

Core Knowledge Area Module Number 6:
Organizational Leadership and Change

Depth Component

Student: William A. Brantley
Faculty Mentor: Dr. Jason K. Lum

Walden University
November 18, 2005

Table of Contents

Annotated Bibliography.....	3
Introduction.....	15
Why Change Leadership is Necessary	15
Bringing About Change.....	17
Comparison of Different Change Processes.....	20
Duck's Change Process.....	20
Appreciative Inquiry Change Process.....	22
Mental Maps Change Process.....	23
Kotter's Change Process.....	26
Fullstream Process Model.....	27
Cameron and Quinn Change Process.....	29
Evans and Schaefer Change Process.....	30
Why Change Fails.....	34
Innovation in Government.....	37
Change Leadership.....	43
Synthesizing a Change Model for Public Agencies.....	47
References.....	51

Annotated Bibliography

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*. 158-198.

The authors conducted six case studies of the organizational change that occurred in a group of Canadian National Sports Organizations (NSO). Over a twelve-year period, the authors used semi-structured interviews to determine what factors determined a successful change effort as the NSOs went from mostly volunteer associations to professionally-managed organizations. Three factors were key to a successful transformation. First, the various interests of the subgroups in the NSOs were considered and their interests were protected. Second, there was a shift from centralized power to dispersed power during the change process. But the most important factor seemed to be strong transformational leadership and a clearly-communicated vision.

These case studies provide empirical evidence for the theory that leadership and vision are key to organizational change. The authors concentrated on studying radical change which they defined as “large parts of the organization [being] altered over a very short period of time” (p. 159) because they argued that this area of study was neglected in the literature. This study also emphasized the importance of creating a shared vision for change and empowering interests in the organization so that they can participate in the change effort.

Bloch, S. (2002). Positive deviants and their power on transformational leadership. *Journal of Change Management, 1:3*. 273-279.

Bloch (2002) argues that organizations should cultivate people who look for more efficient and innovative ways to do things. These positive deviants are often customer-

focused and have strong leadership potential. Thus, organizations should develop ways to identify and cultivate these natural change leaders for the benefit of the organization. Another benefit to Bloch's article is her discussion of six different leadership styles and their impact on organizational change.

This article is included in the annotated bibliography because Bloch (2002) demonstrates how positive deviants have a high degree of emotional intelligence which is the key to good change leaders. By providing a framework for identifying positive deviants and describing how they can benefit the organization, organizations can better manage the change process by nurturing potential transformational leaders.

Caldwell, R. (2003). Models of change agency: A fourfold classification. *British Journal of Management*, 14. 131-142.

Caldwell (2003) classifies change agents into four models based on a selected literature review. Leadership is the first model and it grew out of the organizational development field and a merger with leadership studies in the 1980s. In contrast, the second model of change management emphasized managerial competencies in bringing about organizational change. Change consultancy, the third model, has risen in the last two decades as a response to the perceived shortcomings of change leadership and change management. The fourth and final model, change teams, is a relatively new phenomenon which came about as organizations realized that transformational change is too complex and high-risk to entrust to just one person. Caldwell discusses the growth of each model and highlights how the weakness of each model led to the creation of the other models.

This article is included in the Depth Component because all four models demonstrate different aspects of the Depth Component's model of change leadership in public agencies. It is vital to have a change leader with a compelling vision but it is also necessary to have change management so as to implement and maintain the change. Change teams are also important due to need for buy-in throughout the organization while change consultants can provide the objective perspective to measure progress toward the vision. Caldwell's (2003) four models of change agency demonstrates the complexity of change in an organization by delineating the different roles involved in the change effort.

Day, J.D., & Jung, M. (2000). Corporate transformation without a crisis. *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 4. 117-127.

Day and Jung (2000) address the question of how to affect transformational organizational change without the motivation of a crisis. As they observe, most successful organizational changes are due to a perceived crisis that forces people to change or face ruin. In the cases where there is no looming crisis, it is especially difficult for change leaders to motivate members of the organization to make the change. Day and Jung argue that change leaders must help individuals transform their view of reality in order to affect change. Change leaders must create transformation stories that provides a vision of why the change is necessary, what the change will be like, and how the organization will accomplish the change.

The value of this article is in the process that describes how to create transformation stories which take the place of crisis in motivating the change. Waiting

for a crisis to start a transformational change is a risky and inefficient process for transforming an organization. It is much better for the change leader to control the timing of the change so as to gain the maximum benefits.

Denis, J., Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 44:4. 809-837.

This article is especially relevant to the Depth Component because it deals with affecting change where “strategic leadership roles are shared, objectives are divergent, and power is diffuse” which is often the environment in which public managers work in (p. 809). Using a replicated case study design, Denis, Lamothe, and Langley (2001) studied five different health care organizations from 1980 to 1998 as they underwent various organizational changes. They used a combination of documentary records, observations, and interviews to chronicle how leaders and followers managed the change process.

They developed an “emerging process theory of leadership” with six components that described how strategic leaders could work together in a shared-power environment to initiate organizational transformations. They found that pluralistic leadership is possible but is fragile and easily influenced by interorganizational and intraorganizational politics. The authors chose not to examine the behavioral dynamics of the pluralistic leadership groups which may have given more insight on the factors that led to successful change but this is still an interesting study on how large organizational change works in a diffused-power and multi-objective environment.

Gill, R. (2003). Change management – or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3:4. 307-318.

Gill (2003) maintains that management is necessary for change but it is not sufficient for affecting change. Leadership is required to initiate and motivate the change process and the author provides an integrative model for the change leader based on four dimensions: intellectual/cognitive, spiritual, emotional, and behavioral. Under this model, the change leader provides the change vision, promotes shared values, creates the strategy for change, and empowers followers to implement the change through motivation and inspiration.

Gill's (2003) model is very much like primal leadership model and the principle-centered leadership model as they are described in the Breadth Component. But Gill differs from the other leadership models in that he addresses the importance of change management in implementing and maintaining the change. He also explains the emotional resistance to change and how the change leader can overcome that natural resistance.

Higgs, M., & Rowland, D. (2001). Developing change leaders: Assessing the impact of a development programme [sic]. *Journal of Change Management* 2:1. 47-64.

Most researchers in change management agree that change leadership is vital to organizational change but, as Higgs and Rowland (2001) assert, there is little research on the competencies needed by change leaders. In an earlier article, the authors described eight clusters of change management competencies and in this article, they apply the proposed competency framework to an organizational program. The findings seem to

suggest that the change leadership competencies training did have a significant positive impact on the trainee's knowledge of change management and the ability of the organization to affect positive and rewarding changes.

This article is included because it provides the competencies that are part of the Depth Component's public administration change leader model. The article is also valuable in that an initial empirical study indicated that the framework is beneficial to creating change leaders. But, as the author admits, this is only one study and further research is needed to better establish the value of Higgs and Rowland (2001) competency framework.

Joffe, M., & Glynn, S. (2002). Facilitating change and empowering employees. *Journal of Change Management*, 2:4. 369-379.

Joffe and Glynn (2002) describe a study that measured the impact of employee empowerment in a change initiative. In an organization that suffered from low morale, employees were encouraged to take part in the change initiative by conducting a quarterly web survey on perceptions of the change effort. Employees were also encouraged to suggest change implementation activities. The authors found that the empowerment activities increased overall employee morale and generated greater support for the organizational change.

The value of this article is that demonstrates empirically how employee empowerment contributes to successful transformational change. By constantly soliciting employee opinions on the change effort and by inviting suggestions, the organization had a successful change effort that was well-received by employees. Employee

empowerment is an important component in many transformational leadership models and having it supported empirically helps strengthen these models.

Kim, W.C., & Mauborgne, R. (2003). Tipping point leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. 60-69.

Kim and Mauborgne (2003) profile the career of former New York City police commissioner William Bratton to understand how he affected massive positive organizational change quickly and with few resources. Since 1977, Bratton has led major reorganization projects in five different police organizations with dramatic results. Based on their case study analysis, they created the “tipping point leadership” model that details a four-step process in bringing about “rapid, dramatic, and lasting change with limited resources” (p.64).

This article is the foundation for the Depth Component’s public leader change model because it is a great example of effective public leadership and has compelling real-world evidence that supports the model. The four steps also fit in well with components of other transformational leadership models while explaining how leaders can best implement these four steps.

Lichtenstein, B.B. (2000). Self-organized transitions: A pattern amid the chaos of transformative change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14:4. 128-141.

Lichtenstein (2000) argues that even though organizational change outcomes are unpredictable because of the inherent complexity of large-scale transformational change, the process of change is similar in many cases. He develops this argument by in-depth case studies of three firms. Based on his findings, successful change is based on

organizations that have intrinsic values, the capacity to follow through on the change, and the ability to be both organized and innovative at the same time. Lichtenstein also argues that power should be decentralized during the change process so as to increase the success of the proposed change.

Although Lichtenstein (2000) has some interesting insights, he does not clearly support his three assertions on what leads to successful change in an organization. His directive to give control of the change effort to the “system” is also vague in that he does not detail exactly who to give the power to and how much of the power to give them. He echoes the conclusions found in the research of other writers but his conclusions are not as specific. There is some value in his description of the pattern of how complex change occurs and that is why the article is included in this bibliography.

Parry, K.W., & Proctor-Thomson, S.B. (2003). Leadership, culture and performance: The case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management* 3:4. 376-399.

This is one of the few articles that deals with change leadership in public agencies with special attention to the constraints that public managers face in managing their organizations. The authors use structural equation modelling (SEM) to analyze two surveys on relationship between leadership, organizational culture, and organizational effectiveness. SEM is a technique where researchers build a model and then predict what the measures should be if the hypotheses are true. Then the researcher conducts the analysis and compares the actual measures to the predicted measures. The closer the fit between the actual measures and the predicted measures, the more validity is given to the

model. This method seems well-supported by the literature review and does help to make the variable relationships clearer.

The researchers found that there is a significant relationship between strong individual and team leadership, an open culture, and higher effectiveness of the public agency. Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2003) also found that resources constraints are a major barrier to organizational change and that agencies should better allocate resources rather than rely on bargaining to distribute resources. There is also further empirical evidence that empowering individuals benefits organizational change.

Pietersen, W. (2002). The Mark Twain dilemma: The theory and practice of change leadership. *Journal of Business Strategy*. 32-37.

The Mark Twain dilemma is based on his observation that he was all for progress but it was change that he did not like. Pietersen (2002) uses this quote to describe how change leaders can best handle the emotional resistance to change by creating a clear reason for the change and continually communicating this reason. He also urges maximum participation but if certain people continue to resist, they must be removed as obstacles to the change. The author also describes the importance of short-term wins and setting an example to rally followers.

There is really nothing new in Pietersen's (2002) advice but his description of how resistance to change arises is important to the Depth Component because the change leader needs to know when to time their strongest efforts to push the change. The best point from this article is the realization of the change paradox: people rationally understand the need for change but they still emotionally resist change based on fear, uncertainty, and doubt.

(2000). Skills, values or impression management? *Journal of Management Development*, 19:5. 407-419.

When implementing change efforts, organizations commonly use change consultants. This article describes the need for organizational development consultants to move from the “limited diagnostic relationship between consultant and client” to a more expansive view of change as a learning process for the organization and its stakeholders (p. 407). There is a need for this change because clients often do not have the resources or knowledge to implement the consultant’s change recommendations. As clients hire one change consultant after another, they experience “change weariness syndrome” (p. 408) and this only increases organizational resistance to change.

Thus, change consultants should strive to teach change leaders to “make decisions”, “build coalitions”, “achieve action”, and maintain the change initiative (p. 411). As the article suggests, the consultancy literature is too “fragmented and discursive” to be effective. The rest of the article deals with ways that change consultancy can be reformed so as to best help the client achieve successful change. It is these recommendations that placed the article in this bibliography. At some point in many change efforts, the public manager will use change consultants and therefore the public manager needs to be able to choose an effective change consultant.

Stewart, J., & Kringas, P. (2003). Change management – Strategy and values in six agencies from the Australian public service. *Public Administration Review*, 63:6. 675-688.

Stewart and Kringas (2003) studied six Australian federal agencies to determine what factors lead to success in change management. They first start by distilling five themes from the literature review which has been commonly thought to make change

efforts successful. The first theme is the selection of the proper change model with the second theme being leadership. The different types of implementing change are the third theme which leads to the fourth theme of communication and the fifth theme of political support. Using these themes, the authors constructed their case studies to determine the success factors. They found that four factors led to success: “an appropriate change model”, “effective leadership”, “sufficient resources”, and “attention to communication” (p. 686). Stewart and Kringas also determined that the major reason most change efforts failed is that there was no linkage between the outcomes with the change model.

This article was included in the bibliography because of the extensive literature review and the four factors for organizational change success. The factors of “effective leadership” and “attention to communication” are mentioned in other writings but the factors of the “appropriate change model” and “sufficient resources” are new concepts. The requirement that there be a linkage between outcomes and the change model is a foundational concept for the Depth Component’s model of change leadership.

Weymes, E. (2003). Relationships not leadership sustain successful organizations [sic]. *Journal of Change Management*, 3:4. 319-331.

This article was chosen because it further supports the primal leadership model and links emotional intelligence to effective change management through the creation of emotionally-charged shared visions. Weymes (2003) argues that the primary duty of leaders is to create and nurture relationships in the organization. As he argues, “[o]rganisations [sic] are learning that the difference between winning and losing can be attributed to the power of relationships” and not to strategy, processes, or methodologies (p. 320). By mastering the five emotional intelligence clusters, the leader gains self-

mastery and then can motivate and empower their followers. From this comes the “inspirational dream” which is much like the vision described by other researchers but has an emotional component to it.

Weymes (2003) also writes about the need for shared leadership and building trust in the organization. These concepts are important because it is through empowerment, shared vision, and trust in the change leadership that contributes to successful organizational transformation. Emotional intelligence is a major part of the Depth Component’s change leader model because of the five emotional intelligence clusters.

The Depth Component of the KAM will explore how leaders bring about change in organizations. Before discussing how leaders bring about change, the necessity for leadership during the change process will be established. Then, seven different change processes will be compared to demonstrate the wide range of activities involved in transforming organizations. The section after that explains common ways in which change effort fails.

After discussing change processes in general, the section on innovation in government will show how change happens within the constraints of the public sector. The section after that describes the characteristics that are necessary for change leaders and the final section gives a general model of change leadership and the change process in public agencies.

Why Change Leadership is Necessary

Before discussing the type of leadership needed for change management in public agencies, it is necessary to demonstrate why change leadership is necessary. Starting off with Cloke and Goldsmith's (2002) redefinition of work, it is demonstrated that work has evolved from mere economic activity as it was in beginning of the Industrial Revolution to being a way that modern employees self-actualize (pp. 100-101). Workers find personal fulfillment and self-expression in their work and thus they want organizations that allow them to do so. As Cloke and Goldsmith argue, when all members of the organization are performing at their best, the entire organization is working at a high level of creativity, responsiveness, and efficiency.

But public agencies are still hierarchical bureaucratic organizations that defeat the employees' need for self actualization. Hierarchies create "unnatural inequalities in

power, privilege, and status between managers and employees" and thus employees are not motivated to give their best at work and the overall organization suffers (Cloke and Goldsmith, 2002, pp. 45-46). Hierarchies are created to coerce people into following leaders who they would not ordinarily follow and thus these organizations are not agile, creative, and responsive to the public (p. 84). Bureaucracies are even worse because they sap the energy of both leaders and followers while blocking any attempts at creativity (p. 91). All this stems from the traditional practice of management that originated in late 1800s and remains virtually unchanged even today in most public agencies.

Cloke and Goldsmith state that "[m]anagement is one step away from the problems that they are asked to solve" and thus management is ineffective in solving many organizational problems (p. 65). Managers compete with each other to appear as the stronger and more decisive than their fellow managers. This causes their employees to "retreat and appear weak, indecisive, irresponsible, and hostile to change" (p. 70). As managers travel up the career track, they are constantly in competition for fewer and fewer positions and thus they are reluctant to take risks that may affect their personal career chances (p. 75). Ambitious managers also constantly war with other managers by "petty bickering, childish jealousies, bad-mouthing, character assassination, budget manipulations, and resource hoarding" (p. 77). As can be imagined, these wasteful wars have a disastrous effect on employee morale and motivation (p. 58: also see pp. 54-55).

Therefore, the rationale for change leadership is to prevent the inherent malignancies of hierarchies and bureaucracy while encouraging employees to see work as a means to self-actualization. The organizations that help their employees become the best they can be benefit greatly from the synergy of a highly-committed and enthusiastic

workforce. Thus the key to reforming government services is to first start with reforming how public agencies treat their employees.

Bringing About Change

Even though change is constant in organizations, there is still great resistance to change by many people in the organization. This is especially true in public agencies because they often have ambiguous objectives, work processes, and participation (Caluwe and Vermaak, 2003, pp. 8-9). Public agencies are also characterized by "garbage-can decision making" – " 'garbage cans' full of unresolved issues, unrealized solutions, and potential decisions are to be found everywhere and instead of being emptied, they are transferred into new, larger garbage containers" (p. 10).

Given these conditions, it is understandable that organizational learning is difficult even though it is a major factor in successful change management (Caluwe and Vermaak, 2003, p. 14). This inability to share knowledge and learn from the change process leads to resistance to change through inaction (p. 17). Inaction is probably the most difficult response for the change leader to overcome. Petersen (2002) terms this the "Mark Twain dilemma" in that people express support for the general concept of change but they resist taking the personal steps to change to realize that progress (p. 32).

To learn how to overcome resistance to change, Caluwe and Vermaak (2003) offer five ways to help people think about change. The first is "yellow print thinking" in which people only change if their interests are considered or they can be compelled to accept the new ideas. "Blue print thinking" assumes that change will occur if the result is specified while "red print thinking" motivates change through making the process itself

interesting and desirable. "Green print thinking" equates change with learning. People are motivated to change because they will learn from it. In "white print thinking", change is inevitable and it is in the best interest of people to change or they will be left behind. (pp. 42-44). Using these different ways to conceptualize change, leaders can better create a change vision that is motivating to the particular audience that adapts one of these five thoughts about change.

Anderson and Anderson (2001) also argue that change happens when people receive signals from their environment that change is happening (p. 15). Basing their "Drivers of Change Model" on social constructivist theory, these signals require people to change their way of thinking about their organization (p. 16). As Anderson and Anderson explain, everyone has a mindset – their perspective in which they experience reality and form their perceptions (p. 80). It is only through the changing of mindsets that successful change can happen. Fail to change the mindset and people will resist the change no matter how well-crafted is the vision and how well the process is planned (p. 78).

Changing people's mindset is both an intellectual and emotional activity. Good change leaders know that it is important to appeal to both the intellect and the heart when communicating the change vision. As Duck (2001) observes, "Changing an organization is inherently and inescapably an emotional human process" (p. 9). Change leaders have to help their followers to discover the emotional impact of the change so that people can begin forming a shared language that explains the current reality and the ideal state that change will bring about (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002, p. 198). Once the shared language is created, people are in emotional alignment and thus the change can occur (p.

208). Change occurs within individuals, teams, and the culture simultaneously (p. 234) and successful change results when the employees of the organization own the change vision and processes of change (Cloke and Goldsmith, 2002, p. 263).

Gladwell (2002) agrees that changing mindsets is the key to successful change when he describes his "tipping point theory" of how organizations undergo rapid transformation. He argues that change can be thought of as being like the spread of a disease. The change message has a "stickiness" so that it is memorable and people are eager to spread the message (p. 25). Along with a sticky message, three types of people are key in spreading the change message. The first is the "maven" who likes to accumulate knowledge (p. 60), the second is the "connector" who has a large personal network (p. 38), and the third is the "salesman" who has great persuasive power (p. 70). Using the "law of the few" (p. 22), connectors are informed by mavens about the change message and they communicate the change message to their network which includes salesmen. This is how change is communicated through the organization and how mindsets are altered to accept the change.

Therefore, in bringing about change, leaders must understand that most resistance is emotional and expressed through inaction. To affect successful change, leaders must create an emotionally-compelling, sticky message that is adaptable to the different types of "print thinking." Once they have successfully convinced the mavens in their company to accept the message, the connectors and salesman will help spread the message. At that point, the change leader must guide the creation of a shared language so that their followers are emotionally-aligned in favor of the change message. These conclusions are supported by three different case studies in which the researchers found that overcoming

resistance to change and creating a compelling vision is the key to successful organizational change (Amis, et al., 2004; see also Stewart and Kringas, 2003; Joffe and Glynn, 2002).

Comparison of Different Change Processes

There are many different methods to initiate and lead organizational change - so many it can be difficult to choose one that will prove successful. In this section, seven change processes will be explained and compared so as to demonstrate that even though the details may differ, there are common elements. Most change processes start by assessing the culture, creating "resonance around the idea of change", and building change leaders (Goleman, et al., 2002, p. 233). It is also vital to create a climate of trust and openness that aids in empowering employees in doing their part for the change effort (Cloke and Goldsmith, 2002, pp. 103-105). But the most important and common element to all change processes is the creation of a compelling change vision and constant communication of the change vision (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 33; see also Lichtenstein, 2000).

Duck's Change Process

Duck's (2001) change process centers around the emotional issues that affect the transformation effort. There are three change elements that must be considered: strategy, execution, and "emotional and behavioral issues" (p. 11). Duck concentrates on the emotional and behavioral issues in describing how change progresses along the "change curve." In the first part of the change curve, "stagnation", people do not feel that change

is inevitable and thus they have no "sense of threat" (p. 20). The threat, which Duck calls the "change monster", is felt when the decision is made to initiate the change – the "preparation" part of the change curve (pp. 22-23). This is the part of the change curve where change most often fails because of the "lack of alignment among the leaders" (p. 24). But even if the leadership is in alignment and the change is communicated well, change can still stall if the preparation phase takes too long (p. 25).

The third part of the change curve is the implementation phase in which the plan is executed resulting in new processes and new roles. At this point, there are a multitude of reactions to the change resulting in the most intense resistance to the organizational transformation (Duck, 2001, p. 26). Communication is critical at this stage but the leaders must do more than just tell the employees what to do. It is vital that leaders fully explain the rationale behind the change effort and the decisions made along the process (p. 27).

The determination phase of the change curve is when the results of the change effort should start appearing. This is also the phase in which change fatigue starts to set in and people start to retreat from the change effort. The most common forms of retreat are "apathy, hopelessness, or cynicism" but retreat can also be deceptively positive in which the organization "declares victory" even though the change effort is not completed (Duck, 2001, p. 31). If the leader does not manage this phase successfully, the change effort will fail leaving the organization in a halfway state from the former work processes and the half-formed new work processes. Failure at this phase can be most disastrous to the organization.

If the change monster has been successfully managed, the final phase is "fruition". This is when the change has been completed and implemented. It is at this phase where leaders should encourage people to reflect on their efforts and feel pride in their accomplishments while recording the lessons that they learned during the change process (Duck, 2001, p. 34). The organization then goes into the stagnation phase until another change effort is needed and the change curve repeats.

Joffe and Glynn's (2002) case study of a change initiative appears to support Duck's (2001) conclusions. In the study, employees in organization that had low morale were encouraged to take part in the change process. These empowerment activities helped to raise employee morale and increased support for the organizational change. By making employees part of the change process, this diminishes the emotional resistance to change.

Appreciative Inquiry Change Process

The second change process, "appreciative inquiry", focuses exclusively on the communication aspects of the change process and can be paired with other change processes (Watkins and Mohr, 2001, p. 25). Appreciative inquiry is a "collaborative and highly participative, system-wide approach" (p. 14) that is built upon social constructionism and attempts to determine how members of the organization collectively construct their perceptions of the organization (pp. 27-28). By understanding how organizational members collectively construct their current perception of the organization, change leaders use the five processes of appreciative inquiry to shift the collective perceptions to the new change vision (p. 25).

The first process of appreciative inquiry is choosing the positive aspects of the current organization as the focus of the inquiry. Then the leader collects stories that affirm the chosen the positive aspects so that themes can be selected out for further inquiry in the third process. In the fourth process, the chosen positive aspects are weaved together to create a shared image of the ideal future. The final process is the creation of innovative ways to bring about the ideal future (Watkins and Mohr, 2001, p. 39).

Five core principles inform the process of appreciative inquiry. The "constructionist principle" is "that knowledge about an organization and the destiny of the organization are interwoven" (Watkins and Mohr, 2001, p. 37) while the "simultaneity principle" establishes that the process of appreciative inquiry and organizational transformation occur simultaneously (p. 38). The "anticipatory principle" posits that the most important resource for organizational change is the collective imagination of the organizations' members and that the organization should be an "open book" to its members – the poetic principle (p. 38). The final principle, "positive principle", is based upon the belief that the more positive the questions used in the appreciative inquiry, the more successful the change effort will be (p. 39). The purpose of these principles is to build trust and positive feelings during the appreciative inquiry process so as to quell any negative feelings about the change that could transform into resistance.

Mental Maps Change Process

Black and Gregersen (2003) argue that the key to changing organizations is to first change the individuals and then the organization will follow. This is because of the mental maps that people create of their organization and their role. Leaders have to

redraw those mental maps in order to make change successful (p. 2). Also, leaders cannot move too fast in initiating change. "The faster a leader tries to force change, the more shock waves of resistance compact together, forming a massive barrier to success" (pp. 6-7). Thus, it is important for the change leader to fully understand the individual mental maps before even beginning to plan the organizational transformation.

As Black and Gregersen (2003) argue, there are three common barriers to all change efforts. The first barrier is the failure to see the need for change while the second barrier is the "inability to move" when the need for change is seen. The third and final barrier is the failure to finish the change (p. 8). Overcoming these barriers is essential for initiating and implementing change so the leader must utilize a variety of strategies centered on reforming the mental maps of their followers. Day and Jung's (2000) research also supports Black and Gregersen's conclusions especially the need for creating "transformation stories" that also shape the mental maps in the members of the organization.

In overcoming the first barrier, the failure to see the need for change, change leaders must create a vision that highly contrasts with the current mental map and forces people to confront their established mental maps (Black and Gregersen, 2003, p. 48). Therefore the change leader must create a compelling vision that is easily remembered and simple. As the authors argue, a new mental map that cannot easily be remembered might as well not even be created in the first place. Black and Gregersen hold that a simple but memorable change vision that accomplishes eighty percent of the desired results is much better than creating a change vision that attempts to accomplish one-hundred percent of the desired results (p. 9).

In presenting the new mental map, leaders often make two major mistakes. First, in an attempt to be comprehensive, they present a complex mental map for the change vision. Because of the inherent resistance to change, people are likely to focus on the aspects in the new change vision that just confirm their old mental maps (Black and Gregersen, 2003, p. 49). The second mistake is that the leader only presents the new change just once or a few times with the expectation that the followers will immediately comprehend all aspects of the new change vision. It takes constant communication with periodic feedback to insure that the followers fully understand the new mental map for change.

Once the first barrier has been surmounted, the leader then has to provide a clear path for the followers to initiate the change. The paradox inherent in presenting a clear change vision is that people will conclude that they will perform their new tasks worse than they currently perform their present tasks. The change leader must overcome this resistance by helping the followers to see the target clearly; "give them the skills, resources, and tools to reach the target," and "deliver valuable rewards along the journey" (p. 76).

As the employees travel toward the new mental map of change, the leader must continually champion the need for change and reward small successes along the way in order to defeat the final barrier – failure to complete the change. It takes great effort to affect deep organizational change and it is only natural that people become tired of the effort. As change continues, people continually measure their progress against their memories of how well things worked in the past and thus they become discouraged with seemingly inadequate returns from the change effort (Black and Gregersen, 2003, pp. 98-

99). Leaders must continually monitor progress and provide constant communication that counters the shared perception that the change is not working and the old mental maps were better (p. 112). Successful change is based on how well the change leader persuades people to change their mental maps in favor of the new change vision.

Kotter's Change Process

Kotter (1999) outlines what is the common approach to change management. According to his formulation, change is an eight-step process in which the leader creates a sense of urgency for change and puts together a team to create a change vision and direct the change process. The team communicates the vision and empowers employees to act upon the vision with the goal of creating and maintaining momentum for change. The final act of the change team is to incorporate the change into the overall corporate behavior (p. 7).

Although he offers a generic blueprint for change, Kotter (1999) argues against using "cookie-cutter" change processes indiscriminately (p. 9). As he states, successful change hinges upon strong leadership (p. 11) and a management process that can deal with complexity (p. 52). Successful change leaders also realize the difference between articulating a change vision and planning for change. A change vision has a compelling emotional impact while change planning "is a management process . . . designed to produce orderly results, not change" (p. 55). Change leaders also utilize their extensive network of informal relationships so as to quell resistance and help sell the change vision (pp. 61-62).

Kotter (1999) then describes the eight most common reasons that the change process fails. The first three errors deal with the need for change which can result from not demonstrating an urgent need for change (p. 77), having a weak change team (p. 79), or failure to create a change vision (p. 81). The next three errors are typical problems with nonexistent or inadequate change visions. The change team fails to adequately communicate the change vision (p. 82), counter obstacles to the new vision (p. 85), and failure to capitalize on short-term wins (p. 87). The final two errors occur at the end of the change process in which the change team fails to complete the change (p. 88) or does not incorporate the change into the organization's culture (p. 90).

There are three skills that leaders must master if they are to be effective according to Kotter (1999). They must be adept at setting agendas (p. 151), building networks (p. 155), and using those networks to execute their agendas (pp. 158-159). These same skills that make executives in their everyday duties are also necessary for successful change leadership.

In support of Kotter (1999), Caldwell (2003) also emphasizes the need for change teams in his survey of the four types of change agents. Change leaders are important to the change process but, as organizations try to bring about more complex change, the change effort has become too much to handle for just one person. Thus, the rise of change teams to manage the process of organizational transformation.

Fullstream Process Model

A similar change process is the "Fullstream Process Model" by Anderson and Anderson (2001). Before discussing their model, the authors establish the foundation for

it by stating that there are three types of change: "Developmental – improvement on an existing process"; "Transitional – replace old state with known new state"; and "Transformational – significant shift from one state to another that requires a new culture and employee mindset" (pp. 3-4). In developing a change strategy for each change type, the strategist must consider what to change (Content), the human aspects of the change (People), and how the change will affect the organization (Process) (pp. 4-5). But no matter the change type and change strategy, the leader must be cognitive of the external and internal drivers of change (p. 6). This is accomplished by considering the twenty-one dimensions of change which is constructed by considering four common domains (physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual) inherent in five levels (individual, relationship, team, organization, and marketplace) and adding in environment as the twenty-first dimension (p. 6).

From this foundation, Anderson and Anderson (2001) create the nine-step change process model. The model is called the "Fullstream Process Model" because the first three steps form the "upstream stage" which sets up the change process. The "midstream stage" is the design of the change state while the "downstream stage" is the implementation of the change process (p. 10). The three steps of the upstream stage involve "preparing to lead the change," creating the vision and capacity for change, and determining the design requirements for change. In the midstream stage, the desired state is designed, the impact of the change is analyzed, and the leader plans for the implementation. The downstream stage consists of implementing the change, integrating and celebrating the new change state, and learning from the change effort (p. 15).

Cameron and Quinn Change Process

Cameron and Quinn (1999) take a different approach in constructing their change process. Based on their research concerning what makes an effective organization, the authors asked what the criteria is for determining organizational effectiveness and the factors that determine organizational effectiveness (pp. 29-30). Two dimensions emerged from the empirical data that allowed Cameron and Quinn to create four profiles of organizational culture.

The "Clan" culture has a high degree of flexibility, discretion, and dynamism along with a high degree of internal focus and integration. This type of culture is essentially an extended family with high deference given to the leaders who can expect great loyalty from their followers. Teamwork, participation, and consensus are highly valued in this organization (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 58).

The "Adhocracy" culture also has a high degree of flexibility, discretion, and dynamism but it also has a high degree of external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry. The organization values are individual initiative and freedom and its members are encouraged to experiment and to be innovative. Great emphasis is placed on being cutting-edge and unique (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 58).

Like the previous culture, the "Market" culture has a high degree of external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry. It differs from the other cultures in that it is high on the stability, order, and control dimension. The major concern of the organization is getting results and being competitive. Winning is the highest-prized value in the organization and people are judged on how well they get the job done (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 58).

The "Hierarchy" culture is high on the internal orientation, integration, and unity dimension and high on the stability, order, and control dimension. This organization thrives on order, procedures, and efficiency. Relationships are formalized and almost all interactions are influenced by rules and policies. Success in the organization is based on stability and smooth, error-free operations (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 58).

Once the change leader has successfully diagnosed the organizational culture type, they can begin the six step change process. First, the leader diagnoses the current issues in the existing culture and gains consensus on existing issues (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 77). In the second step, the leader creates a shared consensus for the desired future of the organization (p. 80). Once the consensus has been established, the change leader determines what is needed to shift from the current culture to the desired change (p. 80) and begins collecting "illustrative stories" that demonstrate the key values inherent in the future culture (p. 85). The final two steps are the listing of "strategic action steps" (p. 85) and a plan for implementation (p. 89). All of these steps are based in preserving commonly-held values of the specific culture unless a consensus has been gained in changing an organizational value.

Evans and Schaefer Change Process

Unlike the previous models, Evans and Schaefer (2001) argue that "[c]hanging is what organizations do, not what you do to them" (p. 1). The organization is constantly changing so as to synchronize its internal systems to keep up with the changing conditions of its environment. Change is complex because the organization is complex and the internal processes are extremely agile by design (pp. 2-3). Thus, there ten-step

process is based on harnessing the natural change inherent in organizations and redirecting it toward successful ends.

Therefore, the first task of the leader is an appreciation of the current situation. The leader undertakes an in-depth examination of the organization's environment, mission, processes, capacity for change, costs of the change, benefits of the change, and the type of stewardship needed to affect the change (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 14). They must be careful at this stage so as to ensure that the organization has the capacity for change and to gain buy-in for the proposed change (p. 39).

The second task of the change leader is to develop strategic alignment by creating a robust communication strategy and encouraging open dialogues about the need for the proposed change (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 41). The communication plan must answer five questions about the proposed change: "what is happening?"; "why is it happening?"; "when is it happening?"; what is the impact?; and where can employees go with "questions, issues, and concerns?" (p. 45). Common trip points at this stage center around too much criticism of the current organizational state, not creating a shared vision, and involving too few people in creating the change strategy (pp. 64-66).

Creating a leadership network to support the change is the third task. The change leader clearly defines the roles for the change team members and secures the resources and rewards for supporting the participants in the change leadership network (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 68). The leader has to ensure adequate size for the network and gain the necessary autonomy for the participants so that they can effectively carry out the change vision (pp. 85-86). These newly-created change leaders then go out to help accomplish task four which is expanding the understanding of the proposed change and

gaining commitment from the organization's members (p. 88). It is important that the change leadership network not merely communicate but opens up dialogue among the employees (pp. 103-104).

The goal of the fifth task is to fully analyze the organizational processes so that the change leader and the change leadership network have a comprehensive understanding of current organizational processes (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 105-106). Common problems in this task are moving to the design stage too quickly, trying to solve problems before they are fully analyzed, and being too narrow in analysis (pp. 135-136). This task closely fits in with task six which is the designing of the new processes (p. 137). It is vital that the change leader and their change team do not design structures that is incompatible with the organization or is over-specified (p. 173).

Once the design task has been completed, the change leader and their change team begin to plan the implementation. The change leadership team validates the design, establishes timelines, identifies who is responsible for which implementation task, and creates a "transition management process" (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 179). During this stage, it is vital that the change leader maintains leadership and that there is widespread organizational participation (pp. 189-190).

Task eight, the establishing of measures to gauge the change effort, is almost done simultaneously with task seven. The change leadership team determines what to measure and how these measures describe if the change effort is being successfully managed. It is at this stage that the reward system is linked to the appropriate behaviors that reinforce the change (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 192). The correct choice of metrics is vital to the success of the change effort. The metrics must not focus only on behaviors and

accountability but must be related directly to the goals of the desired change (pp. 204-205).

It is at task nine where the actual transition occurs. The change leadership team implements the plan and collects data to measure the progress of the change effort (Evans and Schaefer, 2001, p. 209). This is a vital stage and the change leadership team must keep focused on the ultimate purpose of the change strategy while ensuring that the employees are transitioning into the new skills (p. 231). The final task is to learn from the change effort and celebrate the success of the new organizational state (p. 234).

As can be seen from the ten tasks, Evans and Schaefer (2001) spend a great deal of attention on preparing for the change because of their arguments that successful change is predicated on a thorough analysis of the current organizational state and a well-planned transition to the desired state. Two important features of the change process are creating dialogue in the organization and empowering members of the organization during the change process. Successful change leadership cannot be imposed from the top of the organization but must be supported by all levels.

Of course there are more change processes than just the seven described but, even though the details differ, almost all models follow the same predictable pattern. First, a need for change is perceived and a leader or a team of leaders craft a vision for changing the organization. This vision is disseminated to the rest of the organization and the change leader/team attempt to gain support for the transformation through empowerment, dialogue, or occasionally by mandate. The change occurs and the organization hopefully arrives at the newly-desired state. Unfortunately, many change efforts fail for several

reasons. The next section describes the most common ways in which the change effort can fail.

Why Change Fails

Cloke and Goldsmith (2002) map out a cynical view of how change is mismanaged in some organizations. At first there is "wild euphoria" for the change effort which then becomes "growing concern" that the transformation is not working well. This concern plunges into "near total disillusionment" which leads to the final perception that the change effort was an "unmitigated disaster." The organizations begins a "search for the guilty" resulting in the "punishment of the innocent" and the "promotion of the uninvolved [in the change effort]" (p. 261).

The reason for this cynical view of change is that even though change is constantly occurring, organizations do not consider the implications of long-term change or to the "subtleties of the change process" (Cloke and Goldsmith, 2002, p. 259). Thus change is undirected and results in needless conflicts and wasted resources. An additional cause for the mismanagement of change is that traditional management fundamentally resists change. As Cloke and Goldsmith argue, hierarchy and bureaucracy degrades the ability of the organization to adapt to rapidly-changing circumstances (p. 68). Hierarchy and bureaucracy also interfere with organizational communication which is vital in initiating and managing change efforts. Messages mostly travel from the top to the bottom of the organization and, as the messages travel, they are distorted and oversimplified to the point that they further more conflict due to misunderstandings (pp. 49-50).

Goleman, et al. (2002) offer a similar view on why change fails. Change leaders ignore the actual state of the organization and assume that all is necessary is to tell employees about the new change state, the organization will automatically develop the necessary process to support the change. They fail to consider culture in the change process and have little support from the top leadership for the change process. Ultimately, the change leader fails to create the "language of leadership" which supports the emotional intelligence leadership qualities necessary to compel people to enthusiastically follow the change leader (pp. 232-233).

But the ultimate reason for change failure is that leaders have inaccurate mental models of the organizational reality. Acting on these false assumptions, change leaders create change strategies that are doomed to fail because they do not address the real issues in the organization. These misperceptions are communicated to the rest of the organization which only further confuses the change effort as the followers try to reconcile their more realistic view of the organization with the leaders' contradictory change model. This leads to distrust in the change leaders and frustration toward an increasingly misguided change process (Anderson and Anderson, 2001, p. 104).

In contrast to the view that change is constantly occurring and that organizations must be quick and agile to cope with the rapid pace of change, MacDonald (1998) states that the change threat is overstated. "They [evolutionary change] are relatively slow-moving . . . [and take] place well within the perspective of intelligent executives and their decision-making cycles" (p. 8). Change only appears fast because of false analogies and people actually adapt well to rapid change. The need for radical change is exaggerated and this myth is causing great damage to organizations (p. 4).

Because it is hard to control the impact of radical change, organizations are better served by change efforts that slowly evolve than rapidly revolutionize the organization (MacDonald, 1998, p. 4). The belief that technology drives the rapid pace of change is mistaken. Technological adoption is actually slow and there is a large gap between the introduction of a technology and when it becomes cost-effective and easy-to-use (p. 9).

So, what drives the belief in rapid change? According to MacDonald (1998), there are three major reasons for the mistaken belief that organizations need to rapidly change. First are the organization's executives who lose touch with "the reality of the marketplace and with [their] own business" (p. 10). When change does occur, the executives panic and overreact by taking sudden and disruptive actions that only harms the organization and its members.

MacDonald (1998) also blames the "false gods of business" such specialization, the corporate office, and scientific management. These beliefs, twelve in all, reinforce the hierarchical nature of the organization and prevent executives from perceiving change realistically (pp. 27-28). The final contributing factor are "false gurus" or management consultants that constantly barrage executives with the message that change is threatening their organization and that only with the help of the management consultant and their patented change processes will the executive successfully lead the organization through the transformation (p. 13).

As this section demonstrates, the road to change is filled with hazards and failure can occur from the very beginning to when change is almost complete. Many hazards are just inherent in the change process such as the natural emotional resistance to change but change leaders also contribute to failure by inadequately communicating the vision or

fully completing the transformation. Change efforts in the public sector come with an additional set of hazards based on the constraints placed on public leaders. The next section on innovation in government exhibits these constraints and how they affect change in public agencies.

Innovation in Government

In the public sector, change efforts often fall into three categories: "civic reforms, social movements, and revolutions" (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 22). Thus, change efforts in government often have greater ramifications than many change efforts in the private and non-profit sectors. Not only are the employees in the public agency affected by the change, but the people that are served by the public agency are also impacted by the change effort. The public leader who initiates change in a public agency must consider both the internal and external effects of the change and often has severe constraints on actions that they can take. The two most powerful constraints on transforming public agencies are budget constraints and the shared power environment of public administration.

"American government is waist deep in its worst fiscal crisis since World War II" (Osborne and Hutchinson, 2004, p. 1). Due to a number of trends such as an "obsolete tax system," a population that is becoming older, and increasing health care costs, the public sector is an "era of perpetual fiscal crisis" (p. 2). Governments are forced to use accounting trick to keep budgets afloat and make irrational budget cuts based on which interest group objects the loudest (p. 5). Without a consistent budget to support change projects, public leaders are prevented from affecting transformational change in public

agencies even though there is constant pressure from the public to make government more effective and efficient.

For public leaders who have to operate in this new era, Osborne and Hutchinson (2004) write that a new type of public leader is needed:

“To get ourselves out of this mess, we need leaders who abhor the status quo but are not prisoners of ideology; leaders who are driven to deliver better results at a price citizens are willing to pay; leaders who are willing to charge citizens the real price of government in return for real value; leaders who have the common sense to dismount the dead horse of bureaucracy but the courage to search out a stronger steed.” (Osborne and Hutchinson, 2004, p. 309)

For the new public leader to be effective in changing organizations, they must take five critical steps. First, they need to truly understand the problems in their agency. Then they need to establish the price of government and determine what the priorities of government are. The leader then determines the price of each priority and creates a plan to purchase the priority (Osborne and Hutchinson, 2004, p. 13). In taking these steps, the leader should not be influenced by criticism because no matter what action they take, they will be criticized for their choice. The leader should focus solely on the results of their decision (p. 312).

Another critical task for the new public leader is to empower leadership at all levels in the agency. They must identify promising leaders, coach these potential leaders, and help them when they are in trouble (Osborne and Hutchinson, 2004, p. 322). By having empowered leaders at all levels of organization, public leaders can more easily initiate and maintain the change effort in their agencies.

Along with the new era of permanent fiscal crisis, public leaders must also operate in a shared-power environment. Agencies that share similar objectives often

have to share resources and authority to achieve their collective goals (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 4). Shared-power government arose from the confluence of technology, interconnected agencies, new public policies, and increasing population growth (p. 14). These four factors have resulted in "organized anarchy" in which many have partial authority but no one has full authority (p. 60-61).

Organized anarchy has several characteristics with the most prominent characteristic being inconsistent "goals and preferences." Because of the competing goals, coalitions are constantly changing and conflict between coalitions is never-ceasing. Decisions often appear arbitrary and lacking because of the shifting alliances which results in groups strategically withholding or using information. In order to achieve at least some of their objectives, groups use negotiation and compromise. Thus, when change does occur, it is through a fortuitous alignment of coalition groups and successful negotiations (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 61).

Denis, et al. (2001) demonstrate the difficulties in leading change in a shared power environment from their eighteen-year case study of how five health care organizations underwent significant change. According to their findings, transformational change is possible in a shared power environment but the consensus needed to affect the change is very fragile due to shifting coalitions based on interorganizational and intraorganizational politics. Change in public agencies often fails because coalition-building is difficult and the coalitions are inherently unstable.

Because of the constantly shifting coalitions and everpresent conflict in organized anarchy, problems are not actually solved as they are "re-solved", "dissolved", "redefined", or "finished" (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 5). Ideally, under a rational

planning model (pp. 7-8), public leaders seek expert advice to frame the problem and analyze the various solutions to the problem based on merits of each solution. Then the public leader chooses the optimum solution that best serves the public (pp. 5-6).

But a more realistic model is the "political decision making model" in which all problems have inherent conflicts. Public leaders propose policies and programs to confront the problem which immediately draws more conflict between interest groups. The acceptable policies and programs are the ones which resolve or at least mutes the most conflict (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 8). Although the decisions that result from the political decision making model are often less optimal than decisions from the rational planning model, the decisions are more likely to serve the public good. In achieving consensus for a program or policy, public leaders often achieve a consensus among the interest groups that does the most good for the most people (p. 9).

Of course, given the inherent conflict and the need to build alliances, it takes much longer to establish a solution to a problem and there is no guarantee that the support will be stable enough to see the solution through to completion. Coalitions may agree on a solution but may not be willing to commit resources to the proposed solution. Also, problems may change and the proposed solution can become a new problem. Proposed policies can also interact in unexpected ways which creates new unforeseen problems or work to exacerbate an existing problem (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, pp. 320-321).

The new public leader must be a systems thinker so that they can successfully navigate through the problems inherent in the shared power system. They must understand how all of the interest groups in their policy environment interact with each other and what their individual goals are. They must know how to craft communication

that clarifies the problem and the solution while persuading others to support the proposed solution. The new public leaders must understand "policy change cycles" so that they know "when, where, how, and why to intervene with whom and what" (Bryson and Crosby, 1992, p. 36).

Stewart and Kringas' (2003) case studies of change in six Australian public agencies support Bryson and Crosby's (1992) findings in that the most effective public leaders had four factors that determined the success of their change efforts. The leaders had a good change model, they were considered effective leaders by the organization, had sufficient resources for the change, and constantly communicated the need for change (p. 686). The most effective public leaders had a great sense of timing for their change message and knew how to speak to different audiences.

Based on the above imperatives, Bryson and Crosby (1992) have established seven tasks for the new public leader. The new public leader must have an appreciation of history but they should not be "captured" by past events (p. 33). Public leaders must also have a great appreciation for the diverse population they serve and are comfortable in communicating to diverse groups (p. 34). The third and fourth tasks compel the public leader to be a team leader which means their primary leadership duties are to empower, facilitate, and mentor their followers (pp. 36-40). New public leaders are skilled at crafting and communicating a collective vision that inspires coalitions to support the proposed solution (pp. 45-46). Thus, public leaders are adept at building coalitions that can marshal support and – most importantly – resources for their policies (p. 51). The seventh and final task is that new public leaders must be ethical. Their persuasive

abilities are based on their integrity and thus it is vital that the new public leader act in an ethical manner at all times (p. 53).

In their case studies on government leaders who were considered outstanding change leaders, Doig and Hargrove (1987) attempted to discover what made these public "entrepreneurs" so effective. They discounted the "great man" theory because public leaders must work in a constrained environment that greatly limits the leader's ability to shape their agencies (p. 1). What they did find is that there are three factors that characterized these great public leaders. They had the ability to systematically and rationally analyze their agency and its policy environment while being able to see the possibilities that are present in the current situation. But the final and largest factor was that these leaders wanted to "make a difference" and were willing to use the power of their reputations and personal energies to bring about the change (p. 11).

Along with these personal factors, three external variables must also be present to bring about change in public agencies. First, there must be fragmentation and overlap in the government agencies so that the public leader can use this to argue for a new policy. Second, there must be public support for a change in how government operates that can be channeled to support the new policy. Third, there must be new technologies that help the leader to implement the solution (Doig and Hargrove, 1987, p. 9). With these three factors in place, the public entrepreneur can effectively bring about change. Parry and Proctor-Thomson's (2003) research echoes these findings as their research indicates a major factor in the success of an organizational change effort is the distribution of resources.

Therefore, it is the fortuitous circumstance that an effective public leader with the right skills is in the right agency to perform the right task (Doig and Hargrove, 1987, p. 13). Even given the above, Doig and Hargrove also stress the need for the right historical circumstances to support the proposed solution (p. 15). This is why the most effective public leaders are the ones who are adept at building coalitions for their proposed policies (p. 17).

Change Leadership

It takes leadership to change an organization because leadership is fundamentally all about "coping with change" (Kotter, 1999, p. 53). Management alone cannot change organizations because its fundamental purpose is to "keep the current system functioning" (p. 11). In contrast, leaders initiate and maintain change by motivating people into the direction of change and aligning resources and people to bring about change (pp. 58-60). But, management is important to maintain change even though it can not initiate the change effort as a leader can (Gill, 2003).

The most important contribution of change leadership is to reduce the costs of change on the organization. According to Black and Gregersen (2003), anticipatory change has the least cost for an organization while change brought about by a crisis has the most costs. The problem is that crisis change is easier to start in an organization because the need for change is highly visible. The need for anticipatory change is not so obvious but it is the most beneficial way of coping with change. Thus, the leader needs to persuade the organization that there is a need to change and that they will be better off changing now than waiting for the turmoil of a crisis to force change (p. 180).

Therefore, the most important skill for a change leader is crafting a vision. An effective vision must clearly describe what the future will be and that this is a desirable future. The vision must demonstrate that the future is attainable using current resources and the efforts of the organization's members. The vision must be focused but flexible enough to allow for "individual initiatives and alternative responses in light of changing conditions" while being easy to communicate (Kotter, 1996, p. 72).

But the change leader cannot create a compelling change vision alone. They must involve their followers in a critical examination of their organization. Then the leader opens up a dialogue on the need for changing the organization and what the ideal future will look like (Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2002, p. 206). The change leader starts by creating the first draft of the change vision alone but then they assemble a team to revise the subsequent drafts. This activity can take several days or even months and it is essential that the team is not afraid to dream but to also be realistic about implementation. The end product should be a vision that is "desirable, feasible, focused, flexible, and is conveyable in five minutes or less" (Kotter, 1996, p. 81).

Almost as important as the creation of the change vision is the communication plan for the vision. The change vision must be simple and clear to understand which often means that the change leaders heavily uses metaphors and analogies to get the point across. The change vision must be constantly communicated and in multiple forums so as to insure that everyone in the organization has heard the change vision several times. No matter how simple the change message may be, it takes some time for people to fully comprehend the vision and to overcome their natural resistance to change. Along with communicating the message, it is also vital that the leader model the expected change

behavior so as to enhance the credibility. The change leader should encourage open dialogue and be honest about addressing seeming inconsistencies in the change vision. Questions left unanswered can undermine the entire change process (Kotter, 1996, p. 90).

The next task after creating and communicating a change vision is the building of a change coalition. The change leader must ensure that there is a sufficient number of key players with expertise and credibility that can be effective change leaders to help drive the change process (Kotter, 1996, p. 57). After assembling an effective change coalition, the change leader must empower the committee by creating new structures that are compatible with the change or aligning existing structures in conformance with the change vision. The change leader must assess the change skills possessed by their team and secure the necessary training if needed. The ideal member for a change team is a "positive deviant" or the organizational members who constantly look for new ways to do things. These members have the least resistance to change and can be helpful in convincing their fellow organizational members to support the change (Bloch, 2002). Change leaders must also have the courage to confront organizational members who continue to resist the change because they can disempower organizational members (p. 115; see also Weymes, 2003; "Skills", 2000).

As the change effort progresses, it is vital that change leaders plan in short-term wins to generate momentum and to keep followers involved. Major organizational transformation is a long-term process and people have to be continually convinced that all the pain and chaos engendered by the change will be worth it in the end. In any change effort, there will be a group of skeptics ready to proclaim any setback as proof that they were right and the change is not worth the effort. By building in periodic

opportunities for wins, the change leader can mute their criticism and keep the organization enthusiastic throughout the change process (Kotter, 1996, p. 119).

There are other competencies required for successful change leadership but, as Higgs and Rowland (2001) assert, there is little specific research on the exact competencies required for change leadership. The authors have offered a competency framework for change leaders that they base on a thorough literature review but, as of yet, their framework of eight competency clusters has not been fully established by empirical research. A promising study for the competencies of change leadership could be Kim and Mauborgne's (2003) study of former New York City police commissioner William Bratton. Their "tipping point leadership" model demonstrates four competencies that William Bratton used in transforming police organizations without additional resources and in a short time period.

There are a lot of opportunities for failure during the change process even if the change leader is very talented. The leader can become too complacent or, concerned about challenges to their power, put together too weak of a change coalition. The vision can be inadequate or the leader can undercommunicate the vision. The leader is unable to counter resistance to the change or there are not enough short-term wins to build credibility. Finally, the change leader can declare victory too soon and the transformation is never fully-completed (Kotter, 1999, pp. 9-10).

As discussed in the Breadth Component, there is little consensus on what leadership is and, as demonstrated in the Depth Component, there seems to be even less agreement on what change leadership is and what is a successful change process. As admitted by several researchers, there is little empirical research that establishes the

competencies needed for change leadership and the factors for affecting transformational change in organizations (let alone in public agencies). The concluding section offers a general framework of change leadership and a change process for public agencies that could be the basis for further empirical research in the areas of leadership and change management.

Synthesizing a Change Model for Public Agencies

The change model for public agencies draws upon the Breadth Component's public agency leadership model for the change leader part of the model. The change process is a synthesis of the common elements from the change models described previously in the Depth Component. Taken together, these parts form the complete model for initiating, leading, and accomplishing change in public agencies.

As described in the Breadth Component, the public agency leadership model rests on a foundational component of integrity which supports three additional components: resonance, empowerment, and vision. Not only are these four components essential for the prime directives of public agency leadership (conserve the agency mission, maintain the agency, and gain support) but they also vital in initiating and leading change in public agencies.

This is because the public agency leadership model contains the four competencies necessary for change leadership as discussed in the section on "Change Leadership." First, the model emphasizes the skill of crafting a vision which leads into the second competency of communicating the vision. The model also stresses the third competency of building coalitions to support the vision. The final competency is derived

from the moral exemplar part of the integrity component. Setting an example implies a personal commitment from the leader and this is the fourth change competency of the drive to make a difference.

The public agency leadership model also supports the Kim and Mauborgne (2003) tipping point leadership model. This model consists of four hurdles that are common in transforming public agencies: resources, motivation, politics, and cognitive (p. 64). Public leaders who use the public agency leadership model possess the integrity to create win-win situations to overcome resource problems and to motivate followers to believe in the change vision. Through empowerment and resonance, the public leader can change the cognitive resistance (mindsets) to accept the change vision. Public leaders using the leadership model are politically-savvy and thus can silence critics and create coalitions to support the vision. Thus, the public agency leadership model has some indirect empirical support based on Kim and Mauborgne's case studies of William Bratton's successful public agency change efforts.

Even so, change leadership is necessary but not sufficient to affect change in public agencies. A change process is needed so that the change leader can communicate what to change and how to change to the organization. A change process is also necessary in measuring progress toward the desired state and insuring that the change leader does not stop before the transformation is fully complete. Drawing from the comparison of seven different change processes, a general model of a public agency change process has been developed.

The first step of the proposed change process is composed of three tasks for the change leader. The change leader constantly scans the organization's environment to

anticipate change. At the same time, the change leader also continually analyzes the organization's culture, emotional intelligence, and capacity for change. When the leader spots the need for change, they balance the need for change versus the organization's ability to change so that the proposed change will have the most benefit for the organization with the least cost. The key here is to anticipate change and not overreact to impending change.

When the change leader determines the need for change, they craft an initial vision that is designed to start a dialogue with the members of the organization. Based on the dialogues, the change leader assembles a change team that has the key players necessary to build a coalition to support the change. The change team revises the initial draft of the vision to encourage more dialogue until enough support has been gained and the opposition to the change has been answered. At this point, the final version of the vision has been drafted and is used to create the implementation plan.

During the implementation phase, the change leader and the change team continue to communicate the need for change and provide clear guidance on how the change will happen. The goal in this phase is to provide an unambiguous path from the current situation to the desired change state. It is also vital as this phase to quell any opposition by celebrating wins, defeating nostalgia for the past situation, and silencing critics.

While the implementation phase is progressing, the change leader and change team continually monitor the progress of the change effort to determine if the goals in the vision statement are being fulfilled and the costs of the change are contained. Once the goals of the change vision have been reached, the change leader and change team celebrate the organization's arrival at the new organizational state. The change leader and

change team also capture lessons learned from the change effort so that they can apply what they learned to the next change effort. The change leader then goes back to surveying the environment and analyzing the organization in anticipation for the next change.

Organizational change is difficult and it seems especially so with public agencies. As the research demonstrates, change is complex and it is difficult to pin down the few factors that determine the success or failure of organizational transformation. The public leader change model and change process are supported by the literature and by the few empirical studies that exist concerning public agency transformation, but more research needs to be performed to verify the models. Be that as it may, the Breadth model of public leadership and the Depth model of public agency change capture the current thinking on leadership and change management and thus are beneficial models for guiding public leaders.

References

- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18. 158-198.
- Anderson, D., & Anderson, L.A. (2001). *Beyond change management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Anderson, L.A., & Anderson, D. (2001). *The change leader's roadmap*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Black, J.S., & Gregersen, H.B. (2003). *Leading strategic change: Breaking through the brain barrier*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Prentice Hall.
- Bloch, S. (2002). Positive deviants and their power on transformational leadership. *Journal of Change Management*, 1:3. 273-279.
- Bryson, J.M., & Crosby, B.C. (1992). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Caldwell, R. (2003). Models of change agency: A fourfold classification. *British Journal of management*, 14. 131-142.
- Caluwe, L., & Vermaak, H. (2003). *Learning to change: A guide for organization change agents*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cameron, K.S., & Quinn, R.E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Cloke, K., & Goldsmith, J. (2002). *The end of management and the rise of organizational democracy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Day, J.D., & Jung, M. (2000). Corporate transformation without a crisis. *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 4. 117-127.
- Denis, J., Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 44:4. 809-837.
- Doig, J.W., & Hargrove, E.C. (1987). "Leadership" and Political Analysis. In Doig, J.W., & Hargrove, E.C. (Eds.). (1987). *Leadership and innovation: A biographical perspective on entrepreneurs in government*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. 1-23.

- Duck, J.D. (2001). *The change monster: The human forces that feed or foil corporate transformation and change*. New York: Crown Business.
- Evans, J., & Schaefer, C. (2001). *Ten tasks of change: Demystifying changing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Gill, R. (2003). Change management – or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3:4. 307-318.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Higgs, M., & Rowland, D. (2001). Developing change leaders: Assessing the impact of a development programme [sic]. *Journal of Change Management* 2:1. 47-64.
- Joffe, M., & Glynn, S. (2002). Facilitating change and empowering employees. *Journal of Change Management*, 2:4. 369-379.
- Kim, W.C., & Mauborgne, R. (2003). Tipping point leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. 60-69.
- Kotter, J.P. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*. Boston: Harvard Business Review.
- _____ (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review.
- Lichtenstein, B.B. (2000). Self-organized transitions: A pattern amid the chaos of transformative change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14:4. 128-141.
- MacDonald, J. (1998). *Calling a halt to mindless change*. New York: AMACOM.
- Osborne, D., & Hutchinson, P. (2004). *The price of government: Getting the results we need in an age of permanent fiscal crisis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Parry, K.W., & Proctor-Thomson, S.B. (2003). Leadership, culture and performance: The case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management* 3:4. 376-399.
- Pietersen, W. (2002). The Mark Twain dilemma: The theory and practice of change leadership. *Journal of Business Strategy*. 32-37.
- (2000). Skills, values or impression management? *Journal of Management Development*, 19:5. 407-419.

Stewart, J., & Kringas, P. (2003). Change management – Strategy and values in six agencies from the Australian public service. *Public Administration Review*, 63:6. 675-688.

Watkins, J.M., & Mohr, B.J. (2001). *Appreciative inquiry: Change at the speed of imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Weymes, E. (2003). Relationships not leadership sustain successful organisations [sic]. *Journal of Change Management*, 3:4. 319-331.