



Organization Development and Change

Division Newsletter

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Winter 2001

Published by the ODC Division

CALL FOR PAPERS: HOW GOVERNMENTS MATTER

Peter Sorensen
Program Chairperson

The 2001 national Academy of Management meeting will be held August 3-8 in Washington, D.C. The theme for this year's meeting is, "How Governments Matter". With this being a year for the presidential election this topic is ever present in our lives as the conference quickly approaches. This theme invites all of us to contemplate, question, theorize and imagine how government plays a role in management and the daily events of organizations. I encourage you to visit the Academy web page to learn more about this year's theme and elaborate upon any of the suggested topics. This call is to invite you to join in this inquiry with us in Washington, D.C.!

Submission Process

I cannot emphasize this too much: please read over and follow the submission guidelines in the All-Academy Newsletter or AoM Website (you can download the information at, <http://www.aom.pace.edu/meetings/2001/callsub.htm>). Like last year, your abstract, title page, and affiliation information will need to be submitted over the AoM website before mailing the printed versions of your submissions. This is because you need to receive what is called an "electronic submission number" from the AoM website (see URL above). This number should appear on your hard copy/printed versions that you submit by mail.

Be sure to print out the electronic submission, as it will serve as the cover page for your printed submission. A printout of your electronic submission should contain the following information:

- The electronic submission identification number
- Formal name, postal and e-mail addresses, telephone and FAX numbers of all authors or presenters
- Title of paper or session
- Up to a 250 word abstract of your paper, art/poetry,

(See Sorensen, page 2)

SELF-ORGANIZING SYSTEMS: OUR DISCIPLINE'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

Kenneth L. Murrell
ODC Division Past Chair 1999-2000

In less than humble terms I would like to frame what I strongly believe will be the most crucial test of our division during the first half of the new century. Can we, as a community of scholars and practitioners, help the world understand and capitalize on the rich human potential of "self-organizing systems"? Can we play a leadership role in creating new human communities and institutions that will make our lives better? Posed not as questions these are more appropriately thrown out as challenges. I think the answer is yes, however if we do not believe we can play a leadership role in this arena then I urge us to dismantle the division and seek another vocation.

I am optimistic about the role we as ODC division members can play. As a core value, I believe our field is based on the notion of human liberation or empowerment if you will, and the natural consequence of this thinking over time is the enhanced ability for us (See Murrell, page 2)

Table of Contents

Peter Sorensen, Call For Papers: How Governments Matter	1
Kenneth L. Murrell, Self-Organizing Systems: Our Discipline's Greatest Challenge	1
ODC Division Executive Committee 2000-2001	2
Books By Members 1998-2000: A Call for Informaiton	3
Georg Schreyögg and Christian Noss, Reframing Change In Organizations: The Equilibrium Logic And Beyond	4
Alannah E. Rafferty And Mark A. Griffin, Beyond The Single Intervention Study: A Collabroative Research Project To Investigate Organizational Change	6
Christina J. Kennedy and David J. Gonsiorowski, Studying Organizational Change: A Change Response Model With Readiness Factors	9
Call For Nominations For Division Officers	11
Feedback to the Editor	12

ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2000-2001

Ronald E. Purser, Division Chairperson,
San Francisco State University
Phone: 415/338-2380
Fax: 415/338-0501
Email: rpurser@sfsu.edu

A.B. (Rami) Shani, Past Division Chairperson,
Cal Poly State University
Phone: 805/756-1756
Fax: 805/754-1473
Email: ashani@calpoly.edu

Peter F. Sorensen, Jr., Program Chairperson,
Benedictine University
Phone: 630/829-6222
Fax: 630/829-6211
Email: psorensen@ben.edu

Christopher G. Worley, Pre-Conference Chair Program Chair Elect,
Pepperdine University
Phone: 949/488-7978
Fax: 949/488-0157
Email: chris.worley@pepperdine.edu

Gretchen Spreitzer, Division Representative,
University of Southern California
Phone: 213/740-9419
Fax: 213/740-3856
Email: gspreitzer@marshall.usc.edu

Lynda M. Kilbourne, Representative-at-Large (2-year term),
Xavier University
Phone: 606/442-0073
Fax: 513/745-4383
Email: kilbourne@xavier.xu.edu

Henrik H. Larsen, International Representative-at-Large (2-year term),
Copenhagen Business School
Phone: +45 38 15 28 15
Fax: +45 38 15 28 28
Email: hhl.ioa@cbs.dk

Phillip H. Mirvis,
Executive Scholar-Practitioner
Phone: 301/652-4600
Fax: 301/774-7377
Email: pmirv@aol.com

Eric A. Goodman,
Web Page Master, Colorado Technical University
Phone: 719/590-6772
Fax: 719/590-6738
Email: egoodman@coloradotech.edu

Karen S. Whelan, Special Projects,
Samford University
Phone: 205/870-2694
Fax: (205) 726-2540
Email: kswhelan@samford.edu

Jim "Gus" Gustafson, Student Representative,
Benedictine University/ELECTRICjob.Com
Phone: 888/482-2562
Fax: 419/818-8174
Email: gus@gusgroup.com

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor,
University of Colorado
Phone: 303/492-8488
Fax: 303/494-1771
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(From Sorensen, page 1)

or symposium submission

- The single division or interest group receiving the paper submission. Papers can only be submitted to one division/interest group. In case of a symposium, identify all the divisions or interest groups receiving the submission. Please use the same name and affiliation on all submissions, and proof carefully.

There are more requirements for preparing and mailing your submissions, so I highly encourage you to consult the national newsletter or the Academy web site for the details. The deadline for receiving mailed/hard copies of your papers and symposia submissions is January 5, 2001.

Send your submission with the copy of the web-based electronic printout sheet to Dr. Peter F. Sorensen, Jr., Ph.D. Program in Organization Development, Attn: Angie Covey, Benedictine University, 5700 College Road, Lisle, Illinois 60532-0900.

(From Murrell, page 1)

to take more responsibility for developing the systems we live and work in. Also the fundamental assumption of our capacity to socially evolve has a natural consequence that we will be able to build our human systems in such a way that they are continuously evolving. While this is beginning to occur it is imperative that we do our best to discover the natural laws that promote that development. The growing level of acceptance for collective behavioral principles is pushing us to be more aware of when and how this natural organizing process occurs. We are challenged to study and learn how this works and how to replicate the many successful experiences we have had in self-organizing. It is incumbent upon us to learn the ways of self-organizing rather than continually depend upon the top down imposed order or the mechanistically inclined models for how we should organize.

The ODC division will play a leadership role in this quest if, for no other reason, than that has been an implicit mission for the last three decades of our existence. The common hope and dream is that we can discover a better way of organizing ourselves for collective action. In developing that better way it not only increases our capacity to respond to global needs but it also assists us in our world-wide development of the higher values we represent as a human commu-

nity. Now, more than ever, it is possible to find the natural self-organizing properties that will enhance our ability to create effective human systems. Systems that that can become what we really want to be a part of and systems that help us find our desired level of meaning and significance that is often lacking in many of our current organizations and institutions.

I propose the following agenda for the division to support with regard to better understanding the nature of and necessary conditions for facilitating the growth of “self-organizing systems” or SOS.

- Identify examples of human systems where there appears to be important characteristics of SOS that would allow for both broad and deep studies of what is at work that helps create these unique forms of self organizing.
- Conduct cross-disciplinary literature reviews that focus on the wisdom in our field and in other areas not locked into a limited set of contemporary assumptions. Seek out the wisdom of the ages and the integrating work that allows us to learn from a richer and deeper human experience base.
- Cooperate with other divisions that share an interest in SOS and help fund and energize research studies that build toward a broad AOM agenda that represents more than a few scholars in isolation.
- Partner with other academic and practitioner groups around the globe who may or may not be associated with the AOM but whose insight and interest would allow for grounding theoretical developments on a wider base of knowledge.
- Work toward active experimentation and efforts to identify funding sources for testing of SOS ideas in live fieldwork. Offer knowledge to sectors of society that are not able to come up with funding but would be willing to participate in field trials of emergent SOS ideas and guidelines.
- Publish in a number of different forms the work taking place to better understand SOS and to help coordinate a broad based research study that is built from an action research and/or action inquiry mode of learning. Use these publications not only to share knowledge but to effectively spread interest in the question of how to help develop the conditions for SOS.
- Inform and educate the media about the nature of

SOS and other human system dynamics to lessen reports based on their inadequate knowledge base.

These are some initiatives I personally would like to see the division undertake. Who else would be better positioned to take on this challenge? We are the scholars and practitioners to take up the call. Working with others we could make a significant difference in reducing the time it takes us to stumble toward discovering the ways of creating conditions for more and more able self-organizing systems. Following up my reflective essay in last year’s newsletter on the future of OD being based in “Spirit, Community, Work, Wisdom and Transformation” it is clear that if we hope to take our field into the future we need both the means to understand and capacity to create self-organizing systems. With SOS the potential exists to build work communities that do have high levels of spirit, who get the work done, and who, building from the wisdom of our human experience, have the capacity to transform the ways we work and live together. This can be an exciting challenge for our division and we can rally around this to build a shared commitment for moving our division into the new century.

In closing I first want to thank all of the members of the division who have contributed so much to make the division ever stronger and who have had exhibited great patience with my efforts to be in service to our shared cause. From the heart I want to sincerely thank the many fine board members I have had the privilege of working with over the last five years. It has been a wonderful experience and now that it is coming to a close I am going to very much miss the challenge of our shared responsibility and the collegiality of some really great professionals. Thanks to all for allowing me the opportunity.

**BOOKS BY MEMBERS 1998-2000:
A CALL FOR INFORMATION**

The next issue of the ODC Newsletter will contain a bibliography of books published by ODC Division members during 1998-2000. If you have had a book published during this three-year period, please send the appropriate bibliographic information to Wayne Boss at the following email address: <wayne.boss@colorado.edu>.

REFRAMING CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONS: THE EQUILIBRIUM LOGIC AND BEYOND

Georg Schreyögg and Christian Noss
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
ODC 2000 Best Paper Award

Today, the ability to master change has become the critical challenge in enhancing and sustaining corporate success. Organizational Development (OD) has dominated the field of change management for decades. Currently, a number of theories of organizational change are being explored. Among them, the Punctuated Equilibrium Model is rapidly gaining general acceptance (Gersick, 1991; Romanelli & Tushman, 1994).

These prominent conceptions of organizational change draw on a very similar logic. They picture change processes as interruptions of a state of organizational harmony or equilibrium. Organizations are conceptualized as relatively stable entities based on rules and routines designed to guarantee continuity (state of equilibrium stabilized by structural inertia). The phases of stability are punctuated by eruptions of change periods (phases of transformation). These dramatic periods of change are expected to bring about fundamental shifts in patterns of thinking and activity, which establish the basis for a new organizational equilibrium.

This widely accepted “harmony/transformation logic” rests on two basic assumptions. Our further argument calls the validity of these implicit assumptions into question and sketches an alternative logic of organizational change.

Challenging the Basic Assumptions of the Equilibrium Change Logic

Assumption 1: Organizational change is a clear-cut period. The equilibrium models depict change as a distinctive, clear-cut period in organizational evolution. In this perspective, change processes have a clearly defined beginning and end. Organizational processing is composed of separate phases, which create a linear sequence. The main problem with this perspective is that it badly underestimates the complexity and richness of organizational processes and dynamics in both empirical and conceptual terms. Many studies inform us about different conditions and developments in actual change processes (March, 1994): organizational problems and problem-solving processes largely overlap and interpenetrate, management can never

hope to solve and thereby end a change problem in the long run, etc. This critique results from the fact that change processes have to be realized in a world of inherent ambiguity and uncertainty (Weick, 1995). Thus, change processes and “normal” (routine) operations are fully intertwined. Clear-cut points as to where change starts, and especially where it ends, are hard to find in real organizations.

Assumption 2: Organizational change is an exception in organizational life. The second, and even more important assumption concerns the nature of organizational dynamics. Equilibrium models depict change as an extraordinary event, a rare exception in organizational life. It is not only considered as an extraordinary phase, but also as a threatening and somewhat chaotic stage (in that it involves the dissolution of long standing defense mechanisms). Change amounts to disturbances which are likely to undermine the system’s rationality and efficiency. This view results from the underlying idea that effective organizations are stable and well-ordered entities. The primacy is on stability. Stability stands for equilibrium and this in turn stands for efficiency, rationality and harmony. Obviously, these ideas originate in classical organization theory and its core conception of the well functioning bureaucracy (Weber, 1947). They stand in sharp contrast to more recent views of effective organizational functioning such as the “chronically unfrozen” organization (Weick, 1977), dynamic networks, or post-industrial configurations (Clegg, 1990), all of which focus on fluidity as a core feature of modern organizations.

Underlying Methodology. Some further remarks are due on the underlying methodology. The model of punctuated equilibrium treats the alternating sequences of equilibrium and change as if they occur as a *law-like process* in nature. The sequential connection between the two states is seen as a causal certainty. This, however, is far too mechanistic a perspective; there are no objective imperatives that enforce this type of change sequencing. Organizations are no “trivial machines” (von Foerster, 1981) paced by natural laws such as the pressure equalization of two gases in thermodynamics. In those processes, the end state of a physical experiment is foreseeable for structural reasons. This is not the case in the complex field of organizational behavior. Moreover, organizations are essentially self-reflexive systems, i.e. the members of an organization are able to communicate and make

sense of their situation as well as to act and react to it on the basis of their cognitions. By implication, organizations can reflect on the situation, diagnose inertia and mobilize forces against states of equilibrium.

In summary: This short discussion clearly indicates that a new conception of organizational change is required, a conception that overcomes the law-like episodic view of change and sees change as a normal feature of modern organizations.

Outlines of a Learning-Based Theory of Change

It is our main thesis that the basic idea of *Organizational Learning* (OL) embedded in *Modern (Social) Systems Theory* (MST) can provide a promising framework for reorienting the discourse about change. The very reason for this proposal is the general insight that learning and change are closely related *on the conceptual level*. From a conceptual point of view, OL rejects the idea that there are stable organizational solutions to enable organizations to match external and internal problems over an extended period of time. Instead, the concept of OL starts with the insight that – in order to survive – organizations are inherently restless. They raise new questions to old problems and/or give new answers to old questions. They permanently adapt and re-adapt to environmental requirements. In this very basic sense, the notion of movement, change, and fluidity in organizations is endemic to the learning perspective.

In particular, the *cognitive models* on organizational learning elaborate on the issue of *continuous* organizational change. In essence, these approaches start with a (self-) reflexive perspective of a social entity vis-à-vis its environment and view learning processes as revisions of the organization's cognitions, cognitive patterns or of its *knowledge-base* (Hedberg, 1981; Nonaka, 1994). Portraying organizations as self-reflexive makes it difficult to find reasons why an organization should suddenly cease cognitive enacting, information processing, and knowledge development. Thus, the learning/change perspective stands in sharp contrast to the equilibrium-oriented view on change. It conceives organizations as dynamic entities, thereby overcoming the law-like pacing of processes into change and non-change periods. There are no periods exclusively dedicated to (radical) change or stability.

A severe problem is raised, however, by conceptualizing organizations purely in terms of movement – the

institutional character of organizations thereby vanishes. As is well known, organizations cannot be thought of as having no boundaries or boundary maintaining (stabilizing) activities. There is no such thing as a “boundaryless organization” in the empirical world. Boundaries are, however, effective just because of being *valid* for a longer period of time. Organizations need some processual order (selectivity) to reduce environmental complexity to a workable level. Do these requirements contradict our suggestions?

The Contribution of Modern Systems Theory to a Model of Continuous Organizational Change

At this point, MST (Luhmann, 1995) helps to provide an integrative view, in that it facilitates the integration of the restless learning perspective with institutional requirements. MST has two major implications for our argument: firstly, since systems are never boundaryless, any concept of organizational fluidity, therefore, has to account for stabilizing procedures. Moreover, and secondly, OL is not an isolated activity of “intelligent” systems or the occasional acquisition of new knowledge in order to gain competitive advantage. Rather it is a basic systemic function which helps to make the system prepared for contingencies and surprises. Thus, OL increases the organization's general competence to keep the system alert and flexible – a basic requirement in a complex environment.

Invariance and Change in a New Perspective

In our framework, stabilizing procedures can be conceived as deliberate decisions *not to learn*; the system is advised to adhere closely to the prefixed expectations, even if deviations do occur (Luhmann, 1995: 319 pp.). By their very nature, non-learning rules are precarious. If not carefully surveilled, they are likely to threaten the system's survival. For system management, this implies the necessity of continuously scanning the environment and strengthening the system's vigilance (Schreyögg & Steinmann, 1987). To put it differently, organizational learning as a basic operation includes the case of *intended non-learning*, i.e. the decision not to learn in particular situations (stabilization).

A learning system also has to learn to make use of the advantages of non-learning. This does not contradict what we have said so far. Non-learning is thought of here as a deliberate procedure, which is to be made an integral part of an overarching deutero-learning

process (Bateson, 1972). On the one hand, stabilization is the outcome of past learning processes; the organization has learned to take advantage of formalizing certain actions. On the other, stabilizing procedures are always prone to fail and therefore have to be monitored continuously and, if necessary, stopped. In other words, to remain advantageous, stabilizing procedures have to be embedded in a learning framework. This is indeed paradoxical: a system cannot refrain from any stabilization, but in the face of uncertainty and complexity, stabilization is always potentially blinding and, therefore, risky in nature. This paradox causes the system to be restless and makes change a permanent feature of organizational life. In contrast to the equilibrium model, in which change is the problem - it is the selective stabilization (non-learning), which is the problem in our conceptual proposal.

Some readers may feel uneasy with this complicated pattern of simultaneous learning and non-learning. We should, however, refrain from any oversimplification in change theory – simplifications have been around for too long and they have not worked.

Authors' note: We gratefully acknowledge the help of Susan van der Werff.

References

- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.
- Clegg, S. R. (1990). *Modern organizations: Organization studies in the postmodern world*. London: Sage.
- Foerster, H. v. (1981). *Observing systems*. Seaside, CA: Intersystems.
- Gersick, C. J. G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 10-36.
- Hedberg, B. (1981). How organizations learn and unlearn. In Nystrom, P. C. and Starbuck, W. H. (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*. Vol. 1, (pp. 3-28). London: Oxford University Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- March, J. G. (1994). *A primer of decision making: How decisions happen*. New York: Free Press.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organization knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5, 14-37.
- Romanelli, E. & Tushman, M. L. (1994). Organizational transformation as punctuated equilibrium: An empirical test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1141-1166.
- Schreyögg, G. & Steinmann, H. (1987). Strategic control: A new perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 91-103.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Free Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1977). Organization design: Organizations as self-designing systems. *Organizational Dynamics*, 6, 31-46.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

BEYOND THE SINGLE INTERVENTION STUDY: A COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Alannah E. Rafferty and Mark A. Griffin
Queensland University of Technology
ODC 2000 Best Practice-Related Paper Award

Rapid changes in the external business environment have resulted in modifications to traditional management roles. Middle managers are increasingly being required to act as transformational leaders who are responsible for stimulating and managing change (Bass, 1999; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Spreitzer & Quinn, 1996). Organizational development (OD) must support managers as they attempt to operate in this environment by developing theory and practice guidelines suitable for this new group of research consumers. However, past research has concentrated on implementing and evaluating single intervention studies which are designed and delivered by consultants (Covin, 1992). This body of work does not reflect the diverse types of change interventions that occur in large organizations and the differences in implementation that can occur within work groups. The current paper presents findings from an ongoing project designed to investigate factors underlying the success of management driven OD activities.

Improving the Work Environment

Recent work in the area of organizational health suggests that the quality of the work environment is a vital element in a "healthy" environment (Miller, Griffin, & Hart, 1999; Griffin, Hart, & Wilson-Evered, 2000). One measure of the quality of the work environment is organizational climate, or individuals' perceptions of relatively enduring aspects of the work environment (James, James & Ashe, 1990). Climate has been demonstrated to affect individual well being (Michela, Lukaszewski, & Allengrante, 1995), group processes (Griffin & Mathieu, 1997), and performance (Brown & Leigh, 1996). The extent to which inter-

ventions impact on organizational climate has been identified as an important indicator of OD success within the current organization.

Characteristics of Interventions and OD Success

Three characteristics of OD interventions were investigated. First, the type of intervention implemented was classified using Porras & Robertson's (1992) model of key internal organizational factors. Organizing arrangement interventions modify the formal organization in some manner while social factor interventions affect relationships among staff or organizational culture. Technological interventions affect the manner in which work is performed. Physical setting interventions affect the concrete structures and objects of the physical work environment.

Second, the number and mix of interventions adopted was investigated. Covin (1992) reported that the number of interventions adopted significantly influenced the effectiveness of a change program. Number of interventions adopted is influential because increasing the number of activities increases the number of organizational variables affected, heightening the probability of behaviour change (Covin, 1992; Nadler, 1981).

The mix of different types of interventions adopted has been found to be influential. Nadler (1981) suggests that organizations are composed of closely interconnected parts and a change in one element of a system results in changes in other parts of the system. Macy and Izumi (1993) reported that the use of multiple action levers from different categories was related to improvement in financial outcomes.

Third, the number of organizational levels at which an intervention is directed at may influence OD success (Neuman, Edwards & Raju, 1989; Porras, 1979; Rodgers & Hunter, 1991). Rodgers and Hunter (1991) reported that a management by objectives intervention was more successful when senior management supported and participated in the intervention.

Organization Characteristics and Sample

The focal organization was a large public sector agency in Australia with over 3000 employees located in 30 business units. The primary task of the organization is strategically planning and developing road infrastructure, and managing an extensive road network. The business units were the unit of analysis for the current study.

Measures and Procedure

This study involved three separate sources of data. First, a statewide survey assessing climate and morale was administered during May 1998 and in May 1999 to all employees. The statewide survey had a response rate of 86% in 1998 and 84% in 1999. Measures were based on the Organizational Health Questionnaire (Hart, Griffin, Wearing, & Cooper, 1996).

Second, each business unit within the organization completed quarterly enterprise development agreement (EDA) reports. These documents provide a report on the actions undertaken within business units to improve a number of key performance indicators including organizational climate and morale. This paper focuses on the OD activities described in the March and June 1999 reports. Two hundred and twenty one interventions were reported to have occurred within the 30 business units over the two EDA reports.

Third, focus groups were conducted with seventeen work groups to obtain specific information on leadership and employee feedback interventions. These two types of intervention were examined because leadership development is an area of focus in the organization, while appraisal and recognition is an area of relative concern.

Three aspects of interventions were assessed. First, the number of leadership or feedback interventions in each unit was measured. Second, the mix of leadership or feedback interventions was assessed by counting the number of different types of interventions used. Third, we assessed the number of organizational levels at which each intervention was directed. We differentiated four organizational levels within an organization; the individual, the leader/manager, the work unit, and the organization as a whole (Porras, 1979).

EDA Reports

The number of organizing arrangement interventions, technological interventions, and the total number of interventions implemented were significantly positively related to perceptions of leadership and employee feedback in 1999.

Change in organizational climate was assessed by regressing 1999 climate results on the total number of interventions implemented. When controlling for unit size and climate 1998, total number of interventions predicted change in leadership 1999, change in employee feedback and change in morale 1999.

Focus Group Analysis

The second analysis revealed strong positive results for supportive leadership interventions but little effect for feedback interventions. The number and mix of leadership interventions adopted was significantly positively associated with supportive leadership and morale in 1999, and with quality of work life in 1998. The number of organizational levels involved in leadership interventions was also associated with improvements in leadership 1999. One significant relationship was found between feedback interventions and climate and morale. As the number of levels of the organization affected by an appraisal and recognition intervention increased, so did perceptions of leadership in 1999.

Finally, results indicated that units with higher quality of work life in 1998 were more likely to implement a greater number of leadership interventions, a greater mix of leadership interventions, and aim these at more levels within the organization. Groups reporting lower quality of work life in 1998 were more likely to implement a greater mix of appraisal interventions.

Discussion

The extent and intensity of management driven change interventions had a positive impact on organizational climate. Interventions crossing multiple organizational levels and addressing multiple factors within the environment were more likely to result in positive change over the period of the study. Results indicate that managers need to do more of the “right” things in order to improve climate and morale. In the current study, this involved implementing organizing arrangement, technological, or leadership interventions.

Units with lower morale in 1998 were more likely to implement less effective intervention strategies (a mix of appraisal interventions) than units with higher morale. Born and Mathieu (1996) reported a related effect. They found that work groups who used survey-guided feedback tended to have better climate and morale to begin with, and their climate and morale improved significantly over time. However, groups who failed to use survey-guided feedback had lower climate and morale initially, and got worse over time. Born and Mathieu (1996) used the phrase “the rich were getting richer while the poor were getting poorer” (p. 398) to describe this phenomenon. The current study provides evidence of the process underlying this effect, with better functioning units adopting more effective improvement strategies.

Practical Implications

Successful management of organizational change is a strategic imperative in today’s business environment. However, there is a paucity of practical guidelines designed to aid organizational change leaders. The current paper addressed this lack. This paper demonstrated that middle management change activities do impact on climate and morale, and identified activities that were particularly likely to be associated with improvements in climate and morale. Importantly, this paper was also able to identify work groups who reported lower quality of work life and link this to the type, number, mix and broadness of the change activities that they implemented. Identification of such groups is important, as these groups may need to be provided with greater support in choosing and implementing OD activities that are likely to improve climate and morale.

References

- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-25.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Born, D. H., & Mathieu, J. E. (1996). Differential effects of survey-guided feedback: The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. *Group and Organization Management*, 21(4), 388-403.
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 358-368.
- Covin, T. J. (1992). Common intervention strategies for large-scale change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 13(4), 27-32.
- Griffin, M. A., Hart, P. M., & Wilson-Evered, E. (2000). Using employee opinion surveys to improve organizational health. In L. R. Murphy & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Health and productive work: An international perspective*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Griffin, M. A., & Mathieu, J., E. (1997). Modeling organizational processes across hierarchical levels: Climate, leadership, and group process in work groups. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 731-744.
- Hart, P. M., Griffin, M. A., Wearing, A. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). *Manual for the QPASS Survey*. Brisbane: Public Sector Management Commission.
- James, L. R., James, L. A., & Asche, D. K. (1990). The meaning of organizations: The role of cognition and values. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 40-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Macy, B. A., & Izumi, H. (1993). Organizational Change, design and work innovation: A meta-analysis of 131 North American Field Studies- 1961-1991. *Research in organizational change and*

development, 7, 235-313.

Michela, J. L., Lukaszewski, M. P., & Allengrante, J. P. (1995). Organizational climate and work stress: A general framework applied to inner-city schoolteachers. In S. L. Sauter, & L. R. Murphy (Eds.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress* (pp. 61-80). Washington, DC: APA.

Miller, R., L., Griffin, M. A., & Hart, P. M. (1999). Personality and organizational health: The role of conscientiousness. *Work & Stress*, 13(1), 17-19.

Nadler, D. A. (1981). Managing organizational change: An integrative perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(2), 191-211.

Neuman, G. A., Edwards, J. E., & Raju, N. S. (1989). Organizational development interventions: A meta-analysis of their effects in satisfaction and other attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 461-489.

Porras, J. I. (1979). The comparative impact of different OD techniques and interventions intensities. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 15, 156-178.

Porras, J. I., & Robertson, P. J. (1992). Organizational development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough, et-al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 3* (2nd ed.). (pp. 719-822). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rodgers, R., & Hunter, J. I. (1991). The impact of management by objectives on organizational productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 322-336.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Quinn, R. E. (1996). Empowering middle managers to be transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(3), 237-261.

STUDYING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: A CHANGE RESPONSE MODEL WITH READINESS FACTORS

Christina J. Kennedy,

State University of New York at Binghamton

David J. Gonsiorowski, Webraiser, Inc.

ODC 2000 Best Interactive Paper Award

Just about every aspect of business is subject to a whirlwind of change. These aspects include, among others, technology improvements, mergers or acquisitions, structural changes, top management changes or cultural changes. It is endemic that change seems to apply to just about everything. Even the very nature of scientific research is based on the methodology of studying how a focal variable changes or is changed, by other variables. Because change is so fundamental, the focus of research can be on topics such as the types of change, the sources of change, the effects of change, and organizational responses to change. It is topics such as these that provide the greatest value to organizations as they can be studied for descriptive

explanations or prescriptive recommendations.

It feels intuitive that various change events, like the ones described above, manifest themselves differently in an organization. For example, the response an organization must make because of deciding to redirect the focus of their key products or services will be different than the response an organization must make if they upgrade the operating systems of their internal computers. The difference between the previously mentioned scenario generally falls into two main concerns. The first main concern is how pervasive the change will be to the organization. In addressing this concern, one needs to understand how important the system or process is to the core business of the organization. The second main concern is the time frame allowed or required for completing the change. For competitive reasons or maybe even corporate survival, enacting a change very quickly may be imperative. Changes can therefore, be classified as either short-term radical, long-term radical, continuous improvement, or incremental changes. Short-term radical changes are massive changes to fundamental systems or processes that are either completed reactively or in the short term. Long-term radical changes are massive changes to fundamental systems or processes that are completed proactively or in the long-term. Continuous improvements are modifications to existing systems or processes that are completed proactively or in the long-term. Incremental changes are modifications to existing systems or processes that are completed reactively or in the short-term.

Change research is dominant in many other disciplines in the social sciences and one key learning from these other disciplines is that the response to a change tends to be the phenomena of interest. Because of this key learning, change is defined as 'a system, process or behavioral response to a stimuli that originates either internal or external to the organization.' While the method followed to complete a change effort is critical, this paper focuses on the types of change responses and the readiness factors that can be managed to support the change effort. Thus, this paper serves as a precursor to the change management models, helping the organization to determine the best course of action, and suggesting organizational factors that can be readied for the change effort being planned.

The classification of responses draws heavily from the discipline of biology. Biology was used as a reference because of the extensive emphasis on distinguishing types of organic responses to environmental stimuli. This is the closest analogy to organizations based on the definition offered earlier. The responses are adapt, transform, evolve and refine. The alignment of the responses to the change types is depicted in Table 1.

So, given the above discussion, how does an organization ensure that the business survives despite the onslaught of constant change? The answer seems to lie in the identification of the factors that are within a company's control that prepare the organization to handle the changes, called readiness factors. Because the organizational focus is on the response to change, readiness factors suggest variables that can be manipulated to prepare for the appropriate type of change. The most common factors are leadership and management style, performance management, and communication.

The leadership styles that are most appropriate in the framework of organizational change are transformational and transactional (Bass, 1985). The transformational style will be most appropriate when the change is either proactively-driven or will occur over a long period of time. Because the transformational style focuses more on visions, missions, inspiration and intellectual stimulation, the employees will be more inspired to accept a change as a proactive measure. The fact that the change may also take a long period of time requires that the motivation be internalized. The transactional style will be most appropriate when the change is a reactive measure or must occur very quickly.

There are numerous dichotomous categorizations for various management styles or managerial philosophies. Some of the more widely used styles include Theory Y and Theory X (McGregor, 1960) and Consideration and Initiating Structure (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). For this paper, these various management styles have been synthesized resulting in behaviors that are labeled supportive and directive.

Performance management is employed in organizations for two basic reasons – evaluative and developmental (McGregor, 1972; Rheem, 1995) and in the context of a change environment, management has a greater or lesser role in the measurement and

execution of the performance management system. This is represented as management ownership. Intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement are tools to facilitate employee motivation (Skaggs, Dickinson, & O'Connor, 1992). Extrinsic reinforcement includes motivators like good pay, status, job security, company procedures, and tends to be most effective achieving results immediately. Intrinsic reinforcement includes motivators like achievement, the work itself, advancement, responsibility, recognition, potential for growth, and competence. Intrinsic rewards tend to be motivators for longer time periods than extrinsic rewards. Based on the type of change required, management can determine the need for supportive or directive behavior and tie it to their use of intrinsic or extrinsic rewards.

Most researchers recommend that the implementers of change in an organization communicate with the employees. And the emphasis of communication is on the timing or frequency. But few have provided clear suggestions on what the intent or content of the communication should be beyond being able to say that the implementers are keeping the employees up to date. The field of marketing provides a rich portfolio of the intention behind communications and the motivating effects of rich communications. A mnemonic AIDA is taken from the marketing field and applied to organizational communication in the context of change. AIDA stands for Attention, Interest, Desire and Action, and is still commonly promoted in the marketing literature (Redman & Mathews, 1992; Smith & Swinyard, 1982).

In the AIDA mnemonic, attention refers to the act of getting the audience engaged in the activity of paying attention to whatever you want them to pay attention to. Interest refers to getting the audience personally engaged in the activity. Desire refers to shifting the focus of the motivation from the giver of information to the receiver of information. And action is the activity that the giver of the message wishes the receiver of the message to do. The alignment of the AIDA mnemonic (as well as the other readiness factors) with the change response types is in Table 1.

A stream of research based on the model presented here provides an opportunity to try and reverse the trend of organizational change efforts that cost millions of dollars, yet provide disappointing results. A prescriptive model that organizations can apply as change events unfold is invaluable. Couple the sug-

Table 1
Summary of change types, responses and readiness factors.

Change Response Types

	Adapt	Develop	Refine	Evolve
Type of change	Short term radical	Long term radical	Short term incremental	Long term incremental
Leadership Management Style	Transactional/ Directive	Transformational/ Directive	Transactional/ Supportive	Transformational/ Supportive
Performance Management Reinforcement/ Mgmt Ownership	Extrinsic/ Directive	Intrinsic/ Directive	Extrinsic/ Supportive	Extrinsic/ Supportive
Communication Intent	Attention/ Interest	Attention/Desire/ Interest	Interest/ Action	Attention/Interest/ Desire/Action

gestions of this model with change management models that prescribe methodologies to successfully complete a change event, and the field has gone a long way to prepare corporate American for the challenges the future promises.

References

Bass, Bernard M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press..

McGregor, D. *The human side of enterprise*. (1960). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

McGregor, D. (1972). An uneasy look at performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(4), 133-139.

Redman, T. & Mathews, B.P. (1992). Advertising for effective managerial recruitment. *Journal of General Management*, 18(2), 29-45.

Rheem, H. Performance management: A progress report. (1995). *Harvard Business Review*, 73(3), 11-13.

Skaggs, K.J., Dickinson, A.M. & O'Connor, K.A. (1992). The

use of concurrent schedules to evaluate the effects of extrinsic rewards on "intrinsic motivation": A replication. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 12(1), 45-84.

Smith, R.E. & Swinyard, W.R. (1982). Information response models: an integrated approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(4), 81-93.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR DIVISION OFFICERS

During the coming year the members of the Organization Development and Change Division will elect a new Division Representative and two Member-At-Large Representatives to the ODC Executive Committee. The Division Representative will serve for five years on the Executive Committee, including terms as Program Chairperson and Division Chairperson. The Member-At-Large Representatives will serve in their positions for two years. We invite nominations from the membership for these positions. Self-nominations are acceptable. Please complete the form below and mail nominations to: Dr. Gretchen Spreitzer, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, Bridge Hall 306, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0808 or email the information to Gretchen at the following address: gspreitzer@marshall.usc.edu

Nomination

Name of nominee _____

Affiliation _____

Phone number (if known) _____

Mailing address _____

I nominate this person for the following position:

Division Representative _____ Member-At-Large _____

Please Address All Correspondence to:

R. Wayne Boss
Academy of Management ODC Newsletter
Graduate School of Business Administration
Campus Box 419
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309
(303) 492-8488

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the OD Newsletter may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. After completing your comments, please detach this page and return it to the editor. *(Please Print All Comments.)*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

1. Do you have any comments that you would like to share with the Editor (comments on articles from the last issue, comments on this issue, suggestions, etc.?)

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

2. Is there any important information about you or a colleague that you would like to have appear in the next issue?

PUBLICATIONS

3. Please list below any recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague. (Indicate full citation.)
