

Running Head: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Organizational Change

Organizational Change

Dynamic environment requires constant change. For an organization to be successful in midst of highly-competitive market and demanding customers it is imperative for organization to regularly, if not constantly evaluate the need for initiating changes. Organizational change enables a company to achieve organizational success by providing tools and techniques for the organization to meet the challenges and demands of both the external and internal environment.

When an organization or a company begins its operations, it creates its vision, mission, goals and objectives based on the prevailing environment. Organizations create strategic plan within the context of the existing environment. However, the environment does not remain stagnant. The environment to which organizations and corporations operate is a dynamic world where only change is constant. Thus, there is a need for constant revisions, alterations, and changes in strategic plans, even in goals and objectives to be able to meet the challenges and demands of the dynamic environment.

Change Factors

There are many factors that can trigger changes within the environment and within the organization. A study by the American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) with ICF Kaiser (1997) identifies both external and internal factors that trigger organizational changes.

External factors include changing regulatory or legal environment; competition; changing expectations on quality, productivity, and customer satisfaction; public image; and new technologies. A new law, decree or even a treaty may affect the operations of an organization. Such legal constraints may cause an organization to cease some of its operations or revises its operations to meet the changes within the legal environment. Likewise, technological advances affect productivity and quality. Moreover, it makes the competition tougher. Hence, there is a

need to keep revising, adapting, and changing to meet the threats and opportunities provided by technological advances and competition. An organization or a corporation that refuses to grow and develop will fail to adapt to the changes as well as protect it from threats or seize opportunities to improve its operations.

Aside from the external factors, factors happening within the organization itself can also cause organizational change. Financial constraints such as declining/increasing profits, and declining/increasing revenue; merger and acquisition; and employee morale can cause organizational change. Top-level management must establish ways to provide solutions to its internal problems or concerns. For example, low employee morale will affect the productivity of the firm. Thus, it is imperative that human resource management address this issue by finding out the root causes of the declining employee morale. This is to prevent further damage to the production and operation of the firm. The management will then have to decide what changes will be implemented to raise the employee morale and motivate them to work together towards organizational success.

Other factors such as changes in business operations such as outsourcing, globalization, automation, downsizing, best practices, re-engineering, and repositioning can also cause changes in the organization. These changes are inevitable and could either be a threat or an opportunity for an organization. With the right approach, the organizational change can turn any threat into an opportunity for growth.

All the factors, external or internal, pose one great challenge to an organization: "balancing the demands and expectations among stakeholders---including customers, employees, management, and shareholders" (APQC, 1997). Thus, it is very important for an organization to identify these factors and to determine ways on how to address them.

An organization must be evaluated based on the impact of the different factors, externally and internally, on the organizational operations, management and success. There are many tools available for evaluating the need for organizational change. One of the organizational analysis tools used to diagnose the need for organizational change and transformation is the Burke-Litwin model. Developed to evaluate organizational change and performance, the Burke-Litwin “provides a link between an assessment of the wider institutional context and the nature and process of change within an organization” (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning") by focusing on the following key points:

- The external environment is the most powerful driver for organizational change (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning").
- Changes in the external environment lead to significant changes within an organization – its mission and strategy, its organizational culture and its leadership (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning").
- Changes in these key factors lead to other changes within an organization – changes to structure, systems and management practices. These are more operational factors and changes in them may or may not have an organization-wide impact (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning").
- Together these changes affect motivation, which in turn impacts on individual and Organizational performance (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning").
- The model describes 12 organizational variables (incorporating the 7 variables of the 7-S model) and the relationships between them. Each of the variables interacts and a

change in any one of them can eventually impact on the others. This is useful in explaining not only how organizations perform, but also how they can be changed (ChildHope, 2004, "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning").

Specifically, the Burke-Litwin model evaluates an organization based on external environment, mission and strategy, leadership, organizational culture, structure, management practices, work unit climate, task and individual skills, individual needs and values, motivation, and individual and organizational performance. Using the Burke-Litwin Model, an organization can be diagnosed for organizational change by answering the Dimensions of Model Key Questions. For this paper, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is diagnosed for organizational change and transformation.

The investigation conducted by the Columbia Accident Investigation Board (CAIB) on the accident involving NASA's space shuttle Columbia shows that casual factors of the accident include the structure, hierarchy, culture, management practice, and work unit climate of the organization. According to the Board, there were three major reasons for the accident: mission management team shortcomings, managers little concern for mission safety, and safety shortcomings.

The CAIB believed Management Mission Team was overconfident as there was "no compelling explanation for why bipod foam had separated on ascent during the preceding mission...with the low meetings during STS-107.... the organization determined it did not need daily meetings during a mission, despite regulations that state otherwise" (NASA Report, 2003, p. 192). CAIB observed that meetings conducted during the Columbia mission did not encourage participation of all concerned parties due to the organization's hierarchy which encourages silence among the employees on the bottom of it (NASA Report, 2003).

Furthermore, CAIB found out that managers demonstrated little concern on the safety of the mission. The Board asserted that:

Organizations with strong safety cultures generally acknowledge that a leader's best response to unanimous consent is to play devil's advocate and encourage an exhaustive debate. Mission Management Team leaders failed to seek out such minority opinions. For these methods to be effective, they must mitigate the fear of retribution, and management and technical staff must pay attention. Shuttle Program hazard reporting is seldom used, safety time outs are at times disregarded, and informal efforts to gain support are squelched. (NASA Report, 2003, p. 192).

More importantly, the CAIB concluded that the accident was primarily caused by the safety shortcomings of the organization.

The Board believe[d] that the safety organization, due to a lack of capability and resources independent of the Shuttle Program, was not an effective voice in discussing technical issues or mission operations pertaining to STS-107. The safety personnel present in the Debris Assessment Team, Mission Evaluation Room, and on the Mission Management Team were largely silent during the events leading up to the loss of Columbia. That silence was not merely a failure of safety, but a failure of the entire organization (NASA Report, 2003, p. 192).

CAIB reached their conclusion upon thorough examinations of the archives of communication among those on top of the hierarchy and those occupying the lower parts. They also conducted interviews with among the bottom-level workers up to the top-level officers. All in all, the findings of CAIB indicate that there is a problem within the organizational structure and operations of NASA.

Based on the evaluation tools set by the Burke-Litwin model, it can be concluded that NASA is in need of reorganization, restructuring, and transformation as its structure, hierarchy, management practices, mission and strategy, and individual and organizational performance are no longer effective in ensuring the safety and success of its space missions. Therefore, NASA must undergo reorganization, restructuring and transformation to shift its focus on the safety of its missions by improving the operations and internal communications process and hierarchy.

Every Mission Management Team must be diagnosed for its preparedness to meet any foreseen and unforeseen challenges and safety risks involving a space mission. In this way, the need for organizational changes will be determined and must be implemented as soon as possible.

The experience of NASA with the accident involving Columbia indicates how an organization must commit itself to changes in order to meet the demands and challenges of the changes within the environment. While NASA's case may be different from the experience of other organizations, particularly the corporate ones, it indicates the importance of self-evaluation towards organizational change.

For some leaders, performing organizational change may be considered risky. For others, implementing organizational changes has become a great challenge. Kurt Lewin (1999) proposes a three-step way to initiating organizational changes. Lewin's theory requires rejecting and replacing prior learning through the process of unfreezing-making the change- refreezing. Lewin's theory is "based on the idea that when a group reaches a level of change, it is difficult to stay at that level and the group will eventually return to the original place" ("Core Management Theory", 2007). Lewin proposes a way to maintain the desired level of change through the unfreezing, changing, and refreezing processes.

The first step, unfreezing, prepares the organization for change. The preparation for change is very important in an organization because change is something that groups have

difficult time accepting, adapting, and adjusting to. Lewin states that “sudden and unexpected change is socially disruptive” (“Core Management Theory”, 2007). The unfreezing stage orients the group to the future changes and makes them as comfortable as possible with the changes before such changes are implemented. According to Schein (cited in Wirth, 2004), there are three sub-processes involved in unfreezing:

- Disconfirmation where present conditions lead to dissatisfaction, such as not meeting personal goals. However, the larger the gap between what is believed and what needs to be believed for change to occur, the more likely the new information will be ignored (Wirth, 2004).
- Previous beliefs now being seen as invalid creates “survival anxiety.” However, this may not be sufficient to prompt change if learning anxiety is present (Wirth, 2004).
- Learning anxiety triggers defensiveness and resistance due to the pain of having to unlearn what had been previously accepted. Three stages occur in response to learning anxiety: denial; scapegoating & passing the buck; and maneuvering & bargaining. It is necessary to move past the possible anxieties for change to progress. This can be accomplished by either having the survival anxiety be greater than the learning anxiety or, preferably, learning anxiety could be reduced (Wirth, 2004).

The second step, making the change, involves the implementation of the changes within the organization. Changes are introduced in gradual progression from the old way to the new way. This second step is necessary to ensure that members of the organization are slowly introduced to the changes. Changes are initiated and develop during this process.

Wirth (2004) states that there are “three possible impacts from processing new information are: words take on new or expanded meaning, concepts are interpreted within a

broader context, and there is an adjustment in the scale used in evaluating new input.” This process would allow the members of the organization to have “a concise view of the new state” so that they can “clearly identify the gap between the present state and that being proposed” (Wirth, 2004).

The third step, unfreezing, is the final step in establishing change. It requires the group to permanently implement the changes that was created in the second step. This is the most important step because it allows the organization to address the complaints, and side effects, resulting from the changes implemented in the second step. This final step is the “only way to complete Lewin’s change cycle without reverting to the original way the group functioned previously. Constantly reinforcing the change until it is accepted and practiced consistently is essential in assuring the continuation of the change” (“Core Management Theory”, 2007).

Conclusion

Organizational changes are necessary to empower the organization to meet the demands and challenges of the external and internal environment. The successful implementation of organizational change lies on the ability of leaders to diagnose the need for strategic changes and the creation of strategic planning to ensure that both the management and the workforce communicate and integrate their efforts towards the achievement of the organizational goals and objectives and to meet the demands of the dynamic internal and external environment. Organizational changes allow an organization to establish techniques and tactics to guarantee the successful operations of the organization.

References

- American Productivity & Quality Center (1997). "Organizational Change: Managing the Human Side." Retrieved April 4, 2007, from http://www.exinfm.com/pdf/files/change_apqc.pdf
- Axelrod, R. (2000). *Terms of Engagement: Changing the Way We Change Organizations*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- "Change Theory." Retrieved April 4, 2007, from <http://134.126.98.105:2500/cob300a/show/Change+Theory>
- ChildHope (2004). "Organizational Assessment for Development Planning." Retrieved April 4, 2007, from <http://www.childhope.org.uk/resources/oadp-part3.pdf>
- NASA Report. (2003). "Part Two Why The Accident Occurred." National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Retrieved April 4, 2007, from <http://www.nasa.gov/columbia/caib/PDFS/VOL1/PART02.PDF>
- Schein, E. H. (1995). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning [WWW document] (74 paragraphs). URL <http://www.sol-ne.org/res/wp/10006.html> [2002, March 20]. Also URL: http://www.a2zpsychology.com/articles/kurt_lewin's_change_theory.htm [2004, September 9].
- Wirth, R. (2004). "Lewin/Schein's Change Theory." Retrieved April 13, 2007, from <http://www.entarga.com/orgchange/lewinschein.pdf>