishing group interaction, and creating a sense of vision or urgency around a change need are common contemporary themes. More thorough, extended, and detailed initial change model steps extend the foundation of Lewin's (1948, 1951) unfreezing premise. Contemporary theory broadens the unfreezing process to ensure a more secure or certain "move" to the next level. Without a successful unfreezing, it is clear that any move or change will either: (a) stall, (b) fall back to the previous equilibrium state, or (c) never get off the ground at all. With a longer development process designed to fully evolve the unfreezing mechanism, contemporary execution of the move or change resembles more of a transitional exercise designed to move rapidly into the stage of refreezing and creating change permanency (Kotter, 1996; Judson, 1996; Galpin, 1991).

Contemporary Views and Refreezing

Refreezing the group to the new level established by the change objective is the final step of the three step change process (Lewin, 1948, 1951). However, left unattended after executing the move process, change is likely to fail as the group and individuals will revert to the previous state of equilibrium if not anchored to the new state (Lewin, 1948, 1951). What may be at first a change success could rapidly erode to a failure due to unexpected problems such as the influence of firmly established and strongly held group beliefs, standards, and norms (Judson, 1996; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Senge (1990) held that change failures are often directly attributable to the affects of limits to growth structures in organizations. As changes gain momentum on their own and succeed, they may conversely generate increasing levels of fear and uncertainty among group members and leaders, resulting in an undermining of the change process (Senge, 1990, p. 98). This phenomenon is attributable to several group and individual social and behavioral observations such as: (a) new levels of openness and candor, (b) polarization and competition between group factions trying to maintain group culture, and (c) uncommitted management that fractures interpersonal relations between individuals and groups (Senge, 1990).

People try harder and ultimately create more apprehension and failure (Senge, 1990, p. 99). To unfreeze and move groups to a new level, shared vision and team learning are critical guiding disciplines required if permanency is to be established (Senge, 1990). A key principle to gaining the permanent anchoring of the change is to first ensure that the change has a significant and accepted higher purpose that is “worthy of the commitment” of the group and individual members (Senge, 1990, p. 263).

The power of culture. The group decision process around change is powerful in moving the group to a new level. However, there is a great deal of complexity in freezing at a new level due to many other variables in social processes, including the influences of group and organizational cultures (Lewin, 1948, 1951, p. 334). Cultural values, equated to shared social and ideological assumptions around belief systems, create a powerful cohesiveness among the many variables of culture (O’Toole, 1996). These are critical forces that, when moved to a new

level, are likely to establish a permanent and binding change. Conversely, they are a common ground also likely to deconstruct a change if not addressed in the moving and refreezing processes (O'Toole, 1996).

Culture management through the use of a cultural screen is a tool to help sustain change (Galpin, 1996, pp. 54-57). Creating a “cultural screen” is a technique intended to focus on any combination of cultural variables to help manage and sustain or freeze change (Galpin, 1996). The ten cultural components for creating cultural screen process are: (a) rules and policies, (b) goals and measurement, (c) customs and norms, (d) training, (e) ceremonies and events, (f) management behaviors, (g) rewards and recognition, (h) communications, (i) physical environment, and (j) organizational structure (Galpin, 1996, p. 54). The application involves matching a specific change to any corresponding cultural elements that come into play in the implementation of the change. The objective is to address cultural issues throughout the implementation process and into the actual freezing of the change at a new level (Galpin, 1996).

Aligned with resistance, culture is a powerful and somewhat invisible force that creates norms of behavior and crystallizes shared values (Kotter, 1996). Culture is difficult to change and therefore represents the critical link to sustain a new equilibrium state. In the cultural framework of refreezing, changing shared values such as customer service and customer commitment are significantly more difficult to change than norms of behavior such as leaving an hour early on Friday (Kotter, 1996, pp. 148, 149).

Changing culture and powerful norms and values is actually the last step in the process of change and the most critical step in anchoring the change in permanency (Kotter, 1996, p.156). Attitude and behavior changes occur early in the transformation or change process and are later anchored into the culture as they both become familiar, comfortable, and routine (Kotter, 1996). This supposition appears to consider Lewin's (1948, 1951) theories about the importance of time perspective, group values, and shared learning as socializing components of change and specific here to freezing any group at a new level.

Similarly, Senge (1990) tied this theory to cultural systems as critical interrelationships of variables that are sufficient to influence behavior over a period of time. In the context of group norms and behavior, the result is a consistency sufficient to stabilize cultural change and anchor group change at a new, permanent level. Changing norms and values to anchor behavior is a basic learning practice and a key element of cultural change efforts (Senge, 1990, pp. 274, 275).

Communication, learning and result. Transforming the theoretical application to the practical result is a function of continuous, ongoing, and clear communication across the change process. Within the context of group power, when information is mutually held, productivity and interpersonal strength is enhanced to the benefit of facilitating and stabilizing change (Galpin, 1996). When transferring this communication sharing power from interpersonal to group strength, the entire change process is enhanced and more likely to remain sustainable (Galpin, 1996, p. 37)

When change is a learning process evolved through a deliberate learning environment, the natural feedback systems contribute to establishing a permanency for the effort (Garvin, 2000).

Supportive learning environments contribute to refreezing when basic stimulating conditions exist: (a) recognition and acceptance of differences, (b) provision of unfiltered feedback, (c) pursuit of new ways of thinking and new sources of information, and (d) an open tolerance for failure and mistakes as an accepted cost of improvement (Garvin, 2000, p. 34).

Judson (1996) supported the learning process theory, suggesting that maximizing the change and ensuring its permanency required thorough evaluation procedures, constant and ongoing feedback, and complete and objective review and improvement across the organization so that future change and learning would be enhanced. Objectively defining the extent and effect of change provides a measurement against expectations that can help with not only confirming a new level, but fostering and institutionalizing “productive organizational learning” (Judson, 1996, pp. 181, 182).

Breadth Synthesis

“Change often invites risk and an uncertain future or destination, so having a compelling reason is crucial” (Kezar, 2001). A single sentence of a contemporary change scholar captures the essence of Lewin’s overall social psychological platform for a three stage change theory. Risk and uncertainty are functions of the cornerstones of hope, morale, time perspective, and ultimately, resistance as an immovable state of equilibrium (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Vision, learning, motivation, and a purpose sufficient, compelling, and worthy to move values and beliefs are also Lewin (1948, 1951) hallmarks. Kezar (2001) goes on to recognize that successful organizational change

requires a learning process anchored to the organizational and environmental systems and processes (value systems, norms, and beliefs) held by the members.

The evolution of the three stage model to contemporary practice is most profound in the emphasis placed on the unfreezing process. Because of the social and psychological factors Lewin (1948, 1951) established as benchmarks of resistance, modern theory has expanded the conceptual process required to ensure that the current state of equilibrium both can and will ultimately move. As a result, the activity of moving to a new level functions more as a transitional action, to get to the next, most crucial step, which is refreezing. While it is logical that the goal is to ensure success, the act of establishing change permanency is equally complex and tied convincingly to the power of established individual and group culture.

DEPTH

AMDS 8622: CURRENT RESEARCH MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

Annotated Bibliography

Burnes, Bernard (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A reappraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977-1002.

The author presents and analyzes contemporary criticism of Kurt Lewin's change theory and the key components of Lewin's planned approach to change: (a) field theory, (b) group dynamics, (c) action research, and (d) the three step change model. Burnes' intent was to reevaluate Lewin's contributions against more prominent criticisms of his work as a social psychologist and change management theorist. The analysis progresses through a critical discussion of Lewin's contribution to change management and his dominant focus on social conflict and the problems of minority and disadvantaged groups. As noted in the breadth section, there is an apparent theme in Lewin's work as a matter of both his religious and ethnic heritage and the emergence of the Nazi regime and a racist and authoritarian pre world war two Germany. The author's primary research mechanism is a review of scholarly literature specifically challenging Lewin's theories and models.

Burnes' summary of Lewin's history and work provides a useful preface and staging for a discussion of the four components of planned change. In particular, the synopsis ties together Lewin's social view with the psychology and approach to social theory, critically framing the

broader behavioral premise for the three step change model in particular. The discussion transitions a bit abruptly to the 1980's and the emergence of direct criticism of Lewin's work in the form of an impatience with the process that Lewin advocated. Burnes posits that the core competing theories that began to diminish the Lewin model were: (a) the culture excellence school, (b) the postmodernists, and (c) the processualists. Through the analysis of the literature, the author provides insight into the arguments behind each competing theory and then dissects and responds to the criticism for each.

Burnes' frames the purpose and intent of the research and the discussion as a mechanism to: (a) present the nature of Lewin's contribution, (b) establish or challenge the validity of the criticisms, and (c) address the relevance of Lewin's work for contemporary social and organizational change. This work provides insight and perspective that helps to validate the conclusions drawn in the breadth section. It further provides references and insight into contemporary analysis and criticism of Lewin's work, assumptions, and change theory. Finally, it provides a reflective quality to help in the understanding of the continuum of change management in theory, research and experimentation, and practice.

Schein, E.H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Reflections, 1*(1), 58-74.

Edgar Schein, a noted leadership, change, and organizational development author and scholar, discusses and analyzes the influence of Kurt Lewin's work on contemporary organizational development theory and research. The focus of the discussion is around Schein's findings and learning that resulted from his change management teachings at the MIT Sloan

School. Applying Lewin's change theories in various test applications in a teaching environment, the author relates first hand outcomes that are the outputs of the effort. The primary research mechanism for his applications methods were in classroom experiments with students. Each stage of testing produced project reviews by students around specific applications for both learning and change management.

The article provides valuable insight into a modern scholar's interpretation and application of Kurt Lewin's change model. Using the MIT classroom environment as a live incubator, Schein is able to test his own research hypotheses and get direct feedback from very focused and targeted groups. Assigned project applications generated very specific change outcomes at MIT as a result of Schein's teaching and theory testing process. It is clear that a change management teaching method was a key output of the effort. However, some caution is advisable for broader use of the findings as the specific school, environment, motivations, and audience are a narrow sample.

Schein's critical discussion of Lewin's change theory and model at the front end of this article is invaluable. In depth discussion around topics such as cognitive redefinition in the context of unfreezing and the requirements of change as learning provide contemporary insight into change management practice. From a practical viewpoint, Schein's discussion of consultative change management provides perspective on how change agents in the field should approach the successful application of Lewin's model and theory. This discussion is especially rich in reflecting on the importance cultural immersion, continuous diagnosis and evaluation, and ongoing

intervention as key change agent behaviors either within the organization or from without in a consultative role.

Walinga, J. (2008). Toward a theory of change readiness: The roles of appraisal, focus, and perceived control. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(3), 315-347.

The author pursues three research questions in a study to determine how people prepare themselves for change in such a way that the implementation will be successful. Further, the desired outcome would be a clearer understanding of a process for change readiness. The study asks: (a) what does it mean to be ready for change, (b) how do organizations get ready for change, and (c) what organizational change readiness supports individual change readiness.

Walinga chose a women's college soccer team who had set a goal of attaining a national championship as the unit for the study.

Sports team models provide a unique platform for formal study. Concepts of teamwork, team learning, and team effort to achieve goals and thus varying levels of change are generally accepted anecdotally and informally by anyone who has participated in organized sports, especially at older ages. The downside of this particular study is the small unit of study, 29 female players and a single coach. Walinga conducted a literature review for background on change readiness theory and used a case study methodology for in depth interviews and questionnaires with the research spanning three seasons of play. Interestingly, a stress coping measurement tool was used as the instrument to gauge preparation, goal setting, and goal attainment.

Considering the issue of change readiness is valuable in the context of understanding the necessary preparation for successful change execution. This particular research suggests that varying degrees of readiness, or perceived readiness for change among group members can have a measurable impact on the overall effectiveness of change execution. Additionally, the need for individual control as a transactional variable in the change environment is a powerful factor and individual contribution to the group's overall change effort. Walinga suggests that the lack of perceived control is a predictor of individual performance relative to change and is an area worthy of further study.

Robinson, O. & Griffiths, A. (2009). Coping with the stress of transformational change in a government department. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(2), 204-221.

The focus of this research was to gain insight into the specific factors and methods for coping with stress associated with transformational change in organizations. The transformational model is one of the most severe in terms of overall change throughout an organization. The authors use a government agency as the unit of study. Semi structured interviews were given to a sample of 28 participants drawn from an employee base of 390. The specific focus of the study was to determine what it is about the process of change that individuals consider stressful and how they cope with various stress drivers. Five key stressors were identified as being triggered by transformational change: (a) increased workload, (b) perceived loss {status, power, etc.}, (c) uncertainty and ambiguity, (d) interpersonal conflict, and (e) unfair treatment.

The research considers the issue of coping with change as an individual responsibility, a worthwhile consideration when considering theory in the Breadth section that addresses the

challenges of moving individuals through a change process. Considering that transactional change is more isolated, methodical, and process oriented, the transformational situation provides a more constructive look at the severity of stressors on individuals in an organization wide change effort. The authors note that there is narrowness to the effort as a first step in addressing the particular research questions and caution about expanding the findings and conclusions into a broader external application without a deeper, quantitative look at the topic of individual coping strategies.

This particular body of work is valuable because of its specific application in the public sector. This is significant in several areas, including the fact that the involved employees all had civil service protection. To some extent, the issue of job loss potential is eliminated as one example of the separation provided in this study. There is a more pure look at the social and psychological issues related to coping and stressors that are unique to more protected government employment as opposed to the private sector where significant layoffs and severe job changes may be a higher order respondent assumption in a study such as this.

Moore, M.J. (2005). The transtheoretical model of the stages of change and the phases of transformative learning: comparing two theories of transformational change. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(4), 394-415.

This research critically compares and contrasts transtheoretical change theory against transformative learning theory. Transtheoretical theory presents a model of six stages that individuals evolve through to achieve self change that transpires through a process of changing behaviors. The transformative learning model defines and describes how adults process life

experiences to change a belief, attitude, opinion, perspective, or a behavior as a change process. The author's goal was to integrate these two research-based concepts in order to help clarify and further define the process of transformational change.

The author develops an analytical link between two theories of transformational change, but each drawn distinctly from the differing fields of psychology and adult education. The comparative analysis approach sets up the models for qualitative analysis to determine possible relationships and connections between the two. The discussion brings contemporary concepts around stages and processes of change that are rooted in learning and behavioral sciences applications such as clinical treatment. The discussion focuses somewhat narrowly on a few theorists in each discipline and the analysis in each area centers on transformational change relative to individuals.

This analysis draws usable links between individual behavior and learning relative to transformational change, a more dramatic change model. The individual behavioral focus helps to stretch the discussion from a variety of perspectives. For example, is the decision to quit smoking and the change processes required to achieve that change, in any way similar to the processes and decisions necessary to change a work process or protocol that has been repeated every day for 20 years? The question of readiness and execution are addressed, invaluable to establishing correlations to Lewin's theories and their evolution through contemporary research efforts.

Henderson, G.A. (2002). Transformative learning as a condition of transformational change in organizations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(2), 186-214.

This research critically compares theoretical perspectives behind transformative learning and transformational change. The author selected the most critically cited and established theorists behind each concept to compare and contrast views and research around the two topics. The distinguishing differences between the two schools of theory primarily deal with individual change (transformational learning) versus organizational change (transformational change). The author links conclusions about the comparative similarities and differences in terms of management implications. The outcome provides four critical conclusions and implications for applying both transformative and transformational change theory to real world change applications.

From the reader's perspective, an assumption has to be made that the author has identified, selected, and critically evaluated the most relevant and pertinent scholars in the schools of transformative learning and transformational change. To that end, the inclusion of Lewin, Schein, Burke and Litwin, Kotter, and Mezirow, provide a continuity of theoretical perspective for the purposes of this body of work. The comparative analysis also helps to focus the current effort on both the similarities and differences in thought around the critical role of the individual in change processes and execution.

This study provides a substantive contribution to the discovery process through the discussion of critical reflection as a core learning and change mechanism for individuals as leaders, managers, and participants in change. The critical reflection process is relevant in particular to personally held beliefs, values, and assumptions and their relationship to executing a change and making it permanent. The piece further contributes reinforcement and clarity around the

differences between transactional and transformational change in simple terms of policy, action, and process.

Alas, R. (2007). The triangular model for dealing with organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(3,4), 255-271.

The author of this research sought to compare and contrast established transformational and transactional change theories against the background of transitioning from a socialist to a market economy in post-cold war Eastern Europe. Structured interviews of managers across a broad range of organizations ascertained organizational change outcomes in the transformational and transactional context. Interestingly, the issue of societal change and disorientation was introduced as a critical social variable in the research to compare and contrast real outcomes against more stable theoretical settings.

The research indicates that transformational change is more prevalent when societal upheaval (which could also include market conditions such as severe recession) is present. This in turn extends to and may correlate with more extreme conditions of internal upheaval in organizations. Conversely, transactional change occurs in more stable environments, suggesting overall that organizational change connects to institutional environments. The author further extends the learning from the research to management implications for global firms with subsidiary companies in transitioning and unstable countries whereby transformational and transactional strategies can apply depending on the overall socio cultural environment. The perspective of an international scholar from a Soviet bloc country is inherently valuable considering the depth of analysis given to change scholars from Lewin to Schein and applied to

the difficult transition from socialism to a pure market economy and capitalism. Additionally, the author contributes to clarification of the nuances of transformational versus transactional change in relevant and applicable situations that include the unique perspective of the role of a society in transition on the periphery. Further, the work contributes validation to the importance of key concepts such as readiness for change, culture, and organizational learning. As with most articles reviewed for this work, the discussion of Lewin's theories and contributions is central to the author's overall work and conclusions.

Chen, C.C. (2007). The effect of organizational change readiness on organizational learning and business management performance. *The Business Review*, 8(2), 68-74.

This body of work explores the effect of employees' readiness for change on organizational learning and business management performance and outcomes. The author used a questionnaire spread among top 500 firms with a return of 175 completed questionnaires. The study revealed that the individual employee level of readiness directly impacted the level of organizational learning and management performance. The study's conclusions also suggest that organizational learning as part of the change process can contribute significantly to management performance outcomes when there is an emphasis on communication and inclusion in the change process.

One of the more difficult to grasp hypothesis in this effort revolves around correlating employee change readiness to business management performance. On a purely common sense level, it might be natural to assume that if change is successful at any level, there may be a logical relationship to relevant or parallel management performance success. In all fairness, there is a

relational connection established between the necessity for change and profitability in the context of measuring performance related to change implementation and management. Other discussions frame this concept more in line with innovation and competitive pressures that occur naturally in the context of management obligations for implementing and sustaining change. The discussion however contributes valuable data around the relationship between learning, readiness and attitude to change, and change implementation.

Chen's discussion relating organizational learning as a mechanism to create desired behavioral change is a constructive contribution to the discussion of learning in the change model. Furthermore, the author asserts that organizational change is an incessant learning process causing behavioral change in order to adapt to changing environments and circumstances. Constant learning as a means to change and improve behaviors as an organizational change mechanism contributes to the value placed by theorists such as Lewin on learning as a strategy to unfreeze, move, and refreeze individuals and groups in the change process.

Hornung, S. & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Active on the job proactive in charge: How autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(4), 401-426.

The authors conducted two separate surveys across hospital employees from doctors to administrators. The measured organizational objective was an effort to institutionalize a shared leadership culture designed to improve everything from patient satisfaction to employee morale and turnover. The research focused on the effect of creating more employee autonomy on the overall acceptance of organizational change, especially related to the cultural environment. While

the organizational effort was leadership focused in terms of the intervention, the result of the research indicated that employees were happier with more individual autonomy, suggesting that creating individual autonomy can be a precursor to successful implementation of some kinds of organizational change.

One of the more intriguing aspects of the research was the implementation of two separate questionnaires among the same employee base. Notably, a third evaluation and cross tabulation of the data was conducted to determine the impact of the intervention on as many individual as could be identified (over 95% in the final analysis). The effort also creates logical connections between leadership intervention practices and their nexus to important change concepts such as openness to change, readiness for change, and commitment to change. The authors effectively introduce work autonomy as a critical principle of their research hypothesis. The shortcoming is that the research reflects only a single hospital site and sample, therefore creating certain caution about the broader application of the findings and conclusions.

This paper appears in the Depth section of KAM V because of its specificity in addressing contemporary leadership concepts and issues. While clearly identifying the shift to more self directed and autonomous individual conduct as a leadership intervention, the authors as well as subject leaders in the organization recognized the change management integration required to achieve the desired result. This is a valuable discussion piece in terms of integrating leadership and change management theory, principles, and practice.

Durant, R.F. (2008). Sharpening a knife cleverly: Organizational change, policy paradox, and the “weaponizing” of administrative reforms. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 282-294.

Durant address new public management and change theory in a relevant analysis of policy tools as change drivers. Of particular interest is the public agency setting where the concepts are applied. The author theorizes by comparative analysis of specific military change applications, how administrative change advocacy can force more global change efforts through. Durant suggests that the “weaponizing” of administrative policy is a change application in public sector management that needs further scholarly review. A study of the greening of the military is used to frame the concept of administrative change policy as a powerful strategy in public organizations to force specific changes, especially in power struggle scenarios. The author uses archival data from congressional testimony, hearings, key government agencies such as the Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office, and a broad array of public sector records and news articles from 1993 to 2005 to support his analysis and conclusions. Durant conducted over 100 interviews with individuals at all ranks and levels, familiar with the “greening of the military” policy and change implementation effort. It is clear from the discussion that the author has a certain bias about the topic of the greening of the military as there is a recurring theme of conflict underlying the discussion and basic hypothesis of using administrative policy change as an ulterior motive driven weapon. There is some acknowledgement however, of more favorable research conclusions about the value of administrative change strategy in the context of desires to improve customer service, alleviate excessive job burdens, improve systems operations, and to reduce overall discontent within systems.

The public sector setting provides perspective on the challenges of change management and implementation at a national level. It is not unrealistic to consider the research and conclusions at a more localized government or even individual government agency level. The author concludes that administrative reforms have serious policy implications from a change perspective, especially in the context of arguing their potential power as potential weapons for driving other agendas and changes. This discussion helps to inform the overall change discussion related to unintended consequences of change administration and for leveraging other change related battles and conflicts in the public sector.

Marshak, R.J. (1993). Lewin meets Confucius: A review of the OD model of change. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 29(4), 393-415.

The author conducts a comparative analysis of the basic principles of Lewin's change model against the eastern Confucian view of change. The method is straight forward utilizing a comparative analysis of the core principles of each theory and approach to change. As an exploratory analysis, the research grounds itself in a set of critical assumptions derived from in depth research of relevant literature. Cultural considerations weigh on the discussion and evaluation, revealing global implications for the topic of change in different cultural settings. Recognizing that there is not a single Confucian model per se, Marshak consolidates and evolves broader philosophy to ground the eastern view and contribution to the discussion. The research effort develops a core conclusion that change agents will arrive at different conclusions and strategies based on their core knowledge of either western or eastern philosophies to organizational development, change, and change processes.

While the conclusions may be somewhat obvious or overly logical given a little thought, the review from the perspectives of eastern and western influences and cultures is not an obvious approach. While on one hand, it is an application that addresses specific cultural differences from a global operations perspective, more contemporary application of the two schools of theory may suggest an integration of Confucian principles as a complement or consolidation of opportunity in the context of Lewin's approach.

The article is not current, but the discussion supporting a comparative look at Lewin's theory and eastern cultural influences relative to organizational development and organizational change is powerful. This particular discussion and analysis forces the scholar practitioner to consider a broader international and cultural viewpoint in the context of change. As a contemporary consideration, it is invaluable as diverse workforces and global collaborations become more prevalent in the organizational change and development landscape.

Alas, R. (2008). Employees' willingness to participate in implementation of organizational change. *Organizacija Vadyba, Sisteminiai Tyrimai*, 46, 7-15.

This research study involved completing 1398 questionnaires administered among employees of 41 different companies in Estonia. The primary objective was to ascertain the specific factors that influence employees' willingness to participate in the implementation of organizational changes. The researcher used the questionnaire to populate two indexes to gauge: (a) employee satisfaction, and (b) employee participation. Participation reflected employee involvement in the change process and the amount of information given about the changes and the

company goals. The willingness index reflected the amount of information made available to employees.

The research concludes that levels of education play a significant role in participation and willingness based on the relationship between the change and the impact on the individual career. Higher education resulted in higher overall change participation, implying a connection to change and implied, perceived, or expected personal, professional benefit. While interesting, the conclusion may only be narrowly applicable given the cultural and socially evolving environment of that region of the world. More broadly, Alas does evolve the result into a discussion of the value of learning organizations in helping organizations more readily adapt to change. In the given sociocultural context, education about change theory may achieve more of the intended outcomes that Alas did discover in the survey results.

Considering the evolving nation setting, the research is of particular interest along the lines of the Confucian versus Lewin study addressed in the Depth bibliography. The author here also considers the cultural issues in relation to the jolting change from a socialist to a capitalist, free market economic structure. Social, political, and economic diversity are important considerations when addressing change in global organizational settings. From the perspective of a learning organization, there is a stark line in this work compared to the more deliberative western integration of basic theory and concepts around change.

Phelan, M. W. (2005). Cultural revitalization movements in organizational change management. *Journal of Change Management*, 5(1), 47-56.

Phelan is a contemporary corporate leader who critically evaluates the application of the cultural revitalization change management theory. The intent of this article is to critically evaluate the application of the revitalization model, with an emphasis on the leader's role in successful implementation. In particular, the analysis also establishes the behavioral connections in the context of the revitalization model. The researcher accomplishes this goal through analysis of change in relation to cultural norms and various resistance factors related to human responses to change such as stress and a host of regressive behaviors.

While targeting corporate culture change in general, the research narrowly focuses on the revitalization model as the critical catalyst to changing behaviors necessary to achieve specific outcomes. Conversely, the discussion introduces revitalization in the context of changing cultures in the broadest change model concept. Contemporary revitalization principles as change catalysts contribute to discussions around the role of culture in organizational change, especially as it relates to a host of leader and follower behaviors. A critical distinction is the discussion of the role of the leader, especially the necessity for charismatic leadership in the revitalization model. The author argues even the role of cult type leadership and its often predictable outcomes in change environments.

Narrowly cast, the research does inform the project in two specific areas: (a) the discussion introduces the role of revitalization theory as a organizational change principle, and (b) the contemporary revitalization theorists serve to reconstruct and support Lewin's three stage change model through various concepts, but including and especially the reestablishment of the

equilibrium state, defined here as the “steady state.” The cult leader role in influencing follower behavior has strong implications in the government and political environment of the public sector. This is noteworthy going forward in relation to the application section.

Cunningham, G.B. (2006). The relationships among commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 29-45.

This research design expands the discussion and examination of the relationship among the concepts of commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. Cunningham chose employees at all levels of NCAA Division I athletic departments. 299 respondents from 10 different departments completed a questionnaire after making the determination that each department was undergoing significant change. The author supports the choice to research athletic department employees on the arguments that: (a) major changes are made extremely public through a variety of local, national, internet, and alumni vehicles, (b) athletic department personnel are publicly searchable and identifiable individuals through a variety of sources, and (c) that Division I athletic departments are powerful and generally autonomous entities subject to intense public exposure and scrutiny.

The research design intends to determine how coping, commitment, and turnover relate to three types of commitment: (a) affective – supporting change on the belief that it will positively affect the organization, (b) normative – the sense of obligation to support change, and (c) continuance – where individuals recognize the cost of failing to support the change. As a result of this effort, the author determined that coping behaviors and effort was one of the more significant

mediating factors where commitment to change and organizational turnover were concerned. The author does caution however that several factors could also contribute to participants' turnover intentions such as: (a) dynamics specific to the organization, (b) personal demographics, (c) work attitudes, and (d) community related factors external to the organization. Narrow sampling suggests caution in generalizing the findings broadly as the study was limited to athletic departments in Division I universities.

The value of this research going forward rests in the discussion of coping's role in mitigating turnover and enhancing commitment to change. The author notes this value as a contribution to change literature through a demonstration of the weight and importance of various psychological factors in the change process. The discussion further emphasizes the importance of commitment as a most significant factor in employee support for change initiatives.

Ford, M.W & Greer, B. M. (2006). Profiling change: An empirical study of change process patterns. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 42(4), 420-446.

The authors conducted a research project designed to advance the understanding of the relationship between a series or sequence of change factors and the relative strength and impact of individual factors along the continuum of a change process. The work used Lewin's three stage change model as the baseline to determine the relationships between the specific implementation steps as a sequence of events that make up the model's execution. Data for this study emerged from 107 questionnaires completed by managers participating in change management seminars. Contemporary theoretical models on change process create change process factors for a referent

baseline or measure to use against Lewin's unfreezing, moving, and refreezing sequence. The authors' project introduces profile analysis as a mechanism to further change process research.

Contemporary theory provides a guidepost to align each of Lewin's three phases of change to change process variables for the purposes of measuring their hypotheses that: (a) as implementation progresses, change process profiles will demonstrate higher levels of moving and refreezing, and (b) change process demonstrating higher degrees of implementation success will show higher levels of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing factors. To operationalize and measure Lewin, the study aligns: (a) unfreezing with goal setting, (b) movement with skill development, and (c) refreezing with feedback and management control. The general conclusion suggests that intensity placed around implementation success yields higher success levels relative to each of the three phases of Lewin's model. Further, the progression of the factors contributes a sequence of escalating progress to support the Lewin model as a measurable process.

The study contributes contemporary validation for the general and broad reference to Lewin's change model as a leading and still viable theory. There is a demonstration of measurement validity that is of particular interest in addressing the challenges of the refreezing concept. In application terms, the researchers conclude that effective organizations apply change process activities at higher levels of intensity than those organizations that are less effective.

Fugate, M., Kinicki, A.J., & Prussia, G. E. (2008). Employee coping with organizational change: An examination of alternative theoretical perspectives and models. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 1-36.

The research project examines several models and theories around the topic of how employees cope with organizational change against a year-long study involving employees going through an organizational change. The key assumptions underlying the study tie into variations on coping theory: (a) stimulus response model, (b) partial mediation process model, and (c) moderated model. Generally, the authors define coping as a transactional process between an individual and the environment. Individual cognitive appraisal initiates the process, which is the perception or evaluation of a situation or stress making input. Surveys and data from 163 employees within a public services organization going through a 12 month restructuring initiative populated the study. The change also included a new top administrator. Data collection occurred at the one month and 12 month marks to specifically retrieve information around employee appraisal processes, emotions, and coping.

The research addresses a critical question regarding the effects of change on employees. How do they perceive it, how do they react and what drives the reaction? The analysis suggests and addresses a lack of agreement around the structure of how people cope and how emotions factor into the role of coping. Using a cognitive appraisal theory of coping as a baseline model, this study provides a picture of the interrelatedness of a structure and individual coping process that evolves as: (a) a situation, (b) an appraisal or evaluation, (c) an emotional response, and (d) a coping choice or behavior. Less clear is a discussion of the relationships between escape and control coping, associated respectively with the intention to quit and a more proactive individual effort to engage in addressing stressors related to change. Using the models analysis for guidance, the findings of the organizational research conclude that emotions, which drive a behavioral

response, are the consequence of the appraisal coping relationship, a concept anchored in behavioral psychology.

A critical contribution from this research evolves from the development and discussion of how employees experience organizational change. Additionally, the authors evolve ideas through their study and evaluation of existing models to provide insight into change phenomena such as how people often experience positive emotional reactions from negatively appraised events. A critical review of how individuals experience organizational change and ultimately respond behaviorally is essential to understanding their process role in actually executing organizational change.

Herold, D.M., Fedor, D.B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 346-357.

The authors of this research examine the relationship between transformational and change leadership and follower commitment to a specific change initiative. The study further examines commitment as a function of the personal impact of the changes. Additionally, the research explores and examines the effects and relationships of transformational leadership and change specific leadership behaviors from the same leaders to determine the effect on employees given a specific change. Data was obtained from 343 employees across 30 organizations. Managers identified specific, individual changes they were responsible for implementing and their respective unit employees completed surveys relative to the change via a web based instrument. Respondent commitment to the specific change was the dependent variable, using the personal change survey as the measure of transformational change and the organizational change survey to measure

change leadership. The key conclusion of the study is that transformational leaders tend to get more buy in or affective commitment to a specific organizational change from followers, regardless of their specific behaviors in planning or implementing the change.

The research indicates that it is not enough to simply focus on leader behaviors in relation to a change as a mechanism to understand or guide follower commitment and support. The authors suggest that the effectiveness of change leadership is driven by: (a) the leader's level of transformational leadership, and (b) the level of impact that a change has on the individual's own job. Considering leadership in the context of individual coping, the findings indicate that transformational leadership can positively impact change commitment, which is a positive coping strategy.

A key statement by the authors suggests that leadership research, for the purposes of expanding leadership theory, needs to more closely align and integrate with change management study and theory. The study also articulates differences between change leadership behaviors, such as improved communication, increased involvement, and reinforcing new behaviors, versus broader transformational efforts to build trust and personal relationships with individuals. In the context of affecting the performance of individuals or groups, and sustaining or freezing the change at a new equilibrium, the study helps to delineate and distinguish change management from change leadership.

Buchanan, D., Fitzgerald, L., Ketley, D., Gollop, R., Jones, J.L., Lamont, S.S., et al. (2005). No going back: A review of the literature on sustaining organizational change. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(3), 189-205.

Buchanan et al. address the critical issue of the sustainability of change through a review of contemporary literature. Developing a provisional model through analysis and expansion of existing theory and research was the goal of the study. Of critical interest is their acknowledgement of and focus on Kurt Lewin's recognition of sustainability as one of three key components in his change theory model. The research team employed five search terms across five databases to focus the review. Using variations around sustainability as an anchor term, the search effort first uncovered that there is limited research available around the topic of sustainability relative to organizational change.

Kurt Lewin's third stage in a three stage model of change is refreezing. The concept embodies sustainability in the sense that it reflects the need to make change permanent, more narrowly discussed as anchoring the organization in a new equilibrium state. Contemporary definitions cited frame sustainability as a condition when new ways of working and improved outcomes become the norm. The lack of research in this area may be attributable, among other reasons, to the contrary nature of suggesting that a change becomes permanent when there exist episodic and continuous change models that promote change as an ongoing evolution. Other challenges to sustainability arise such as whether or not sustainability is even a valid research question.

As a process, the authors discuss the views of several contemporary theorists and frame their variations on sustainability in relation to Lewin's theory. Further, they note that researchers such as Kotter, Senge, Jacobs, and Reisner, all advocate, in concert with Lewin, that sustainability

is an integral component as part of an overall change process. In terms of informing the topic and research, the authors create a three piece model that: (a) indentifies a range of potential sustainability and decay influences, (b) exposes the need to determine the interaction among those factors, (c) emphasizes contextual factors, and (d) potentially explains a range of positive and negative outcomes.

Achilles, A.A. & Bedeian, A.G. (1999) Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(30), 293-315.

This research study specifically examines theoretical and empirical organizational change literature over a nine year period from 1990 through 1999. It is included here specifically for the discussion of the Burke Litwin change model, the focus of the Depth essay. The authors focus on four themes related to contemporary change efforts: (a) content issues which focus on the substance of the organizational change, (b) contextual issues or conditions of the internal and external environment, (c) process issues dealing with the actions occurring during the change execution, and (d) criterion issues which deal with the outcomes of the change effort. These themes in turn provided the study focus for analyzing the literature available around the themes. The process theme addresses the work of Lewin in theorizing around the sequential theory of change execution as well as sustainability.

The authors critically review and provide additional perspective on the Burke Litwin change model as a content issue in organizational change. Achilles and Bedeian present the argument that the BL model is novel in its clear distinctions between transformational and transactional factors and their long and short term implications in change efforts.

Transformational factors such as leadership, mission, and culture relate directly to new employee behaviors. Conversely, transactional factors include psychological and organizational variables that predict that control motivation and performance in a work group. The study also cites Lewin as critical to the genesis of process research and the importance of sequence in successful change management and long term viability.

The discussion of the Burke Litwin model in the context of content factors such as: (a) strategic orientation, (b) organization structure, and (c) organization environment fit, provides a study provide a discussion for understanding the model's contribution to factors that define an organizations character, mission, and direction. The authors also suggest that the model is an appropriate diagnostic tool as well as for planning and evaluating a planned organizational change.

Erwin, D. (2009). Changing organizational performance: examining the change process. *Hospital Topics: Research and Perspectives on Healthcare*, 87(3), 28-39.

The author conducted a case study research process to address an underlying issue of poor financial performance requiring significant management leadership and change intervention. The study involved an action research methodology supported by interviews and change implementation design with 35 managers and executive management staff at a 200 bed hospital. For background data, the author examined the findings from similar, current research studies, including a survey of 390 hospitals, another survey of 1,536 executives involved in performance transformation efforts in several related industries, and a performance study of 2,500 community hospitals. In developing the research questions necessary to understand the performance change

issue, Erwin grounded his effort in four change theory processes: (a) realization of the need for change, (b) planning the change, (c) implementing the change, and (d) sustaining the change.

Erwin's action research approach provides direct application of classical and contemporary change management theory. Applying the theory in practice and measuring the results, the author created a financial performance improvement in contrast to the research results cited as benchmark data. Of particular interest are findings related to the lack of personal responsibility accepted by managers for the current financial condition and changing the condition as an organizational improvement. It is unclear, however, whether or not the culture of hospitals had ever prepared managers for a more proactive role and responsibility for financial performance at their level of operation. Regardless, the ongoing action study process, conducted over 2.5 years, provides valuable feedback on change concepts such as constant communications, clarity of vision, commitment, and the need for an executable sustainability plan.

This study specifically focuses on the application of Lewin, Schein, and Kotter's change theories. The hospital study data is compared and contrasted throughout with their theories in side by side application of practice, research, and theory. Erwin, as an active consultant and researcher on the project, used financial analysis throughout the research. This provides quantitative analysis for the actual performance outcomes of the change implementation strategies taken from theory. While the limitations of a single unit research caution broader application of the conclusions, the data reinforces several critical aspects of change management theory.

Latta, G.F. (2009). A process model of organizational change in cultural context (OC³ model): The impact of organizational culture on leading change. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16(10), 19-37.

Author Latta introduces a process model of organizational change called the OC³ Model. The model measures change as a relative outcome against the impact and influence of organizational culture and the leader's ability to read the culture and adjust the change to cultural influence. A qualitative study was conducted across all levels of personnel in a top 25 university. An open ended questionnaire given to one hundred respondents provided data around perspectives on change incidents, the organization's culture, emotional reactions and personal perspectives on the actual changes. The study forwarded conclusions regarding the validation and application of the OC³ Model as well as demonstrating the role organizational culture as a moderator of leader effectiveness in organizational change environments.

Modeling the affective role organizational culture has on the leader's effort to execute change is at the core of this study. As such, the research emphasizes the premise that leaders who either are oblivious to or choose to ignore the significance and presence of cultural dynamics are likely to encounter difficulties, primarily in the form of resistance, when implementing change. By integrating the OC³ Model in the actual research, the author furthers the discussion around behavioral, social, and environmental issues as relative change process theory concepts. Readiness, vision, learning strategies, implementation strategies, and the intent to modify and mediate organizational culture support the author's process model. Additionally, the effort specifically identifies the relationship of contemporary cultural modeling to the process theories advanced by Lewin, Kotter, and Burke.

The study provides valuable discussion and analysis around the role of culture in influencing a variety of change variables, including and not limited to the readiness of individuals to the leader's overall effectiveness in moving the culture in a direction to execute and sustain change. The discussion broadens the knowledge base relative to culture as it pertains to a given state of equilibrium. Latta also gives specific credence to the Burke Litwin model and suggests that culture is a systemic variable and factor influencing change introduction and execution. As a future research question, the study leaves the door open to further exploration of culture as a constant or moving variable in different change stages.

Marques, J. (2008). Making the best of the inevitable: Change. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, 2(2), 33-42.

This study researches the prioritization and focus of management on the process of change from the perspective of workforce members. The research question is intended to obtain follower opinion on what specific three things that management needs to be focused on in times of change. A cross section of 40 respondents from diverse industries in the Los Angeles area participated in the study. All respondents were required to elaborate in detail on the one question identifying the three things they believed management should focus on in times of change. As qualitative data, the responses create a pattern the researcher segregated as internal, mutual, and external focus points. The summary result identifies: (a) understanding of the change as the critical internal focus, (b) communicating and motivating as the critical mutual focal point, and (c) training for employees as the critical external focal point.

The author pursues a critical analysis path around the data and specific respondent categories which in turn drives a literature review around each topic area. As mentioned previously, the top categories for critical analysis supported by literature review includes: (a) communication, (b) motivation, (c) understanding, (d) employee training, and (e) involvement, among a list of a total of 19 total order ranked categories initiated by respondents. This methodology informs and rationalizes the categories provided by respondents. As a result of the researcher's process, the primary conclusions are that: (a) management should first consider and execute internal measures, (b) focus next on mutual issues, and (c) focus on operational strategies that facilitate the change process.

A critical contribution of this study is the researcher's approach to executing a literature review and critical analysis of subject matter driven and prioritized by the respondent feedback around a specific research question. This specific study also provides a graphic representation of the interrelatedness of the critical factors identified by respondents as areas of management focus in a change environment. While the literature review of each topic was admittedly somewhat brief, the concept overall suggests an effective methodology for seeking greater understanding of respondent feedback and the direct relationship with existing literature, theory, and research given the appropriate topical setting.

Gilley, A., McMillan, H.S., & Gilley, J.W. (2009). Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16(1), 38-47.

The authors of this effort expand and develop previous research on organizational change by developing the relationship between leader behavior and change. Focusing on leader

effectiveness, the variables of effectiveness in the context of implementing change were examined. 470 respondents completed a 36 question survey over a three year period. The dependent variable in the survey was cultivated as perceptual response around manager effective implementation. The independent variables were derived from research on leadership skills and behaviors associated with change, such as the leader's coaching, rewarding, and motivating behavior.

The research yielded three key findings: (a) leadership is often perceived to be a considerable barrier to or source of change resistance, (b) certain leadership skills and abilities are associated with successful change implementation- coach, communicate, involve others, motivate, reward, and build teams, and (c) positive relations between key leader behaviors and success rates of change—motivate, communicate, and build teams. The research affords caution for generalization, however, as the respondents were primarily MBA and OD Masters and PhD candidates at three different universities, suggesting a heightened sensitivity to the topics and issues studied here.

The study speaks strongly to the issue of critical leader behaviors and corresponding follower responses in a change situation. The potential follow up research to the findings and conclusions here is evident; simply continue to test the viability of the key change success factors for leader behavior. The authors pointed out on several occasions that the literature and research data supports the extremely high failure rates for change initiatives. Clearly, the academic community continues to search for valid data to support strategies that will begin to reverse the trend of two thirds to 90% change failure rates. The leader skills and abilities discussed here that

can potentially improve the likelihood of change success are invaluable to the knowledge required for this project.

Literature Review Essay

The Depth review analyzes the Burke Litwin model of organizational change in the context of contemporary literature. As a contemporary process model, the Burke Litwin theory integrates the concept of assimilating organizational culture into models of organizational change (Latta, 2009). The literature suggests an evolutionary relationship of the Burke Litwin model and other key theoretical advances to the Lewin model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing as a seminal process change model.

Lewin sought to draw bright lines in terms of requisite process and sequences to achieve organizational change. The three stage model of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing also suggests that critical variables, such as culture, group learning and decision making, and individual and group resistance, contribute to define the degrees of effort required to achieve and sustain a successful change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Contemporary critics of the Lewin model suggest that rigidity in strict process change modeling ignores other variability, such as: (a) assuming organizations operate in a stable state, (b) large versus small scale organizations and change environments, (c) the reality of organizational power and politics, and (d) top down and management driven influences in change situations (Burnes, 2004). The unifying thread of Lewin's model was its goal to change and sustain behavioral change (Burnes, 2004). Burke and Litwin (1992) support the basic Lewin premise, arguing that any number of variables in a

transformative (cultural) or transactional (climate) context can be explained in a causal order such that they can rationalize the total behavioral output of an organization.

Focusing on higher order, or more transformational variables, Lewin (1948,1951) established a baseline theoretical premise for group equilibrium and environmental condition or force fields as organizational change systems that moved as the process of change moved. While not specifically identified as a causal model, the rationale is implied in Lewin's overall theoretical discussion around areas such as group decision making and the linkage created between motivation and action (Lewin, 1948, 1951). In comparison, Burke and Litwin (1992) assert that achieving sustainable organizational change is a response to external, environmental variables. Organizational behaviors at all levels, responding to transformational inputs such as culture or leadership, result in organizational change as a response to environment (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Burke Litwin Model

The Burke Litwin model develops the process theory of change, adding greater depth by exploring and interjecting the concept of causation. The causation theory creates critical links to understand or define more clearly how actions create change outcomes (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Applying process method and causal assumptions creates an integration of patterns such that implementation and change process define a change method (Burke & Litwin, 1992). The relationships are such that implementation represents specific actions and activities and change process reflects the actual changes that must occur as a result of the implementation (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In formulating these relationships, Burke and Litwin (1992) sought to both create

a diagnostic tool to determine what change needed to occur and a process model for then executing planned and managed organizational change.

Establishing causal relations demonstrates two key assumptions about what the Burke Litwin (1992) model actually sets out to accomplish: (a) to demonstrate the direct influence of organizational variables on other variables, and (b) to differentiate transactional and transformational factors in organizational change. The issue of internal and external variables represents change taking place within the system and change seeking to actually modify the system itself (Alas, 2007). Transformational and transactional factors or variables are distinct in characteristics as either strategy, culture, leadership, or mission issues or those psychological or organizational variables that deal with control, motivation, and performance, or more functional and operational considerations (Alas, 2007).

Process modeling. Process models specifically account for a series or sequence of events that are necessary in the execution of organizational change as an independent event (Latta, 2009). The sequences can be made up of individual and collective events, actions, and activities that evolve over a period of time in such a way that they can then describe or actually account for how an organization changes or develops (Ford & Greer, 2006). Categories of process models exist around philosophical perspectives, definitions, major assumptions, and the ways in which they are characterized to make sense (Latta, 2009). In positioning Lewin's three stage process of change in the categorical context, Schein (1996) noted that the power of Lewin's work revolves around a modeling process that recognizes critical variables that have context in creating planned

change. With variables providing a key linkage, five distinct process models exist to help differentiate ways of framing change variables: (a) evolutionary (inevitable), (b) teleological (planned), (c) life cycle (maturational), (d) political (strategic), and (e) social cognitive (conceptual) (Latta, 2009).

Burke and Litwin's (1992) theory develops a concept that change process represents a certain state of chaos. As a process order, the theory revolves around several categories of variables. In turn, these variables establish a change process that is in constant motion (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Each of the variables represents individual processes that form patterns based on their distinct content and condition, such as: (a) some combination of variables changing at the same time, (b) the relative scope of environmental change, and (c) the resistance of human systems (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Chaos created by variables in motion ultimately coalesces into a semblance of theoretical order in the form of consistent patterns and critical linkages. These relational assumptions form the foundation of a causal theory of change process, a cornerstone of the model (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Schein (1996) distinguished change as a process by identifying the need to separate the actual diagnosis of the problem or need for change from an actual intervention, or the actual act of changing an organization. There is a parallel in this thinking to the role of variables in motion and the concept of the change model as first functioning as a diagnostic tool (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Other arguments suggest that there may be little distinction as the change process unfolds between a diagnosis and a change intervention (Schein, 1996). Via this rationale, the process of a diagnosis is in fact an intervention that creates an ongoing, initial change step in and of itself (Schein, 1996). This argument evolves process concepts such as unfreezing further to a more engaged model that Lewin identified as action research (Schein, 1996). In this framework, an approach functioning as a constant intervention creates: (a) the diagnostic effect, (b) manipulates moving and fluids variables, and (c) promotes change as a dynamic, moving process (Schein, 1996; Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Sequence and process. As a process model, Lewin's three stage theory also contributes the concept of sequential progression as a core element of successful change (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Effective movement along a series or sequence of necessary change events or phases defines the process implementation and outcomes (Latta, 2009). Burke and Litwin (1992) integrated a causal relationship of organizational conditions along the sequence of events to explain or predict the resultant effects (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Through deliberate efforts and acts to focus the outcomes of variables in motion, change can be planned, managed, and manipulated (Burke & Litwin, 1992). As a flow, the management of change and change variables as a sequence of events then contributes: (a) an ongoing analysis tool, (b) a constant learning model, and (c) a system of continuous and ongoing intervention (Schein, 1996).

Core processes, defined as strategically important processes, are planned events that create ordered, sequential steps which significantly impact the way an organization functions

(Atlas, 2007). This has a direct correlation to what Burke and Litwin (1992) identified as the hierarchy of cause and effect change. Generally some trigger event occurs, whether intentional or not, that initiates the sequences associated with change (Atlas, 2007). Trigger processes are relevant given the referent social and psychological context that Lewin (1948, 1951) created his change theory around. Arguably, the extreme social dimensions of the era provided Lewin (1948, 1951), as the social psychologist, with a viable platform to establish a causal framework as well as develop theories around change triggers and change sequence and process (Lewin 1948, 1951).

Simplification of the processing concept along a continuum of cause and effect relationships between variables may be viewed as: (a) recognizing a current state, (b) initiating an intervention, and (c) reaching and sustaining a future state (Marshak, 1993; Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992). The importance of sequence discipline is supported in the literature through research demonstrating that successful culture change occurs when each stage of the change process is completed before moving on to the next stage (Phelan, 2005). This process sequence is represented by the series of Lewin's (1948, 1951) change events of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing.

Transformations and transactions. In the Burke Litwin model, transformational variables drive organization wide change and must come before those interactions or transactions that are more operational and that occur incrementally through the change process (Burke & Litwin, 1992). The distinctions between transformations and transactions separate the intent of change from the actualization of change. In an organizational context, a mission reflecting the

organization's values and beliefs, or creating a sense of meaning and direction, also establishes the higher order transformational components that in turn establish the culture (Burke & Litwin, 1992). The transformational environment exists first at the higher organizational levels as a mindset and belief that in turn evolves to leader behavior (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

The significance of the relationship of leader beliefs and behaviors relative to the organization's culture represents the total relationship of transforming variables leading the change process (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Transformational leadership is at the core of those issues that surround the process of transformation and change (Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). In practical terms, varying levels of organizational strategy ground the behavioral and belief systems context for leaders relative to culture and change (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In this framework, clarification emerges for the distinction between big picture or organization wide transformations requiring a broad cultural change and the individual transactions that occur to execute broad or narrow operational changes.

Opposite culture, leadership, values, and beliefs are those variables that involve structure, management practice, and systems. As transactions, those events are generally acknowledged as operational in nature and occur incrementally in the change process (Burke & Litwin, 1992, p. 537).

Transactions and change managers. The defining difference in the transactional environment is the difference of leaders and managers. At the level that the change is actually implemented and operationalized, managers enter the change scenario, responsible for the actual

outcome at the individual level, transitioning behaviors from adaptation to execution and influencing climate (Burke & Litwin, 1992). As the independent variable, the climate of the organization exists in the implementation stages of change, influenced primarily by structure, management practices, and reward systems (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

The behaviors of management relative to implementation are a significant influence on how effective change occurs. There also appears to be a lead and lag effect as managers begin to recognize the challenges placed on them to implement through the transformational or cultural changing dynamic. Research indicates that at later stages of change implementation, managers may begin to resist as they realize that they have to accept responsibility and be accountable for the execution of change in their area (Erwin, 2009). Research also suggests that the managers take away very specific learning about those most critical issues surrounding implementation and management of change including: (a) communication, (b) motivation of stakeholders, (c) understanding of the change itself, and (d) proper training for subordinates (Marques, 2008).

As managers learn to accept their functional roles and responsibilities in creating the exchanges and transactions, relationships emerge that clarify how they can focus on transactions that directly impact the climate and thus the change outcomes (Marques, 2008). Divided into three focus areas, the transactions for managers are: (a) internal measures such as understanding of the change, honest and open feedback, and optimized involvement, (b) mutual issues that include motivation, trust, path agreement, and good implementation planning, and (c) operational strategies to facilitate the change process such as training, a sustained creative environment, and

flexibility to adapt to sudden shifts in the process (Marques, 2008). Burke and Litwin (1992) note that creating a total environment of participation as a climate structure, positively affects the change process, creating a positive outcome and measurable productivity.

Culture and climate. As a social psychologist, Lewin (1948, 1951) placed great stock in the psychological state as an environmental factor affecting group and individual change. Further, Lewin (1948, 1951) posited that to change any social state of equilibrium, that group, sub group, and individual value systems, beliefs, and practices require attention when considering the total state to be changed. Burke and Litwin's (1992) change model applies this concept in the separation of transformational and transactional variables. In this context, transformational variables or dynamics are the higher order issues around values and belief systems. Transactional variables relate more closely to the exchanges between individuals or individuals and groups, and the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Transformational variables exist through the culture of the organization and are the leading dynamic factors to affect and sustain cultural change (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Culture, therefore, represents the values and norms that give structure to what organizational members hold as "meaning," or the way we perceive "how things are" (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Lewin (1948, 1951) held this out as the psychological state that defined belief systems and values as the cultural equilibrium and operationalized their transactional value in terms of "social habit."

In another context, the climate of the organization is also a psychological state that exists as a more practical response behaviorally to variables such as organizational systems, manager

behaviors, and the mechanics of job or other operational function (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Climate is a perceptual state placing value on interactions or transactions as events (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Where culture may reflect more of a “feel” and behavior generally assigned to the broader environment, climate reflects more immediate psychological and behavioral responses to the impact of interactions or transactions (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Climate also influences the power of values and norms as held by the group where the group majority drives how transactions take place and how they are perceived, given value, and ultimately affect organizational behaviors (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Transformational variables align with leadership concepts and principles in relation to culture as opposed to transactional variables which relate more directly with management practice (Burke & Litwin, 1992). The significance of this point evolves from research that indicates the importance of choosing leaders to establish the transformational issues behind the change premise versus choosing managers who may have process skills but not necessarily the ability to lead (Phelan, 2005).

The role of causation. The transformational or cultural variables are the critical variables that affect change in the organization. As a causal concept, transformational change variables manifest themselves as value shifts that ultimately change behavior. These shifts are required to change the culture of the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Thus in the Burke Litwin model, culture is dominant in driving climate as a causation variable.

The causal relationship of transformational and transactional variables as process model variables evolves through the hierarchy of cause and effect change. As an influence path, Burke and Litwin (1992) advocate the position that generally, culture supersedes climate as a core premise of their causal model. This emerges through arguing that transformation variables such as leadership, culture, organizational mission, and strategy necessarily precede transactional considerations such as management or implementation ability (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

In practice, the causal model supports this position by giving greater weight in total organizational change influence to the transformational variables of mission, strategy, leadership, and culture over structure, management practices, and systems, which may or may not affect a total organizational system change (Burke & Litwin, 1992, p. 528). The causal theory of dominance around transformations versus transactions further supports the argument for aligning leaders as agents of change over managers of change responsible for implementation and sustaining behaviors (Erwin, 2009).

Additional evidence drawn on to validate the Burke Litwin model links causal relationships as a causal predictor where leadership, culture, and management practices predict variances in employee perceptions of work unit climate and organizational performance (Burke & Litwin, 1992, p. 540). In this instance, the interdependence of transformational and transactional variables suggests critical linkages between climate and culture and leadership and management. As a causal model the theory holds, however, that transformational variables are the lead predictors (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Causation, culture, and the individual. Following the supposition that environmental factors, internal and external, initiate the change process from the higher order variables or transformations, the question becomes the entry point for the individual in the Burke Litwin model. Lewin (1948, 1951) theorized that successful change for the individual is subject to the decision making of the group. To get the group in position, the unfreezing process requires changes in the norms, beliefs, and customs of the group; in effect an initiating cultural or transformational change (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992). Cultural change forces transaction variables and systems into upheaval, especially in the context of how they anchor to beliefs and the underlying organizational culture (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Culture, as a value system, creates individual attitudes and behaviors that collectively define the organizations climate; the transactional environment (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Culture is a cognitive mechanism that has a direct bearing on individual change behavior in the causal framework (Latta, 2009). As an ongoing cycle of interpretation, individuals continually reinterpret change events that enter the realm of “meaning” within their transactional sphere and that of the organization at large (Latta, 2009). In the causal hierarchy, the individual executes four interpretive acts in response to those cultural and transactional inputs that appear to change the world as it is: (a) symbolization, (b) implementation, (c) manifestation, and (d) realization (Latta, 2009). After the transformational inputs driven by cultural cognitions, the individual acceptance of change follows a process path identified as: (a) awareness, (b) interest, (c) trial, (d) decision to quit or continue, and (e) adoption (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). In this context, culture is one of the more critical situational moderators in determining leadership effectiveness in

terms of individual and group execution of change (Latta, 2009). As a belief system held collectively by individuals and members, culture thus functions as a moderating variable where the act of implementing change is concerned (Latta, 2009).

Burke and Litwin (1992) note that changes in the climate structure, the environment where individuals and managers process change, may cause a distinct upheaval that has a direct bearing on the acceptance path described above. Lewin (1948, 1951) noted the significance of potential destabilization as a necessary element of successful unfreezing and moving of group and individual equilibrium states. Schein (1996) individualized the unfreezing and destabilization process, advancing a theory that for change to be successful, the individual had to ultimately experience some level of manufactured psychological safety.

To achieve this state, change implementation must include a balance of threat produced by disconfirming data; information initiating a challenge to individual hopes and expectations that creates dissatisfaction and frustration (Schein, 1996). Whether climate or culture in nature, the disconfirming effort must succeed to have the effect of: (a) accepting the disconfirming information, (b) feeling a level of survival anxiety, and (c) motivating the individual to change (Schein, 1996).

Collectively, individual needs, values, and motivations in a change environment respond to transformations and transactions (Burke & Litwin, 1992). At the implementation level, climate reflects transactions that integrate both types of variables, impacting: (a) mission clarity, (b) structure driven by management behaviors, (c) manager practice reinforced by culture, (d)

systems impact supported by management practice, and (e) the effect of culture reinforced by other variables (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Environment. In the Burke Litwin causal model, environment is the single most significant factor influencing change, representing the total of external inputs that determine the magnitude of a change (Burke & Litwin, 1992). On this assumption conclusions may be drawn that significant change represents a response to some external environmental factor or factors that could range from competitors actions to technology shifts, unforeseen government legislation, industry regulation, and even war (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

In the context of social fields, environmental factors help to define a quasi equilibrium state at a point in time, supporting the situational implications of the causal model (Lewin, 1948,1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992). The significance of environment on both transformational and transactional variables also suggests a contingent kind of relationship. In the model, organizational effectiveness reflects the compatibility between the external environment and the internal structure or capacity relative to change (Burke & Litwin, 1992). One example of a critical compatibility of variables is the vulnerability of an organization's strategic orientation to an external environmental change (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Contemporary examples of strategic orientation vulnerability would include the move from vinyl records to digital formats and from site based retail record stores to home based, completely mobile, and user-centric digital downloading.

External environmental variables in this context support the Burke Litwin theory around the organization's ability to react, adapt, and reorient in response to external forces by way of its

organizational change capacity (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Further, the model anticipates the environmental impact through the diagnostic process and suggests that changing business strategy and thus organizational change is a direct and deliberate process resulting from environmental impacts (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Similarly, the developmental change theory model suggests that change emerges from an organizational philosophy or transformational consideration that continuous growth and development creates “dynamic stability” (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). As an anticipatory and proactive model, long term competitive advantage is a change-driven objective viewed and fostered as the product of a continuous culture of manageable and sustainable change activity (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). This reflects perhaps a more deliberate refinement of the view of the change environment as a state of chaos (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Anchoring change. Using open systems theory, the Burke Litwin model approaches the issue of change outcomes in the form of outputs, feedback, and the attainment of change goals and objectives as the overarching measure of success (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Individual and organizational performance creates the outputs and eventual feedback mechanism to determine the state of the overall change as an indicator of effectiveness and achievement (Burke & Litwin, 1992, p. 533). The model does not, however, specifically address the question of anchoring change or of change sustainability. Lewin (1948, 1951) argued two critical points around the need to anchor change in its new level. Refreezing is a deliberate change initiative that is critical to stabilizing and establishing permanency of the organization at a new level of equilibrium (Lewin,

1948, 1951). Groups, and especially individuals, will revert back to old cultural norms and behaviors without a concerted effort to establish and hold the new level (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Schein (1996) argues that refreezing at a new level is critical. Positive reinforcement of the new learning that has been involved in a change process can sustain the individual's role in the change. If this does not occur, groups and individual will quickly and deliberately unlearn the new behaviors and revert to the old norms that support old behaviors (Schein, 1996). As a confirmatory process, refreezing does align with the Burke Litwin assertion that feedback on the success of performance, effectiveness, other organizational measures, and providing rewards all contribute to generating acceptance and credibility that drive change to desired goals (Ford & Greer, 2006; Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992).

The systems approach via the Burke Litwin model suggests that a continuous feedback mechanism provides at least the adequate opportunity to determine the effectiveness of a change over a reasonable period of time (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In that regard, change sustainability implies that new methods or activities and new performance levels persist for a period of time that fits the stated objectives (Buchanan, et al., 2005). Deliberately anchoring, refreezing, or sustaining change appears to be critical to successful change. Thus sustainable change reflects a state where: (a) new ways of working, improved outcomes, and new thinking and attitudes become the norm, (b) systems are fundamentally transformed or altered, (c) there is no reversion to old beliefs, attitudes, or processes, (d) it has been able to withstand challenge and variation, and (e) change

has evolved alongside other contextual changes and has even perhaps measurable and continuously improved (Buchanan, et al., 2005).

Change Leadership

A key tenet of the Burke Litwin model is the bright line distinction between the roles of leaders and managers in the change process (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In their hierarchical model, the logic process flows from culture over climate to transformation over transaction and ultimately, leadership over management practice (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In the practical context of organizational change, the leader's role is to foster an environment that drives key transformative variables such as culture, strategy, and mission, with greater overall weight and significance than the incremental managerial functions that advance implementation through structure, management practices, and systems (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

The model further develops the principle that the leadership function is critical to modeling desired behaviors in addition to providing direction and shaping expectations (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Different types of leadership, whether transformational, transactional, or change specific, have the greatest impact on individual change behaviors and actual execution when the effect of a specific change is high (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). As a modeling consideration, other studies indicate that leaders who successfully implement change have at their disposal, a broad range of interpersonal skills, including the ability to: (a) motivate, (b) communicate, (c) build teams, (d) coach, (e) involve others, and (f) reward strategically (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). Therefore, when directly and significantly impacted by change, individuals will

look to the organizations leadership for guidance and help in navigating the change and its direct effects (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008).

Leadership in the change environment as a transformational force can drive desirable worker behaviors by supporting concepts such as: (a) psychological empowerment, (b) organizational citizenship, (c) contextual performance, (d) role breadth self efficacy, (e) constructive deviance (such as aggressive creativity), and (f) personal initiative (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007). These elements of change oriented citizenship behavior contribute to the knowledge of how leadership fosters self directed behaviors that can create employee support for management practices and organizational change (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007).

To get to any transformational result, which includes acceptance of the vision and mission behind the change, leaders must first understand the individual, group, management, and organizational processes that are required to drive the successful execution of a change (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). One goal is to strive to make behavior somewhat predictable by grounding cultural norms in such a way that individuals are better able to deal with the unpredictable (Phelan, 2005). Seeking to establish cultural stability and consistency through the change process is a critical leadership issue in the process model. In this framework, the role of culture evolves to represent a shared belief system of predictable behavior that ultimately reduces anxiety and uncertainty (Phelan, 2005).

Transformational and transactional leadership. The Burke Litwin model focuses almost exclusively on transformational behaviors in the leadership context (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Further, the model draws clear distinctions between transformations and transactions in relation to culture and climate and differentiating leadership versus management (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

Transformational, charismatic, or inspirational leadership in change is a leadership style and behaviors that appeal to followers' sense of values, empowering them to see and participate in a higher vision (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). In the context of leading and executing a successful change event, the research indicates that followers identify the leader's charisma and ability to inspire along the lines of vision and values with their openness to organizational change (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). The ability to radically realign the norms and values of the organization are a critical characteristic of transformational leaders, especially where their specific behaviors can model new guidelines for how the organization's culture should function to develop and define the change environment (Appelbaum, Berke, Taylor, & Alvarez, 2008; Burke & Litwin, 1992).

There is less clarity and even a blurring of lines, however, in distinguishing change leadership, transactional leadership, and change management interventions. Burke and Litwin (1992) establish a clear, hierarchical process that evolves the higher order transformation variables ahead of changing actual systems and functions. Clearly, this line of thinking first ascribes the need to firmly establish a long term vision. This is supported in the discussion as a process requiring transformational leadership behaviors (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Yet there are arguments that tactical or transactional leadership, not entirely separate from managerial actions, is a critical leadership aspect of change (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008).

Lewin (1948, 1951) argued that the unfreezing process forces transactional variables into upheaval, especially those process behaviors grounded in the organization's culture. As a matter of execution, change or transactional leadership involves the immediate activity and task at hand of implementing the change, focusing the leader on the tactical implementation, even if it is to create chaotic or environmental upheaval (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008; Burke & Litwin, 1992). Bass (1990) theorizes that transactional leadership is a more relational and active process where the leader seeks to get a behavior, specific performance, or other output from followers by having the capacity to create an exchange with followers. In a variable context, behaviors and situations in particular, interact along a continuum that seeks to optimize the results desired by both the leader and followers (Bass, 1990).

Burns (1978) developed a view of transactional exchange to define a state of equilibrium between the leader and followers. In the model, transactional equilibrium is established when a state of constant exchange finds the place where both leader and followers are mutually satisfied with the transaction (Burns, 1978). As a change process, the concept implies that the leader's role is to motivate followers through a constant state of exchange conflict or disequilibrium, searching for a point of mutual acceptance. As a pure leadership concept, transactional equilibrium is not sustainable however, as the parties, leader and followers, move on once optimization of the exchange takes place (Burns, 1978).

Relative to change dynamics in the Burke Litwin model and Lewin's three stage model, Burns' (1978) conclusion of the need to move on once transactional equilibrium is reached,

positively reinforces the assertion that change requires progressive disequilibrium in order to move followers on to another state or level. While managers may simply oversee the execution of change activities, transactional leadership may in fact be a necessary higher order change implementation component, ensuring that complex transactions are operationalized and established permanently in the organization's systems and operations culture.

Behavioral modeling and shaping. Drawing from theories of terror management and uncertainty reduction, the leadership focus on grounding cultural beliefs suggests that the fundamental function of culture is then to maintain the psychological integrity of the members of the group (Phelan, 2005). In a causal context, the theory further suggests that the leadership goal thus focuses on a process that evolves the group's shared beliefs and ultimately, a consensus about what is true and good as achieved by common, predictable behaviors (Phelan, 2005). The normative cultural focus aligns with Burke and Litwin's (1992) climate theory related to leadership's modeling function in change. Their leader modeling concept suggests a relational process where common expectations around conduct, process, and the actual work drive behaviors (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

For leadership modeling to succeed, it is important that the functional distinction between transformational change efforts and transactional change events is clear. Alas' (2007) research used the Burke Litwin model to distinguish and differentiate organizational changes. Transformations involved leadership behaviors that drove changes in strategy, culture, or leadership style. Transactions required managerial interventions that change structure, task

requirements, individual skills, and systems or management practices (Alas, 2007). The research supports the Burke Litwin model theory by demonstrating the relatedness of different climate and cultural variables. As causal components, these variables interact as a result of leader and manager modeling behaviors.

Leadership failure factors. Considering change implementation failure, research indicates that poor communication, the inability to motivate others to change, and failure to understand how to use rewards for those who try to induce change are primary barriers to change leadership success (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009). Perception studies indicate that leadership may be a significant source of resistance to change while conversely, research also supports a positive relationship between certain leader behaviors and the rate and magnitude of success with change (A. Gilley, McMillan, & J. Gilley, 2009).

In the broadest terms of change and at the highest transformational levels, success may represent an integration of new goals, values, beliefs, systems, leadership styles, and practices within an entire organization (Appelbaum, Berke, Taylor, & Alvarez, 2008; Burke & Litwin, 1992). Often, organizational change success reflects some measurement of common economic outcomes. However, change failures related to leadership may most commonly occur where economics are the only focus and when ignoring human resources and failing to involve key stakeholders in change related decision making processes (Appelbaum, Berke, Taylor, & Alvarez, 2008). Appelbaum et al. (2008) suggest that change failure avoidance succeeds when leadership focuses on four key organizational categories: (a) economic and financial, (b) human resources,

(c) services and processes, and (d) management. While not mentioned, the transformational focus and the magnitude of change related to leadership failure reflects the emphasis placed on culture and other higher order variables noted by Burke and Litwin (1992) and Lewin (1948, 1951) in the context of change behaviors.

Change Readiness, Resistance, and Learning

Beyond the role of leaders and managers in facilitating a change process, the discussion must necessarily consider follower responses, reactions, and requirements for change. The Burke Litwin model places great emphasis on transformational or higher order variables such as culture as critical components of successful change process (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Lewin (1948, 1951) noted that changes in conduct were a result of changes in perceptions. Perceptual change ultimately creates an action ideology that results in behavioral change, a core objective of both the Lewin and Burke Litwin models (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992). The social theory advanced by Lewin evolved to a clear concept of reeducation as a component of individual and group learning necessary to transform culture and environment in a change scenario (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Learning frameworks. Moving groups and individuals in an equilibrium state to a new state requires a direct effort to unlock strong psychological barriers that exist in the form of restraining forces (Schein, 1996). This unfreezing process implies that some effort has occurred to gain group and individual awareness around those circumstances that exist to validate the need for change, requiring new learning to take place (Erwin, 2009; Schein, 1996). With transformational

or cultural change as the driving force, the preparation for new learning emerges as a cultural revitalization process, creating a crisis of established norms and behaviors and a survival anxiety that opens up the potential for change acceptance through new learning (Phelan 2005; Schein, 1996).

Organizational learning can be a critical strategic tool to actually cause changes in organizational behavior in relation to change efforts (Chen, 2007). Continuous learning activities and knowledge management relative to change implementation can provide an effective mechanism to overcome the resistance to organizational change (Chen, 2007). Henderson (2002) suggests that understanding and incorporating transformative or individual based learning is critical in change learning processes because of its focus on how individuals change their perspectives and ultimately evolve their attitudes through critical reflection. By engaging individuals in a process and environment closely aligned with adult learning, change leaders can better address those individual elements that drive resistance, negative attitudes, and lack of commitment (Henderson, 2002).

Resistance and learning. It is reasonable to inject that there is always some level of resistance that is present or emerging in any change environment (Hodge & Coronado, 2007). Varying degrees of resistance and change anxiety indicate that there may also be varying degrees of unpredictability in the potential outcomes of any effort to unfreeze or destabilize an equilibrium state (Hodge & Coronado, 2007). Senge (2006) postulates that resistance to change, however, is somewhat predictable in the sense that it arises from challenges and changes to existing norms and

the power relationships and structures that maintain the equilibrium of norms and beliefs in the organization.

Anticipating resistance in the earliest stages of the change process presents the learning proposition for leaders to be able to introduce and involve followers in critical processes that includes: (a) goal setting, (b) skill development, (c) feedback, and (d) management control (Ford & Greer, 2006). Logically, Ford and Greer (2006) align these four steps with Lewin's three stage model where: (a) goal setting is the critical unfreezing stage, (b) skill development occurs in the moving stage, and (c) feedback and management control anchor the refreezing stage (Ford & Greer, 2006). The anticipatory approach creates the opportunity for a team building event through a team learning process where the group members are in a position to initiate the change results that they collectively desire (Senge, 2006).

Psychological safety. Addressing resistance anticipation, planning, and team learning strategies, commitment to change remains as a critical individual consideration. Individual change evolves through processes initiated by a person in order to modify behaviors, cognitions, or relationships (Moore, 2005). With learning anxiety as a key restraining force, proactively dealing with change inputs requires the individual to seek out a new level of psychological safety (Schein, 1996). Reaching that state of personal safety creates a psychological environment of change readiness where the individual has begun to withdraw from overt resistance to change (Walinga, 2008). In this regard, the process of creating change readiness and evolving to change willingness and change commitment requires that: (a) there is an acute, individual awareness of the need for

change, and (b) there is support for the individual's perceived needs and ability to participate in the change (Walinga, 2008).

Appraisal. A prerequisite to change readiness and commitment is the process of cognitive appraisal to determine whether an individual believes that they have the resources to respond effectively to the change environment and opportunity (Walinga, 2008; Fugate, Kinicki, & Prussia, 2008). The appraisal process is also a series of transactional events where the individual is constantly evaluating situations in terms of challenges, threats, potential harm, or even opportunity where the individual appraisal effort seeks to address all uncertainty and ambiguity (Walinga, 2008; Fugate, Kinicki, & Prussia, 2008; Robinson & Griffiths, 2005).

When the appraisal process is sporadic, more episodic change occurs such that periods of inertia tend to punctuate equilibrium and stability (Buchanan, et al., 2005). Lacking specific and guided activity, individuals may lose focus, momentum, and capability. As the change process evolves, they may often experience a general failure to pay attention to critical signals related to the appraisal process (Buchanan, et al., 2005). Identified and supported in the research, initiative decay is an individual behavioral phenomenon (Buchanan, et al., 2005). Sporadic appraisal can evolve into negative appraisal, creating negative emotions, actions, and a significant increase in individual confusion reflected in counterproductive change behaviors (Fugate, Kinicki, & Prussia, 2008).

In transformational change environments, initial appraisals are generally negative and thus employee or follower readiness to change is much lower initially than in transactional change

situations (Walinga, 2008; Alas, 2007). It is logical as transformational or cultural changes involving changing behaviors in beliefs systems require greater time and effort than those transactional changes that involve systems, practices, and skill adjustments over shorter timeframes (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

The appraisal process can be complex with many facets specific to individuals. The research identifies possible conclusions that suggest an implied connection between the appraisal process, specific types of individuals, and the relationships to change such that: (a) younger people evaluate more readily, are better able to adapt to, and are more willing to participate in change processes, (b) individuals higher in the organizational pecking order and with more education are more likely to participate in change initiatives, (c) professional interests affect the assessment of the individual's role in the change, and (d) newer employees (five years or less) are more likely to show an outward willingness to participate fully in change initiatives (Alas, 2008).

Readiness and commitment model. Schein (1996) asserts that the key to effective change management lies in the ability to create psychological safety sufficient to allow the individual to accept new information, learn, and go forward motivated to successfully participate in change. Readiness and commitment build the individual's capacity to increase psychological safety through coping mechanisms associated with change (Cunningham, 2006). The coping process then provides the individual with the opportunity to access and apply any of three commitment to change types based on the given situation: (a) affective commitment, which supports the organization's benefit from the change, (b) normative commitment, which is driven by a sense of

obligation to the change effort, and (c) continuance commitment, which is driven by an acute understanding of the ramifications of failing to support a change initiative (Cunningham, 2006). Only continuance commitment is negatively associated with coping and change success as individuals taking this route generally look for a way out of the organization (Cunningham, 2006).

Attaining the desired psychological safety state and securing the desired level of a commitment to change, the individual becomes empowered to create, lead, and participate in teams in a true group and unit sense (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Schein, 1996). In this psychological readiness state, the individual can commit to, execute, and support a process that enables them to ultimately: (a) assess a change situation, (b) appraise the personal impacts that are implied, (c) coordinate the emotional response, and (d) execute a coping choice that results in a specific and desired change behavior (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Schein, 1996; Fugate, Kinicki, & Prussia, 2008).

Depth Synthesis

Lewin's (1948, 1951) three stage change model emphasized the process need for changing behavior at each stage of execution. In each of the stages, existing behavior and changing behavior processes align inextricably with the culture or norms and belief systems of the group in which an individual is attached (Lewin, 1948, 1951). Arguing causality into the Lewin model is conceptually possible in such instances where, for example, environmental and group forces represent the anchor of the individual's belief system and culture and where the desire is to change the group's value system to achieve a change (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

The Burke Litwin model develops the causal model through linkages of transformational or cultural variables and transactional or climate related variables (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Similarly, the model also focuses on the transformations or higher order variables as the leading edge of change that focuses on changes of behaviors (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

A distinct difference emerges where a more contemporary theory integrates directly the leadership relationship and influencing and guiding role in sustainable change. Leader behaviors are critical to unfreeze or create upheaval and disequilibrium in the current cultural state, seeking to alter the view of beliefs, norms, customs, and values of groups and individuals (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In contrast, Lewin's (1948, 1951) process theory leaps to consider more the transactional risk that managers posed in jumping the gun on change implementation. This supposition essentially places the transformational process of changing variables such as mission and culture in the decision making process of the group as the leadership focal point.

Both models give weight to the process of moving or actually executing the change. In terms of a causal response, behaviors are more transactional based on the premise that beliefs, norms, and values have been sufficiently reoriented. Followers are willing to actually move to a new level of equilibrium through a constant process of new transactions (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

The final distinction arises from the lack of a theoretical discussion of sustaining change in the Burke Litwin model. Lewin (1948, 1951) clearly maintained that without anchoring the group at a new equilibrium, that the forces of old norms and values will pull a change back to its old

equilibrium state. Without a new permanency driven by the group they belong to, individuals react even more strongly in terms of either resistance to change or reversion to an old state (Lewin, 1948, 1951). As an implementation model, Burke and Litwin (1992) may at best establish the argument for permanency and new equilibrium by arguing that measurable, successful change implies an attainment of deliberate and perhaps permanent or time specific change.

APPLICATION

AMDS 8632: APPLICATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MODELS

The Application section addresses change and development issues in a public sector, regional government organization using the change models and development theories discussed in the Breadth and Depth sections. The Application further addresses the business, political, and organizational issues emerging from the transformation from an appointed to an elected leadership structure. The discussion critically evaluates the challenges, obstacles, and strategies for integrating change management principles and practices into an “institutionalized” public sector culture as a reorganization initiative. The design of the discussion provides the elected leader and management staff with change management and organizational development perspective and implementation strategy.

Organizational Background

The King County Sheriff’s Office (KCSO) serves over 1.9 million citizens spread across 2100 square miles in Washington State. King County is the 14th largest county in the United States with the city of Seattle as the primary urban center (King County web site, 2009). The organization also has a robust contracting program, providing law enforcement services to 13 suburban cities plus both major public transit entities in the region and the King County regional Airport. There are 39 additional suburban cities throughout the county, served by the Sheriff in a role of concurrent jurisdiction as a regional service provider. The Sheriff’s Office has over 1,100 employees and a 2009 annual budget of over 140 million dollars (King County web site, 2009).

The Sheriff is a separately elected, non-partisan official mandated by law to function as the chief peace officer of the county (KCSO web site, 2009. See also RCW 36.28.010; See also King County Charter 350.20.40, Ord. 12301). Within the organization, there are distinct labor unions that represent both commissioned law enforcement personnel and civilian employees.

From Appointed Manager to Elected Official

This review considers the conversion of a public entity, the King County Sheriff's Office in Washington State, from a leadership structure of an appointed, employer and employee leader relationship, to an independent, separately elected office. For nearly 30 years, from 1969 to 1997, the Sheriff was essentially a divisional manager appointed as an "at will" employee by the sitting county executive. While left to make decisions about basic, day to day operations, any budget or significant policy decisions about public safety were generally dictated to the Sheriff by the county executive's administration. As such, the organization basically ran as another county department with little external leeway. Internally, the operation ran fairly quietly, following core county policy as another executive agency.

Change by Public Election

In November of 1996, the voters of King County passed a charter amendment that returned the Office of the Sheriff to a separately elected office, effective January 1 of 1997 (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from

http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx).

While voted in as a non-partisan office, the Sheriff returned to operating as an independent,

political position and voice directly accountable to the public. In returning to an elected office, however, employees at all levels of the organization were suddenly exposed to the political reality of the elected position as partisan politics would enter into internal and external operations. Cunningham (2006) notes that sudden change is often accompanied by a variety of potential negative outcomes such as stress, conflict, ambiguity, and anger. An additional potential outcome related to these change reactions or side effects is turnover (Cunningham, 2006).

While initiated internally by the police officer's guild, the actual election was essentially out of the hands of the rank and file employees overall beyond their individual vote. Relative to the notion of preparation for change, it is safe to assume that a fairly high level of speculation drove organization wide feelings of anxiety, stress, and ambiguity fueled by multiple levels of uncertainty in an environment where there was no individual, group, or managerial control given the change situation (Cunningham, 2006; Fugate, Kinicki, & Prussia, 2008).

Historical perspective. The political environment for the initial change to an appointed Sheriff emerged during the early and mid 1960's when a great deal of white collar, organized crime was alleged to have infiltrated the city of Seattle and King County government, extending all the way to the Governor's Office in Washington state (Chambliss, 1978). With the aid of local television and newspaper investigative reporters, the author would also explore corruption in the criminal justice system that included the Sheriff, King County Prosecuting Attorney, Seattle Police Chief, and a host of others. Data for the eventual book was gathered through observation

and detailed interviews with various insiders involved in the corruption scandal as well as through transcripts of Federal Grand Jury testimony (Chambliss, 1978).

A regional crime coalition dubbed the Seattle Crime network allegedly included mayors, unions, police, politicians, and prominent business leaders in a criminal enterprise that revolved around prostitution, gambling, narcotics trafficking, pornography, robbery, and burglary (Chambliss, 1978). The Federal Grand Jury convened to investigate the corruption uncovered a money trail to a high ranking Seattle Police Department officer involved in the network whom was openly supported in his campaign for the Office of the Sheriff. While the Sheriff was never charged with a crime, the entire investigation became a major focal point around the conduct and ethics of elected officials, including the King County Sheriff (Chambliss, 1978).

Using the state's charter system, the King County Council introduced a ballot measure on making the Sheriff an appointed position through a charter change. With the public's approval, the Sheriff's Office was renamed the Department of Public Safety with the adoption of the home rule charter in 1969 (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx). Effective with this reorganization, the Office of the Sheriff became an appointed rather than elective office for the first time since 1854, and would legally remain as such until a charter change vote in 1996.

While the deputy's guild was the lead organization behind returning the Sheriff to an elected position, the public face to the reversion back to an elected Sheriff emerged in 1996 and

was driven by several King County council members (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from

http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx).

Those council members involved were concerned that the appointed Sheriff did not have the public position or independent stature necessary to openly debate and discuss an appropriate public safety budget each year. In 1996, the council placed a new charter amendment on the ballot that would return the Public Safety Director position back to an independently elected county Sheriff. The public overwhelmingly supported the measure and the Interim Sheriff was placed in office in March of 1997 (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from

http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx).

Change and Government

Transformational change is manifested and characterized in various ways, including: (a) radical shifts in business strategy, (b) reorganization of systems and structures, and (c) changes in distribution of power, which can occur across the entire organization (Robinson & Griffiths, 2009). In the present case, all three scenarios apply, with perhaps radical shifts in business strategy being more an individualized perception of how a cultural change would unfold driven by significant operational implications. Regardless, a transformational change, with emphasis on governmental organizations, may represent a significant personal transition for employees and a major source of stress (Robinson & Griffiths, 2009).

In public sector environments, transformational change alone does not equate to a source of generalized or broad based stress as much as specific events or sources that are triggers generated by the change itself (Robinson & Griffith, 2009). Logically, negative events generate a priority list of stressors that result from transformational change. These include: (a) increased workload, (b) perceived losses of identity, status, power, and personal mastery, (c) career disruption from position loss, transfer, and path disturbance, (d) general uncertainty and ambiguity related to information and individual roles, and (e) interpersonal disruptions caused by changes in coworkers, bosses, or even new personality clashes. Increased workload, perceived loss and uncertainty, and ambiguity create the greatest amount of stress triggered by changes (Robinson & Griffiths, 2009).

Other considerations in the literature related to the public sector in a transformational change scenario suggest that three key building blocks emerge to help define and differentiate the relative scope of change in both stable and turbulent environments: (a) the type of change, (b) the readiness to change, and (c) the process of change (Alas, 2007). In this context, the individual nature of change relative to public sector environments emerges as change in behaviors that evolve to relative levels of change attitude (Alas, 2007). This has common sense appeal in the environmental discussion of the public sector as represented civil service employees may enjoy certain protections and thus certain psychological independence in a change scenario. As such, change may necessarily first be enacted at the individual level, conceptually in this case as a collection of independent change agents (Walinga, 2008).

Change Dynamics

Time is a major variable in this case. If the election was favorable and the office returned to the elected position, still looming were significant, unanswered issues: (a) the county executive would have to appoint an interim Sheriff covering the period from January 1, 1997 through an election in November of 1997, and (b) there would be an 11 month public campaign season throughout 1997 to determine who would be the voter selected Sheriff for the next four years commencing January 1, 1998.

Relative to change, this long time horizon would seem to thwart any transformational change activity as no new direction, vision, goals, strategy, or communication about change would be available to organization members or the public for a considerable period. Change coalitions and other facilitation groups may form on an ad hoc basis during a period of uncertainty, but more likely for the purposes of preparing for a new leader (Alas, 2007). However, the lack of a permanent and recognized leader and a direction as opposed to a placeholder leader for nearly two years would impede a transformational process (Alas, 2007).

This scenario multiplied the change variables. Among those variables were the facts that the departing, appointed Sheriff would be replaced by an appointed interim Sheriff who may or may not run for and win an election as the permanent elected Sheriff going forward. The dynamics of the position and the office were changing permanently, creating a great deal of internal and external uncertainty over an extended period of time. For the purposes of considering change

dynamics and variables relative to leaders, managers, and followers in this discussion, it is important to consider the emerging and changing environment across a 24 month time horizon.

First, there is the full year 1996 when the public campaign around a charter amendment to change the office to an elected position was taking place. The ballot measure was opposed by good government groups and the local newspapers, who were instrumental in the corruption investigations in the 1960s (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx).

The departing appointed Sheriff would leave behind an organizational culture co designed with the county executive. The interim Sheriff, while appointed and anointed by the county executive and legislative body, was essentially free to either maintain the status quo for the year or begin to impart his individual vision. The third process would be the transition to the Sheriff elect and a high probability of a new vision and direction for the organization.

The environmental variables of anxiousness and anticipation about a change prior to the final outcome of the election suggests a loose parallel to Lewin's (1948, 1951) unfreezing stage. Within that model, it is arguable that the unfreezing process would have been already initiated, regardless of the outcome, purely by the acts leading up to and including the public vote that would permanently change the work environment (Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Viewed from the perspective of an intervention or disconfirmation, the internal momentum around creating an election to change the leadership structure of the organization is also arguable as the initiation of the unfreezing process as the primary bargaining unit experienced some level

and form of dissatisfaction or frustration (Schein, 1996). Additionally, the county council's political effort to affect the charter change that would return the Sheriff to an elected office, also serves the discussion of unfreezing. While the county council debate focused on budget independence and policy transparency, it may have provided a compounding value to unfreezing, both internally and publicly (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx).

Changing power structure. As a result of the voters' decision to revert to the political office, the separately elected Sheriff's newly reestablished power provided the immediate opportunity to: (a) regain full operational control of the organization, (b) develop a new public mandate for vision, mission, and organizational direction around public safety, (c) develop a new internal, strategic mandate to integrate the vision, mission, and values of the organization that would redirect and redefine the organization's culture, (d) reassign, reorganize, or terminate non-represented personnel as an act necessitated by changing values, and (d) freely implement significant organizational changes internally, externally, and operationally.

With little or relatively no experience in change management, the first elected Sheriff in 30 years faced extraordinary internal and external challenges in managing change transitions. The first and most significant change occurs at the individual level where the Sheriff had to internalize and execute a transition from the role of a manager to that of a public leader. Regardless of the leader in place, the organizational change effort emerged almost entirely around the dynamic of a public office in a political environment with an employee base that is over 90% represented by a

variety of labor organizations. These facts and issues are central to the discussion of organizational change management and organizational development in this case.

McNulty and Ferlie (2004) point to the radical change model as a catalyst for a set of enabling change dynamics driven by the actual pressure for change. As such, the political nature of public organizations in a change environment require power to be mobilized and reoriented in such a way that group preferences and interests are promoted in the change action (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004, p. 1393). In the shifting power structure implied here, the deputies, as the substantial power group driving a radical change, demonstrated a capacity for action to the degree that they were able to manage the process required for a major transition.

As a process flow in a transformation, their capacity for organized action also: (a) moved the power base along, (b) demonstrated an understanding of the new conceptual destination with the elected Sheriff, (c) demonstrated an ability to manage how to get there, and (d) exercised some preconception of the requisite level of skill, confidence, and competency to function when they arrive at the new power destination with the elected Sheriff (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004).

Magnitude and scope. The magnitude of the change may be viewed as transformational in nature considering that the organization would: (a) move from a manager leader to a pure leader, (b) the new leader would most likely bring new beliefs, values, and a vision to the organization, and (c) by the magnitude of the leadership change variable, execute new transactions in terms of managerial functions and overall operations. In that regard, the change scenario aligns broadly with the Burke Litwin change model, especially considering the hierarchical influence of the leader

change in higher order variables and how they would impact more transactional types of responses and exchanges at the managerial or implementation level (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

As an organizational transformation, the change by public election from an appointed to an elected leader fits an overall definition where the implied cultural change outcome would include: (a) sharp and simultaneous shifts in strategy, (b) redistribution of organizational power, structure, and control mechanisms, (c) dominant ideologies, (d) cultural systems of meaning, and (e) power relations in the organization (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004).

On a scope level, the change, driven by what may be appropriately viewed as employee radicalism given the professional context of law enforcement, fits a radical change theory (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004). This is identified in the literature where internally driven dynamics of interests, values, power dependencies, and capacity of changing action are supported by a core group. In this case, that dynamic revolves around an implied dissatisfaction with the lack of willingness to accommodate the group's ongoing interests (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004).

On a micro or more individual level, it is more appropriate to consider the changes and ad hoc readiness process in the transition or election cycle overall as climate driven or transactional. Groups and individuals within the organization most likely went through a transactional process around those things that would have the most direct impact when a new leader arrived, such as considering task requirements, unit structures, organizational skills, systems impacts, and management practices relating to their immediate role or position (Alas, 2007).

Discussion

Followers and Change

Of particular significance in this discussion is the consideration of the perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of the employees from the front end of the transition to the elected office. As an independent variable, their position in the series of change events comes from the position of something being done to them in the context of the public voting a change into their environment. Walinga (2008) notes that a key issue for change agents, when change is planned, is the issue of readiness and how people prepare for change. There is little evidence of change planning.

When change is not planned, the issues of cognition or preparation and behavior or the action stage of change leave a gap in understanding around employee clarity, confidence, and the control people desire to be able to enact change (Walinga, 2008). In this case, the public, the county government, and the Sheriff's Office employees could not adequately prepare for the change in the context of a series of change events until the vote was cast and counted in November of 1996, and then again when the an election of new Sheriff was finally elected in 1997.

Organizational resilience applied to public entities, however, suggests that the members of the organization are able or may at least have the opportunity to demonstrate a capability and capacity to act quickly in response to a shock or organizational disturbance (Rochet, Kerimidis & Bout, 2008). Likened to learning organization conduct, the organization members react with specific behaviors in the face of situations, resulting in success or failure to adapt given the

circumstances. Likened to a crisis management scenario, Rochet et al. (2008) provide a viable comparison via the reform of the New York Police Department, citing the resilience concept and noting an effective radical change process in a major crisis of public and internal confidence.

Once the vote to change the charter occurred, individuals were in the position to self analyze and direct their attitudes, emotions, and other cognitions in anticipation of an inevitable change in the power and organizational structure. Transformative learning theory suggests that adults go through processing events in a change environment that allows them to interpret life experiences, create meaning, and change an attitude, belief, or an entire perspective (Moore, 2005).

Applying Burke and Litwin's (1992) change assumption of some level of chaos, the transtheoretical model suggests that individuals progress through six stages that allows them to engage a self change process through altering behaviors (Moore, 2005). Defined as self motivational change, the six stages occur in this model as: (a) precontemplation, (b) contemplation, (c) preparation/determination, (e) action, (f) maintenance, and (g) termination (Moore, 2005). In the change event series, and absent strong leadership for an extended period, transformative and transtheoretical process may logically have guided individual processes and behaviors to some degree.

Absent from this discussion is some act of individual unfreezing. Alas (2007) notes that in comparing change resistance and readiness, the most difficult individual change effort emerges over the conflict or difficulty of unlearning old ways of doing things and abandoning past

practices, creating fear, ambiguity, and anxiety. The long time horizon and a charged political environment around a vote for a major transformation could contribute substantially to individual change conflict.

Conversely, the literature suggests that the individual crisis scenario and a given state of chaos can ultimately drive the momentum for organizational change (Rochet, Kerimidis & Bout, 2008). Given this environment, radical change can force a natural search for a new state of equilibrium among followers through an adaptive process that feeds and strengthens resilience. This event cycle may ultimately contribute to a more stable and new organizational condition driven by follower crisis adaptation (Rochet et al., 2008; Lewin, 1948, 1951).

Readiness. The issue of readiness is significant in its effect on employees and leaders and managers trying to execute (Chen, 2007). The level of readiness or preparation for change can influence organizational learning in the context of change execution as well as management performance overall. Discussed as readiness or acceptance, the effectiveness of a change relies significantly on the overall behaviors of the members as change itself is experienced (Chen, 2007). In this regard, the influence of employee behaviors on the change from a more passive appointed manager system to very public leader system is significant.

Holt, Armenakis, Field, and Harris (2007) noted that readiness is one of the most important factors involved in establishing employees' support of initial change efforts. Understanding levels and degrees of readiness can indicate the magnitude of potential conflicts and differences that can emerge between the leader and the members of the organization (Holt, et

al., 2007). To achieve change in the direction that the leader is seeking, conflicts must be resolved with members such that their overall beliefs and cognitions are moved in the direction of the change effort. In short, resistance, and the potential for resistance, must be replaced by readiness (Holt et al., 2007).

The public's control of a transformational organizational change by way of the vote draws greater attention to the uniqueness of this particular change scenario. Change readiness models emphasize generating awareness for the need for a change and supporting people's willingness and ability to change (Walinga, 2008). The former substantiates the vote generating power of the initiative behind the reversion to the elected office. However, it also assumes in both points, that the employees were both fully aware of the change need and that there was a support mechanism.

Change readiness for a vote, even by employees, is entirely another matter from organization wide readiness for a transformational change event. Walinga (2008) notes that a significant gap exists between preparation and action in organizational change readiness as the present research assumes that all organizational change must first be enabled and initiated at the individual level. The uniqueness of the case and clear barriers support again a concept of chaos created by the inherent ambiguity and uncertainty of a public vote with direct individual bearing.

Hoping for a personal transformation scenario as a readiness variable, Moore (2005) draws the relationship in transformative learning around contemplation and preparation and determination stages as critical and primary tasks for individual preparation for transformational change. In anticipation of an election that would create an overwhelming change environment, the

individual change responsibility reflects an involuntary act which significantly destabilizes the change outcome at many levels (Moore, 2005). Could the organization and members have been more ready? Possibly. But the environmental factors of (a) the lack of a clear leader, and (b) unknown outcomes in two election scenarios, may have significantly limited the opportunity for any organized change readiness process or strategy to emerge.

The logic can be reasonably personalized and extended by considering relevant contemporary events such as presidential or other significant elections where completely opposing views, beliefs, and norms have hung in the public balance as drivers of potential outcomes or changes. Ambiguity and uncertainty can create individual disequilibrium, disrupting an individual's decisional balance through a host of variables that may include everything from conflicting incoming information to internal conflict generated by a constant weighing of potential outcomes (Moore, 2005).

The issue of coping. A fairly high level of across the board uncertainty is strongly implied in this case. Coping and coping capacity and behaviors then become another variable in evaluating the impacts of the transition from the appointed to the elected Sheriff. Coping behavior relative to change reflects a “conscious physical and psychological efforts to improve one’s resourcefulness in dealing with stressful events” (Cunningham, 2006). The literature further discusses the importance of the coping mechanism in organizational change as major or transformational changes, which the Sheriff’s Office example arguably fits, create a significant level of individual

uncertainty, anger, stress, and conflict both at work and at home for employees (Cunningham, 2006).

Within the concept of coping with change, a transaction takes place between the individual and the immediate or perceived environment where there is a cognitive appraisal of the person situation environment (Fugate, Kinicki & Prussia, 2008). The cognitive appraisal process determines the meaning of an event while the significance of the event is the primary appraisal process (Robinson & Griffiths, 2009). This case provides a look at extremely complex scenarios with differing outcomes that imply the potential for significant personal, unit, organizational, government, professional, and community impacts. The layers and levels of complexity, when taken down to the individual coping level, suggest a potentially overwhelming psychological process, especially given the circumstances that initiated the original change in 1969.

Erwin (2009) expands on this concept, suggesting that in the coping process, line employees as well as supervisors and managers, may also execute an appraisal that involves evaluation of personal costs. This includes the act of evaluating and then taking action based upon a personal response to the consequences of not changing when there is no other course of action (Erwin, 2009).

The primary appraisal then more broadly defines whether an event, in this case the outcome of the election, is irrelevant, positive, or negative (Erwin, 2009). It bears repeating that this construct was repeated twice with votes to: (a) first change the organizational leadership structure, and (b) determine who the new leader would be to fill the role of Sheriff as opposed to

the Director of Public Safety. Perhaps adequately viewed as some individual level of anticipation, employees more often appraise organizational changes as something negative, indicating an early assessment of the change as potentially harmful or threatening (Fugate, et al, 2008).

Resistance. No data exists regarding measurement of employee attitudes toward the change in this case prior to the election. Clearly, a majority of deputies voted in favor of publicly advancing the change to the elected office. This was a basic political reality and requirement to move the issue to the public and ultimately to the ballot. That does not, however, imply blanket individual acceptance of the change that would result from the election. Public and private rejection, criticism, and ultimately failure were very real possible outcomes. Given the scenario, there are some generalizations from the literature regarding resistance that help to create possible environmental, cultural, and behavioral scenarios that may have existed at the time.

Avoiding outright dissent is an individual conforming strategy accompanied by a more tacit kind of resistance designed to help change or move the group eventually to a position that an individual or individuals favor in the long run (Hornsey, Grice, Jetten, Paulsen & Callan, 2007). The literature presents several constructs related to individual relationships to change emphasizing resistance in the context of complex attitudes and feelings consisting of both cognitions and emotions (Saksvik & Hetland, 2009). Individual variables, including the five factor model (FFM) personality traits, thus impact overall behaviors such that resistance becomes a complex disposition that may include affective, cognitive, and behavioral components (Saksvik & Hetland, 2009).

Dispositional resistance to change includes not only the context where change is experienced but also certain personality related identifiers as dimensions that include: (a) routine seeking generalized as stability, (b) emotional reaction to change generalized as response to imposed change, (c) short term focus generalized as the near term change hassles versus the long term view, and (d) cognitive rigidity generalized as a tenacity for holding strongly to one's own views (Oreg, Nevo, Metzger, Leder & Castro, 2009). Further, occupational choices relate to individual dispositional inclination to resist change such that high resisters lean more to conventional jobs where change oriented individuals prefer more investigative, enterprising, and more dynamic types of jobs (Oreg et al., 2009).

The dispositional resistance model is significant in its ability to predict individual responses to change situations (Oreg, et al., 2009). This understanding of individual disposition as an individual trait contributes to a broader discussion in this case of how the group needs and individual needs, manifested in the impending change, could contribute to overall change dynamics, variables, and outcomes as a commonly desired end (Hornsey, Grice, Jetten, Paulsen & Callan, 2007). Further, the resistance to change model (RTC scale) creates profiles that demonstrate the variability of individual resistance as a multidimensional disposition (Saksvik & Hetland, 2009).

With an imminent transformational change on the horizon, mutually desirable needs could potentially work to cause both group and individual influence to result in intentional acts of nonconformity and perceived dissent, in this case, more aggressive support of the election and

effort to change to an elected leader. This joint group and individual resistance effort generates a positive effect on the overall group culture and can provide a positive affirmation of the integrity of the group's decision making (Hornsey, et al., 2009).

Oreg et al., (2009) argue a strong relationship between personality and occupational interest where resistance to change, either positive or negative, has a strong individual self interest factor. Avey, Wernsing, and Luthans (2008) noted that dysfunctional attitudes and behaviors can become an underlying current of negative change resistance if resistance to change becomes a dominant driver in the culture. Conversely, strong employees with strong psychological resources, such as hope, optimism, efficacy, positive emotions, and resilience, create a collective of positive psychological capital that can facilitate organizational change (Avey, Wernsing & Luthans, 2008).

In this case where there is a highly individualized career at stake, the application suggests larger group interest driven by common, individual career interest. This argument is further intensified considering: (a) the unique profession, (b) the common ground of the uniform, and (c) a strong labor unit to organize and rally individuals. Assuming a generalized commonality of purpose, positive emotions, attitudes, and behaviors may have been sufficient drivers to mitigate any resistance backlash among the ranks that could potentially have been sufficient to create public doubt. Avey et al. (2008) suggest that the positive psychological influence and positive emotions can help in change environments by: (a) driving better decision making, (b) supporting coping mechanisms, (c) broadening the view of options, (d) supporting an open system for

problem solving, and (e) supplying an energy level to help adjust behaviors to meet the changing environment.

Lewin's (1948, 1951) theoretical argument around group decision power may well apply, but the question that looms large is whether or not the mutual coopting of the group and the individual for the sake of positive resistance later manifests itself in other organizational issues, both positive and negative. Another question arises around whether individual support of a group lead change, even if not individually desired but that may ultimately benefit the individual, is a much broader continuance commitment consideration.

Commitment. In considering the overall environment and critical influencing issues in which the change to the elected Sheriff occurred, commitment to the change is the proverbial third leg of the stool of core issues. Cunningham (2006) notes that three types of commitment to change are critical to understanding the ultimate psychological framework in which individuals cope with, accept, and commit to or abandon change. Affective commitment necessitates a belief that the organization will benefit from change. Normative commitment to a change requires a personal obligation to support the change program. And continuance commitment requires supporting the change as a survival and self preservation motivation as much as anything (Cunningham, 2006).

The King County Police Officer's Guild, the union body for the Sheriff's deputies, has a membership comprised of around 750 sworn officers out of 1000 plus total employees. Requiring a majority guild vote to engage in the effort and commit the members' resources to bring this to a

public vote, the discussion assumes that primarily affective but also normative commitment to change underwrote the initiative at the group level (Cunningham, 2006).

To that end, high levels of affective commitment result in a greater likelihood that individuals will be able to successfully cope with change (Cunningham, 2006). While it leaves a question mark for the remaining 300 plus employees who did not initially participate in driving the change, the literature suggests that such organizational commitment to change allows employees to survive the impacts of stress and tension, increasing the likelihood of a successful change overall (Cunningham, 2006).

In business research, normative commitment is known to be positively associated with: (a) retention of quality workers, (b) positive work attitudes, (c) low absenteeism, and (d) citizenship and other desirable behavior (Yang & Pandey, 2008). In the public arena, research focuses more on normative commitment as an attitudinal concept. Public agency commitment tends more toward psychological attachments based on shared values and a dependence on employee change reactions to their organizations' cultures, values, socialization processes, and work experiences, especially when driven by the political climate established by elected leaders (Yang & Pandey, 2008).

Cerese and Farinella (2009) looked at the relationship between public service motivation (PSM) and individual perceptions of changes taking place in an organization. As a commitment question, high levels of PSM indicate a higher likelihood of acceptance of and commitment to change and management reforms. Additionally, a positive perception of change and high levels of

PSM are positively related to change commitment, job satisfaction, involvement in the job and overall organizational commitment (Cerase and Farinella, 2009).

Given the discussion, it is conceivable that all three types of commitment profiles may have existed among Sheriff's Office employees prior to the election and after the appointment of the interim Sheriff occurred. As a planning and assessment tool, public service motivation (PSM) may have been a measurable factor in evaluating the environment for change in anticipation of a new leadership structure in the Sheriff's Office. Following Lewin's (1948, 1951) model, an understanding of types and levels of commitment to change could be one element used for developing a strategy to freeze the organization at a new equilibrium.

Leadership

Once the election validation was complete, the county executive had the responsibility for appointing an interim Sheriff. Rather than select a safe or obvious ranking commander, including retaining the existing Sheriff, the executive instead went into the managerial ranks and selected an unproven but popular commander to be the first Sheriff in 30 years. Major Dave Reichert enthusiastically accepted the interim position with no significant organizational leadership experience beyond his immediate command duties. He had no known skills or training to lead and manage a nearly 1000 employee organization with a then 100 million dollar budget. The organization was shocked and deeply divided over the choice. That was the environmental starting point.

Sworn in as the interim Sheriff in March of 1997, Reichert, who is today a third term United State Congressman, had little time to both adjust to the role or make an unfamiliar political decision to officially become a candidate for election to the Sheriff's post. Tasked with taking the leadership role of the organization, he too determined that he would officially run for the office. Given the circumstances of a radical change, the initiating outward disposition of the leader in this case was of critical importance.

Momeni (2009) suggests that the morale and emotional behavior of a leader has a tremendous effect on organizational climate, which has transactional exchange implications between leaders and followers. The general assertion is that the overall emotional intelligence of the leader, in this case reflecting an understanding of personal as well as others' abilities, perceptions, and attitudes, is especially critical in a turbulent change environment (Momeni, 2009).

It is also worth noting that upon taking the leadership post as Sheriff, Reichert immediately leapt past the entire command staff of the organization, most of whom he had worked for and was junior to in age and experience. In a paramilitary organizational structure, rank matters, but the culture of followership amongst the rank and file commissioned staff may suffer if the leader does not immediately emerge as a strong force. Given the inherited environment, there was an even greater challenge around the competency, acceptance, loyalty, and commitment of existing management.

Erwin's (2009) research indicates that the new leader's most dire challenge is often to address the lack of leadership, desire, skill, and discipline in the individuals in the organization who are necessary to identify, plan for, and implement the change. This is independent of any direct resistance these same individuals may be promoting individually or collectively.

Denning (2008) suggests that in order to generate a comfort level with change and enthusiasm for moving forward, that successful leaders must first and immediately: (a) identify and explain the irresistible forces of change, (b) establish a larger purpose for the organization, (c) drive the notion that innovation and change are everyone's job, (d) create innovative capacity across the organization, and (e) take structural steps to support the challenges that the leader presents.

The environmental conditions for Reichert formed around an institutionalized culture identified internally and externally with the stigma of leadership criminality. The election alone represented a radical, transformational departure requiring change behaviors at the leader level that would translate into observable effectiveness. Followers mirror the behaviors of leaders in the form of change actions in the workplace when the leader can demonstrate an ability to motivate, communicate, and build teams (A. Gilley, McMillan, and J. Gilley, 2009). When this occurs, the result is modified employee behavior.

Applying the research to the given circumstances, Reichert inspired the organization to follow a new mandate, displaying critical change leadership behaviors and traits such as: (a) supervisory ability, (b) intelligence, (c) need for achievement, (d) decisiveness, (e) self assurance,

and (f) initiative (A. Gilley, McMillan, and J. Gilley, 2009). Employees of the organization emulated these traits and behaviors, motivated by the modeling behaviors demonstrated by a leader who represented the opportunity to emerge from the shadows of the organization's darker period. Gilley et al. (2009) also support the argument that success in this scenario evolves as the ability to positively modify employee behavior in a change environment. Along the way, Reichert either directly removed or retired out obstructionist managers and otherwise inspired the employee majority to marginalize those command staff and civilian supervisors who could not let go of the old organizational equilibrium.

Leadership and motivation. The chosen leader involved as the first Sheriff arguably had a pivotal role in determining whether or not the transition back to the elected office would be successful in the eyes of the public as well as Sheriff's Office employees. Change leadership capacity and attributes may not suffice to entirely transform an organization along the order of complexity and magnitude here. Given the complex and overpowering transformational scenario, it is also unlikely that purely trait, situational, or transactional leader styles would have been independently sufficient to take on the King County Sheriff's Office transformation.

In addition to change leader attributes, Sheriff Dave Reichert displayed charismatic and transformational leadership capacity by broad and interchangeable definition, demonstrating the ability to: (a) articulate a vision to promote change, (b) create strong bonds with followers both in internally and externally, and (c) motivate followers by appealing to common ideals and moral values (Ilies, Judge, & Wagner, 2006). With an effective charismatic leader, motivational success

also results in positive changes to follower self esteem and the organization's collective identity (Ilies, Judge, & Wagner, 2006). Leading up to the change vote, the banishment of the Sheriff's position served as a constant reminder and painful reinforcement of the negative public image of the organization.

In addition to specific skill sets, charismatic leaders have very strong traits and attributes such as: (a) determination, (b) self confidence, (c) enthusiasm, and (d) energy (Ilies, Judge, & Wagner, 2006). These attributes in motion create a flow referred to as emotional contagion, a motivational factor that charismatic leaders demonstrate in transformational environments such that followers experience heightened emotions resulting in proactive displays of trust, cooperation, and mutual support (Ilies, Judge, & Wagner, 2006). The transformational leadership capacity enabled the necessary cultural and higher order changes. The effect was to begin a process to repair the damage to the organizations norms, beliefs, and value systems reflected in the form of public image and internal self esteem.

On the climate side of the leadership equation, the new Sheriff also had transactional circumstances to address. Boyne and Meier (2009) relate that public organizations in particular, face environments that can change in unpredictable ways such that physical, technological, social, political, and economic circumstances can shift rapidly and unexpectedly. Unlike the private sector, community, labor, hierarchical, political, and other considerations from within may create even greater challenges and constraints for leaders and followers in a change scenario. While the

process to get to an elected Sheriff may have been agonizingly slow, the actual change itself had the potential for extreme, complex, and unpredictable shifts.

In the public, government, and internal spotlight, Reichert faced all of these considerations as new variables. Collectively defined as organizational turbulence, these variables can have an immediate and negative effect on performance and stability in public sector settings, requiring strong, decisive, inspirational, and motivational leadership that has a transactional component in the execution (Boyne & Meier, 2009). On all turbulent environmental fronts, the transformative change to the elected office required an ability to successfully execute exchanges necessary to meet new organizational goals and objectives for internal and external constituencies. To be successful, by definition, these exchanges must transfer mutually desirable value that result in some kind of desired performance (O'Shea, Foti, & Hauenstein, 2009).

When considering transformational and transactional leadership, Reichert and the change event represent a leadership match of a given situation, transformational and transactional traits, and a behavioral response skill set sufficient to address a complex and evolving environment. In Bass' (1990) theoretical framework, the convergence of transformational and transactional attributes in particular create the perfect storm of leadership modeling to successfully tackle a complex and volatile change scenario, as Reichert did.

Application Synthesis

To apply the models and theories in a retrospective fashion, it is first appropriate to review the circumstances and critical, mitigating issues. It is a unique change scenario in as much as the

underlying event is a radical transformation, involving a publicly driven change from an appointed managerial position to an elected, leadership role in a law enforcement organization. The election of a leader is not unique, but a transformational shift in the power and leadership structure in a government organization from an appointed to an elected post is uncommon, if not rare, especially considering the public controversy that drove the initial change to the appointed position in 1969.

A recap of the critical organizational change events for the King County Sheriff's Office: 1969-1996

1. After 115 years of independent Sheriffs functioning in a leadership role, a major crime scandal drives a 1969 public vote to convert the King County Sheriff position to an appointed, managerial staff position.
2. The appointed Sheriff, in charge of the "Department of Public Safety," remains in place for nearly 30 years, until the public again votes to change the Sheriff position back to a separately elected office through a county charter amendment.
3. Unionized deputies and several county council members publicly and internally drive the change initiative.
4. Public watchdog groups, the media, and an unknown number of employees and government official oppose the change.

5. The election cycle and public campaign to change the position back to an elected office spans over an 11 month period.
6. A sitting, appointed Sheriff “voluntarily” leaves, disinterested in running for office,
7. After a three month process, the county executive appoints an interim Sheriff in March of 1997.
8. The interim Sheriff decides to pursue the elected office for a four year term, running a campaign from March through October of 1997.
9. From the first quarter of 1996 through November of 1997, the organization has temporary leadership and complete uncertainty about its future.
10. The citizens of King County, Washington, elect interim Sheriff Dave Reichert to a four year term in November of 1997 (King County Archives. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx); King County Sheriff’s Office web site, 2009; Sheriff S. Rahr, Sgt. J. Urquhart, D. Glenn, personal communication, November 16, 2009).

Theoretical perspective. For two years, the employees of the King County Sheriff’s Office and the citizens of King County dealt with an organization shrouded in ambiguity, conflict, and uncertainty (Sheriff S. Rahr, Sgt. J. Urquhart, D. Glenn, personal communication, November 16, 2009). In particular, employees divided quietly over their support of the change. Old commanders and long term employees in particular were silently opposed to and afraid of the return to the

elected office. They had lived the 1960s corruption and subsequent, shaming change environment. However, because of the magnitude of the uncertainty, even the most powerful opposition within the organization assumed the position and attitude of “go along to get along,” accepting that the overall change issue was out of their hands and in the hands of their coworkers and peers and ultimately, the voting public (Rahr et al., personal communication, November 16, 2009).

Applying the Lewin (1948, 1951) change model, these events can be broken down to fit the model as follows: (a) the period of unending public campaign activity fits the discussion of the unfreezing process where the considerable force fields, inner resistance, and established social habits and equilibrium state in the organization are being unhinged by a strong group decision process, (b) the moving stage evolves as the race to select the new Sheriff pushes the organization’s members and the public into an acceptance and validation of a public decision of a new state by way of the election of Dave Reichert to the Office of the Sheriff, a move anchored by an ongoing process of reeducation, public discussion, motivation, and ultimate commitment to a desired outcome, and (c) the refreezing stage at a new equilibrium level is initiated slowly and over a protracted period as the newly elected Sheriff begins to assert a new vision, seeks to stabilize the follower environment, and moves to reestablish the public trust in the elected Office of the Sheriff.

Relative to the Burke Litwin (1992) model, both cultural and climate change emerged in this complex scenario simultaneously. The transformational context occurred as both past and present value systems and norms changed by way of new behaviors internally as well as through a

new leader structure. The transformation or cultural change process was necessary in order for the public and internal confidence to emerge that would be required to successfully drive a favorable change vote. Similarly, exchanges were occurring on various levels between employees, existing and interim Sheriffs, county council members, unions, and the electorate. In this arena, affiliated parties sought a level of mutually rewarding transactions. These exchanges resulted in a continuous, changing climate and evolving environment that was driving toward a new state of equilibrium.

An interesting research question surfaces around the majority voting public and whether they had willingly overcome institutional memory and opposition resolve around the 1960s corruption and regardless, were sufficiently motivated to seek a change back to an environment where they had a direct and collective say in the leadership of the Sheriff's Office.

Implications and considerations. A step for step repeat of the circumstances and events surrounding this case is not likely in the foreseeable future. Given the situational complexity, it appears to be somewhat unique in terms of organizational change research and contemporary modeling. In the grandest theoretical context, it is a monumental behavioral change case, and to date, considered successful when held up to the intent of the change architects and the voters (Sheriff S. Rahr, Sgt. J. Urquhart, D. Glenn, personal communication, November 16, 2009).

While a situation unlikely to repeat, there are contemporary concepts in the literature that support the theoretical framework presented here. Contemporary models can help inform strategy designed to address future changes in large organizations headed by elected officials, especially

those unionized public organizations subject to transformational change that comes inherently with changing elected leadership. Additionally, there are those instances where advance knowledge of a term limited position or a voluntary exit of an elected official provides the organization with the ability to prepare for and anticipate a change environment.

Research conducted by Jimmieson, Peach, and White (2008) explored the theory of planned behavior which considers affective responses to change that help to identify how receptive employees are to an anticipated change. The responses include: (a) readiness, (b), openness and commitment to change, and (c) change related cynicism and resistance. The model specifies the role of social influence variables in helping to predict intentions to engage in behaviors and also why certain change implementation strategies such as focusing on readiness and communications help to drive better change outcomes (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008).

Considering the elected leadership change scenario, understanding intentions, defined as the individual willingness to perform a given behavior, provides some measure of behavioral prediction (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008). Further, the model supports the premise that individuals who: (a) have a positive view about a change, (b) feel a measure of personal control, and (c) believe they have normative support about a given behavior from important persons in their lives, are more likely to have strong intentions to perform a specific change behavior (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008). This type of exercise may provide some insight into perceptions about future leaders, their approach to leading that may be grounded in future

changes, and the strength of followers' intentions to support the person and the changes necessary to move on.

In terms of structural design, Coughlan, Suri, and Canales (2007) contribute the idea of prototyping in a change environment to help facilitate organizational change and development. Transformation by design in this model helps to prepare people for change by creating a continuous, adaptive, and learning cultural structure. Since culture aligns here as a transformational construct, the overarching goal of this model is to directly engage employees in a process that will help them conceptualize, design, and develop the environment for change which they are heading into (Coughlan, Suri, & Canales 2007).

The model is consistent with Senge's (2006) learning organization concepts and team learning principles that establish shared vision, insightful thought, and trust, as critical elements of how teams create outcomes that the members truly and collectively desire. This suggests a realistic application of contemporary models in as much as building capacity to think, fail, and allowing people to explore new behaviors creates a prototypical development and behavioral environment for the anticipation, readiness, and response to change (Coughlan, Suri, & Canales 2007; Senge, 2006; Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008).

In pragmatic terms, these model driven scenarios anticipate a leadership catalyst. Given the discussion, this applies to the sitting leader as the critical change initiator and potential successors as the recipients of change readiness and development effect. Given the literature argued in this project, leaders on both ends of this process require both transformational and

transactional leadership capacity and capability in order to effectively provide the necessary vision in the form of inspiration and directional motivation as the execution driver (Ilies, Judge, & Wagner, 2006; O'Shea, Foti, Hauenstein & Bycio, 2009; Nutt & Backoff, 1993).

As a succession planning tool for a departing public sector official and here a Sheriff, the research conclusions suggest that not only could intended support for a new and planned leadership structure change be anticipated to some degree, but employee intentions overall to behaviorally support the change plan could be predicted (Jimmieson, Peach, & White, 2008).

Given the transformational or cultural considerations and the transactional or climate related variables, these models suggest an overarching causal relationship in classical theoretical terms. This is a foundation in the theory which in turn leads to contemporary modeling underscoring the necessity of readiness to achieve effective change at any level (Lewin, 1948, 1951; Burke & Litwin, 1992). As such, an understanding of the behavioral implications and requirements relative to change is relevant in the public sector where strong labor organizations and institutionalized norms, beliefs, and behaviors can have a tremendous impact on change support, execution, and organizational effectiveness. The ultimate theoretical test of arguably elusive change success is whether or not all were ready, able, and willing to execute a change, regardless. It is a question most likely never asked in the King County Sheriff's Office in 1996 (Sheriff S. Rahr, Sgt. J. Urquhart, D. Glenn, personal communication, November 16, 2009).

References

Achilles, A.A. & Bedeian, A.G. (1999) Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(30), 293-315.

- Alas, R. (2008). Employees' willingness to participate in implementation of organizational change. *Organizacijų Vadyba, Sisteminiai Tyrimai*, 46, 7-15.
- Alas, R. (2007). The triangular model for dealing with organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(3,4) 255-271.
- Allport, G.W. (1948). Foreward to the 1948 edition. In G.W. Lewin & D. Cartwright (Eds.), *Kurt Lewin: Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (6th ed., pp. 5-9). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Berke, J., Taylor, J. & Vazquez, J. A. (2008). The role of leadership during large scale organizational transitions: lessons from six empirical studies. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 13(1), 16-24.
- Avey, J.B., Wernsing, T.S. & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 48-70.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bouckennooghe, D., Devos, G. & Van Den Broeck, H. (2009). Organizational change questionnaire- climate of change, processes, and readiness: Development of a new instrument. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(6), 559-599.
- Buchanan, D., Fitzgerald, L., Ketley, D., Gollop, R., Jones, J.L., Lamont, S.S., et al. (2005). No going back: A review of the literature on sustaining organizational change. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(3), 189-205.
- Burke, W.W. & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 523-545.
- Burnes, Bernard (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A reappraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977-1002.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cartwright, D. (1950). Forward to the 1951 edition. In G.W. Lewin & D. Cartwright (Eds.), *Kurt Lewin: Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (6th ed., pp. 159-165). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Cartwright, D. (1950). Preface. In G.W. Lewin & D. Cartwright (Eds.), *Kurt Lewin: Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (6th ed., pp. 166-168). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Cerese, F.P & Farinella, D. (2009). Public service motivation: How does it relate to management reforms and changes in the working situation of public organizations? A case study of the Italian revenue agency. *Public Policy and Administration*, 24(3), 2810308.
- Chambliss, W.J. (1978). *On the take: From petty crooks to presidents*. (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Chang, C.H., Rosen, C.C. & Levy, P.E (2009). The relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and employee attitudes, strain, and behavior: a meta-analytic examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 779-801.
- Chen, C.C. (2007). The effect of organizational change readiness on organizational learning and business management performance. *The Business Review*, 8(2), 68-74.
- Coughlin, P., Suri, J.F. & Canales, K. (2007). Prototypes as design tools for behavioral organizational change: A design based approach to help organizations change work behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(1), 122-134.
- Cunningham, G.B. (2006). The relationships among commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 29-45.
- Denning, S. (2008). How leaders can use powerful narratives as change catalysts. *Strategy & Leadership*, 36(2), 11-15.
- Durant, R.F. (2008). (2007). Sharpening a knife cleverly: Organizational change, policy paradox, and the “weaponizing” of administrative reforms. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 282-294.
- Elected Office of the Sheriff: Executive Summary. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.sheriffs.org/userfiles/file/The_Elected_Office_of_Sheriff_-_An_Executive_Summary.pdf
- Erwin, D. (2009). Changing organizational performance: examining the change process. *Hospital Topics: Research and Perspectives on Healthcare*, 87(3), 28-39.
- Fernandez, S. & Pitts, D.W. (2007). Under what conditions do public managers favor and pursue organizational change? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 37(3), 324-341.

- Ford, M.W & Greer, B. M. (2006). Profiling change: An empirical study of change process patterns. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 42(4), 420-446.
- Fugate, M., Kinicki, A.J., & Prussia, G. E. (2008). Employee coping with organizational change: An examination of alternative theoretical perspectives and models. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 1-36.
- Garvin, D.A. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organization to work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Garvin, D.A. & Roberto, M.A. (2005). Change through persuasion. *Harvard Business Review*, February, product #2866, 1-10.
- Galpin, T. J. (1996). *The human side of change: A practical guide to organizational redesign*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Gilley, A., McMillan, H.S., & Gilley, J.W. (2009). Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16(1), 38-47.
- Henderson, G.A. (2002). Transformative learning as a condition of transformational change in organizations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(2), 186-214.
- Herold, Fedor, D.M., Caldwell, S. & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 346-357.
- Hodge, B. & Coronado, G. (2007). Understanding change in organizations in a far from equilibrium world. *E:CO*, 9(3), 3-15.
- Holt, D.T., Armenakis, A.A., Field, H.S. & Harris, S.G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232-255.
- Hornung, S. & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Active on the job proactive in charge: How autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(4), 401-426.
- Hornsey, M.J., Grice, T., Jetten, J. , Paulsen, N. & Callan, V. (2007). Group directed criticisms and recommendations for change: Why newcomers arouse more resistance than old timers. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(7), 1036-1048.

- Ilies, R., Judge, T. & Wagner, D. (2006). Making sense of motivational leadership: The trail from transformational leaders to motivated followers. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Jimmieson, N.L., Peach, M., & White, K.M. (2008). Utilizing the theory of planned behavior to inform change management: An investigation of employee intentions to support organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(2), 237-262.
- Judson, A.S. (1991). *Changing behavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change*. (Rev. ed.) Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc.
- Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass
- King County Government. About, home page. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from <http://www.kingcounty.gov/About.aspx>
- King County Archives. Administrative history. Record Groups 120 & 120.001. King County Sheriff's office [1853-1969] and [1999 -]. Retrieved on 11.11.09 from http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/archives/researching/KCSheriffOffice120_001.aspx
- King County Sheriff's Office (2009). 2008 Annual Report. Available electronically at www.kingcounty.gov/safety/sheriff.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Latta, G.F. (2009). A process model of organizational change in cultural context (OC³ model): The impact of organizational culture on leading change. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16(10), 19-37.
- Lewin, G. W. (1948). Preface to the 1948 edition. In G.W. Lewin & D. Cartwright (Eds.), *Kurt Lewin: Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (6th ed., pp. 10-12). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Lewin, K. (1948, 1951). *Kurt Lewin: Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (6th ed., G.W. Lewin & D. Cartwright, Eds.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method, and reality in social science, social equilibria, and social change. *Human Relations*, 9(5), 5-41.
- Marques, J. (2008). Making the best of the inevitable: Change. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, 2(2), 33-42.
- Marshak, R.J. (1993). Lewin meets Confucius: A review of the OD model of change. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 29(4), 393-415.
- McNulty, T. & Ferlie, E. (2004). Process transformation: Limitations to radical organizational change within public service organizations. *Organization Studies*, 25(8), 1389-1412.
- Momeni, N. (2009). The relationship between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2), Summer.
- Moore, M.J. (2005). The transtheoretical model of the stages of change and the phases of transformative learning: comparing two theories of transformational change. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(4), 394-415.
- Nutt, P.C. & Backoff, R.W. (1993). Transforming public organizations with strategic management and strategic leadership. *Journal of Management*, 19(2), 299-347.
- Oreg, S., Nevo, O., Metzger, H., Leder, N. & Castro, D. (2009). Dispositional resistance to change and occupational interests and choices. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 17(3), 312-323.
- O'Shea, P.G., Foti, R.J. & Hauenstein, N.M.A. & Bycio, P. (2009). Are the best leaders both transformational and transactional? A pattern oriented analysis. *Leadership*, 5(2), 237-259.
- O'Toole, J. (1996). *Leading change: The argument for values based leadership*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Phelan, M. W. (2005). Cultural revitalization movements in organizational change management. *Journal of Change Management*, 5(1), 47-56.
- Poole, M.S. & Van de Ven, A.H. (Eds.) (2004). *Handbook of organizational change and innovation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, O. & Griffiths, A. (2009). Coping with the stress of transformational change in a government department. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(2), 204-221.

- Rochet, C., Keramidias, O. & Bout, L. (2008). Crisis as change strategy in public organizations. *i*(1), 65-77.
- Saksvik, I.B. & Hetland, H. (2009). Exploring dispositional resistance to change. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 16(2), 175-183.
- Schein, E.H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Reflections*, 1(1), 58-74.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization* (Rev. ed.) New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Sterner, C.D. (1999, 2009) Web site. President John F. Kennedy's man on the moon address to congress, May 25, 1961. Retrieved on June 20, 2009. HomeOfHeroes.com <http://www.homeofheroes.com/presidents/speeches/kennedyspace.html>
- Walinga, J. (2008). Toward a theory of change readiness: The roles of appraisal, focus, and perceived control. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(3), 315-347.
- Weiner, B.J., Amick, H. & Shoou-Lee, D.L.(2008). Review: Conceptualization and measurement of organizational readiness for change: A review of the literature in health services research and other fields. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 65(4), 379-436.
- Yang, K. & Pandey, S.K. (2008). How do perceived political environment and administrative reform affect employee commitment? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 335-360.