

# **Change Concepts and Innovation**

**Eleanor D. Glor**

Fellow, McLaughlin College,  
York University,  
Toronto, Canada

## **Change Concepts and Innovation**

**Eleanor D. Glor**

### **Abstract**

Discussions of public service innovation and change tend to bandy about complex concepts derived from the fields of organizational psychology, sociology and management. This paper moves away from the "one best way" approach to describe some of the relevant concepts and possible differences between change and innovation. Some governments, among them the Government of Canada (GoC) and international organizations (OECD), now specify innovation as an objective. The Canadian Clerk of the Privy Council, for example, in her *Fourth Annual Report* to the Prime Minister said that "experimentation and innovation need to be encouraged and supported" (Bourgon, 1997: 26). In her *Fifth Annual Report* she said "The Canadian model ... encourages experimentation and the emergence of a diversity of institutional models to put before decision makers" (Bourgon, 1998: 1). Although what is meant by the term *innovation* is not always totally clear, and it often merely means improvements, institutional support for "innovation" is now more common. Often this is symbolic support for the current ideology.

This paper explores some of the major factors that have affected government's capacity to be innovative, including paradigms followed, definitions used or implied, the approach to organizational change, motivation to innovate, organizational capacity for change, change management, discourses and people, organizational culture, the politics of change and impact. A wide range of literature was consulted in Google Scholar.

### **Introduction**

This paper considers what the literature has said about change and innovation from a number of perspectives—paradigms, definitions, the concept of organizational change, motivation to change, organizational capacity for change, change management, discourses and people, organizational culture, the politics of change and the impact innovation and change have.

### **Methodology**

The literature reviewed here was identified through a search of innovation + change in Google Scholar. For the most part, this has meant the copyright for the material covered was either held by the author or the author had permission to distribute the material. Some copyrighted material is included. This database thus includes a wider range of articles than the typical literature search that considers the most recent five years of publications in the top five public administration journals. Whether this made a difference is discussed.

## **Paradigms**

A major paradigm shift occurred during the last fifty years, with a move from public bureaucracy to New Public Management, developed to support the right-wing shift in governments beginning in the 1980s. NPM sold off crown corporations, hired contractors in place of public servants, created separate agencies (Talbot, 2002) and stopped seeing the role of public servants as serving the public, replaced by serving the government of the day. Glor (2001a) demonstrated that NPM was adopted by the Government of Canada.

NPM has been preoccupied with inputs as opposed to outputs. Talbot (2001), who specialized in evaluations, considered the importance of the changes in the public sector and public management in the United Kingdom over the two decades from 1979-2000, focusing on inputs, and concluding that NPM had not qualitatively altered the share of public services consumed, the numbers employed or the range of services offered.

Talbot subsequently asserted, however:

More specifically, the effort to scientifically measure such achievements began at least early as the start of the 20th century. Successive waves of such efforts have occurred, most notably in the English speaking countries but also in many others. But there can be little doubt that the current wave of reform in this area is larger, broader, deeper and longer than all previously recorded attempts (Talbot, 2006: 2).

## **Definitions**

Potocnik and Anderson (2016: 1) sought to clarify the nomological network of change and innovation-related constructs. The nomological relates to or denotes certain principles, such as laws of nature, that are neither logically necessary nor theoretically explicable, but are simply taken as true. Nomological is another term for nomothetic. Their literature review revealed a number of inter-related constructs that have emerged over the last decades. They examined several constructs - innovation, creativity, proactive behaviours, job crafting, voice, taking charge, personal initiative, submitting suggestions, and extra-role behaviours. Their conceptual analysis suggested that each one of these constructs represents a specific component of change and innovation-related behaviours. They also found that on occasion these concepts have been dysfunctionally operationalized, including three dysfunctional effects: (1) construct confusion, (2) construct drift, and (3) construct contamination. Challenges enhancing conceptual and operational clarity are discussed.

The OECD's Oslo Manual defined innovation as a new or improved product or process (or combination thereof) that differs significantly from the unit's previous products or processes and that has been made available to potential users (product) or brought into use by the unit (process). This definition is based on what is delivered and whether it has been adopted. It does not address order of adoption, what the innovative aspects are or how innovative it is. A second

kind of definition is also subjective but instead of focusing on the product, focuses on the perception of newness. It considers dissemination of innovation and defines innovation as anything perceived. A third kind of definition also considers innovation as implemented but as more strictly new. One definition of public sector innovation of this type is the conception and implementation of new ideas, never done this way before in its organization, involving risk and improvement (Glor, 2021a: 3-4). Glor also distinguished dissemination and trailblazing (early [first three in the USA and Canada] adoption). Change involves making the form, nature, content, or future course of something different from what it is or from what it would be if left alone: Glor (2021a) explored and distinguished the terms change and innovation as employed in the study of the public sector, by examining especially theories, definitions of and distinctions between dissemination/trailblazing and innovation/change.

## **Organizational Change**

Organizational change has been of interest to scholars for a considerable length of time. Early scholars on the subject were Rogers (1995) who wrote about the innovation process. He saw innovation as the first adoption of a change. Glor (1998) called this invention. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) wrote about radical organizational change as bringing together the old and the new (neo-) institutionalism.

Based on his interest in the innovation diffusion process, Rogers (1995: 262) identified five adopter categories involved in disseminating an innovation. These included innovators (2.5% of the adopter population), early adopters (13.5%) (innovators and early adopters, total 16%), early majority (34%), late majority (34%) and laggards (16%) (total 50%). This was an estimate, based on a normal curve. He called all of them innovation but the later ones could be considered change, not innovation, depending on the definition of innovation used.

Greenwood and Hinings (1996) asserted that the complexity of political, regulatory, and technological changes confronting most organizations made radical organizational change and adaptation a central research issue. This article set out a framework for understanding organizational changes from the perspective of neo-institutional theory. The principal theoretical issue addressed was the interaction of organizational context and organizational action, that Glor (2002) called determinism and voluntarism. The article examined the processes by which individual organizations retained, adopted, and discarded templates for organizing, given the institutionalized nature of organizational fields.

Hage (1999) concluded that three ideas—a complex division of labor, an organic structure, and a high-risk strategy—provoke consistent findings relative to organizational innovation. Of the three ideas, the complexity of the division of labor is most important as it taps the organizational learning, problem-solving and creativity capacities of the organization. He concluded that these ideas can be extended to the study of interorganizational relationships and the theories of organizational change. Integrating these theories would provide a general organizational theory of evolution within the context of knowledge societies.

Another important element in understanding organizational change is whether change is seen as arising from systemic tension or strategic choices. The *systemic conflict framework* views the organization as a social system based on conflict, politicking and inherent tensions between individuals, departments and organizations. These tensions are seen as providing the impetus for change. When change is seen as based on *strategic choices* (the entrepreneurial approach), on the other hand, the organization is considered to be “a social system which changes by choice. Solutions are found outside the organization and the manager's job is to canvas the environment, import the most relevant solution and act. Depending on whether a systemic or strategic model is chosen, change is understood to be emergent or planned, respectively” (Wilson, 1992: 20-23). Bottom-up approaches to change can be seen to be systemic, while top-down ones are strategic. *Determinism and voluntarism* are also important elements of this distinction. Determinism underlines laws, regularities and limits on human will, while voluntarism (a strategic choice framework) emphasizes the role of human action (Gouldner, 1980; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Reed, 1985; Glor, 2002).

Change models can also be based on the *forces at work*. Lewin (1951) identified driving forces for change as new personnel, changing markets, changing attitudes, internationalization, social transformations and new technology, and restraining forces as fear of failure, loss of status, inertia/habit, strength of culture, rigidity of structure, lack of resources, contractual agreements and strongly held beliefs and recipes for evaluating activities.

Barnett and Carroll (1995: 217) considered organizational change to have two aspects—process and content. Process relates to how change occurs, content to what changes in the organization. Theories and analyses consider these elements as well as why organizations change and the consequences. Empirical evidence is fragmentary and occasionally contradictory. The authors concluded that considering both had the most potential to resolve this problem. Such models could be used to test social science theories as well as to evaluate programs of organizational change. Organizational theory would benefit from considering change more.

Klarner, Probst and Soparnot (2007) found that in an increasingly dynamic business environment organizations had to change constantly in order to develop and survive. *Organizational change capacity* was considered a solution to the question of how organizations can sufficiently adapt to internal and external changes. While the literature dealt with the characterization of change capacity, understanding of the construct was still underdeveloped. They therefore tried to develop a conceptual model of change capacity, that contributed to the literature in several ways. First, it presented a review and classification of existing approaches to change capacity. Second, because a more holistic understanding of the construct was required, their paper combined existing perspectives with a definition. Third, a conceptual model of change capacity was presented that built on a case study of change capacity and enhanced it with theoretical arguments. The authors concluded that understanding what change capacity is would allow companies to better deal with its determinants and consequently increase organizational level of adaptation and ultimately survival.

Klarner and Probst identified two paradigms in the organizational change literature. The first, the *change management paradigm*, suggested change could be managed. It had five prescriptive models: hierarchical model (Child, 1972) (planning of the stages of change),

organizational development (Beckhard, 1969) (devices for support and accompaniment of employees: participation, communication, training and incentives), political (Pfeffer, 1981) (negotiation device for ensuring convergence of interests; legitimacy of the reformers and political support), incremental (Cyert & March, 1963/2015) (reliance on existing routines for initiating in an incremental change), and interpretive (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). The second, the *complex paradigm*, included organizational learning. It structured the context, established facilitating conditions, and indicated change is embedded in organizational constraints. The complex model advanced that change is not manageable.

The management paradigm, based on a driving dimension, included transformational leadership, perceived legitimacy of the change, collectively built change processes, incremental deployment and creation of visibility. The complex paradigm, based on a contextual dimension, included a belief in the value of change, structural flexibility, cultural cohesion, trust, practices based on consensus and capabilities of individual learning.

Graetz and Smith (2010) asserted that most *organizational change approaches* assume change in organizations is linear and one-at-a-time. They examined ten organizational change philosophies, considering the fundamental assumptions governing the different change management approaches. including biological, rational, institutional, resource, contingency, psychological, political, cultural, systems, and postmodern philosophies. Revealing biases and the unidimensional nature of theoretical philosophies of organizational change, the article argues for a multi-philosophy approach that applies an interactive mix of continuity and change.

## **Motivation to Change**

“To be motivated means *to be moved* to do something” (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Some innovation research is occupied with how individuals can be encouraged or persuaded to become more creative (e.g. Basadur, Graen and Green, 1982; Amabile, 1988). Public sector innovation is sometimes defined as any activity that is new to the government introducing it. Using this definition, the same activity could be an innovation many times, as long as it is new to the low-level organization involved. Glor (1997, 2002) used a more demanding definition: something new is considered an innovation only if it is the first time the activity has been introduced in Canada or Canada and the USA. Innovative governments, then, are governments at the forefront of change (Glor, 1997: 4) with regard to a problem, policy, program or administrative practice.

Behaviour modification is the basis of all concepts of motivating others, as well as issues of reward, learning and organizational culture (Wilson, 1992: 28). Research on motivation has largely been preoccupied with explaining and attempting to find ways to enhance the creativity of the *individual innovator* and the individual as part of a *group*, rather than focussing on major factors that impact a government's capacity to be innovative. An individual's motivation is indeed sometimes the primary factor in the innovation process: Individual needs and wants are then the starting point for motivation to innovate. A need is a state of dissatisfaction or frustration that occurs when one's desires outweigh one's actualities, when "wants" outrun "gets" (Rogers, 1995: 164). A response to these personal needs and wants is intrinsic motivation.

The literature does not discuss how the individual feels about the innovation or its impact on the individual's or the program's future (e.g. being laid off, abolishing the unit). If the innovation has important negative implications for staff, this creates extrinsic motivation.

An individual may also develop motivation when s/he learns that an innovation exists. Rogers, for example, asked: Which comes first, needs or awareness of an innovation? Innovations can lead to needs/wants as well as vice versa. As a consequence, some change agents attempt to stimulate motivation by pointing out to leaders and/or staff the existence of desirable new ideas or *best practices* through *benchmarking*. Knowledge of the existence of an innovation or best practice can thus create motivation for its adoption, though of course not needs per se, which exist regardless of the possibility of their satisfaction. Both needs and induced wants can motivate innovation.<sup>1</sup>

While individual urges to innovate can lead to new ways of doing things, frequently innovation in the public (and private) sector is driven by the identification of a problem that the leadership of the organization (usually) or the staff themselves (e.g. as in some quality programs) has determined needs fixing. A concerted effort is then made to solve the problem, sometimes in any way possible, including innovatively. While direction to innovate often creates extrinsic motivation, motivation developed because of knowledge of a better approach created through benchmarking could be a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation or even intrinsic motivation.

Although some ideas in the public service come from individuals, new ideas are often conceived and articulated from above in the hierarchy—by a political party or by someone with authority, such as a minister, senior executive or middle manager, rather than by more junior or front-line staff of the department. Notwithstanding that this approach does not draw fully on individual effort and intrinsic motivation, central support and leadership for innovation is usually a crucial factor in public sector innovation, and is more easily implemented. Such support can take the form of promoting changes, developing policies, passing supportive legislation and providing resources for change. Too often change and innovation are unfunded initiatives, unless the government is convinced it will save money. Central agencies also encourage innovation in line departments by responding positively to requests for changes and also by encouraging or sustaining change through the kinds of policies, direction and regulations it creates for departments. From the perspectives of most public servants, innovation is driven by central agencies for staff groups within line agencies, at the behest of ministers or deputy ministers. This usually creates extrinsic motivation for public servants. Front-line public servants have the same motivational problem trying to convince middle and senior managers of the need to adopt an innovation.

The push for innovation in the public service thus comes basically from one of two directions—from intrinsic individual creativity or from extrinsic direction to develop solutions to problems. Which approach is used has important implications for the level of creativity or

---

<sup>1</sup> The normative basis for distinguishing between needs and wants and deciding which innovations should be adopted is not dealt with in this paper.

innovativeness of the ideas produced, because, as Amabile (1988: 142-3) demonstrated, the intrinsically motivated person is more creative than someone who is extrinsically motivated.

The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is often reflected in models of innovation. Zaltman, Duncan and Holbekt (1973: 2-3), for example, identified two types of innovation in their definitions of innovation—programmed and non-programmed. *Programmed innovations* were scheduled in advance, such as the extension of a production line or appointment of a permanent staff member to take over work previously done by consultants. (Personally, I would not consider either to be an innovation but rather a change.) *Non-programmed innovations* were not scheduled and could be of two types: *distress*, where innovation happened in response to a pressing problem and *slack*, where innovation was stimulated by the availability of resources. King (1990) proposed a third type of non-programmed innovation, *pro-active innovation*. It involved an individual or group seeking to draw the organization's attention to an area where the need for change was not previously recognized. In a similar vein, Mackworth (1965, 1997: 2-3) distinguished problem solving and problem finding. "Problem solving is a choice between existing programs or sets of mental rules—whereas problem finding is the detection of the need for a new program based on a choice between existing and expected future programs." Innovation in response to problems can be seen as action within existing possibilities while a more general desire or need or openness to meet organizational or social objectives can create new options, thus expanding the region of possibility. In the public service, problem finding is often driven by an interest in and a desire to serve the public good—by public servants' and politicians' desires to bring about improvements in society at large or in specific areas of the public domain (government, state-owned corporations, administrative agencies). Again, the ideas produced are likely to be based on a broader consideration of options. Both programmed innovations and non-programmed innovations in response to distress can be seen as being motivated by specific problems, or problem solving, and to be extrinsically motivated; while non-programmed innovations developed in response to slack and pro-active innovations can be seen as being developed as a consequence of problem finding and to be intrinsically motivated.

Glor (2001b) developed a model of types of innovation, with eight patterns: Reactive, Active, Necessary, Imposed, Proactive, Continuous, Buy-in and Transformational. They are based on three factors: motivation (extrinsic/intrinsic), organizational culture (top-down, bottom-up) and magnitude of change (minor, major).

Innovation by public (civil) servants based on intrinsic motivation causes some observers concern. Aucoin (1997: 292-3), for example, cautioned against an entrepreneurial public service. Others emphasized the personal benefits public servants seek in innovating, as addressed in concepts such as public choice theory and principal-agent theory (Massey, 1997). Public choice theory assumes that political actors are mostly self-interested and that people act in the same way in government as they do in the free market. Principal-agent theory is a theoretical framework that describes the relationship between a principal and an agent, and the potential for misalignment in decision-making. The principal is the party that delegates tasks to the agent while the agent executes the tasks delegated by the principal. The motives of public servants in innovating are thus impugned; corruption would also be a concern at this level of analysis. A reality check suggests, however, that at present, at least, the lack of consistent rewards for



innovation, and the penalties frequently incurred for the frequent outcome—failure—means that government employees who are innovative are not realistically likely to do so to enhance their personal status. They are much more likely to be motivated by curiosity, commitment, finding a way to address a problem they care about, or a desire to meet higher-order organizational and/or societal objectives<sup>2</sup> than to be motivated by personal or professional gain. Innovators want to make a difference but the preference for hiring business administration graduates in the Government of Canada after about 2005 may have had an impact on its culture.

## **Organizational Capacity for Change**

A number of factors influencing change in organizations have been grouped under the rubric of organizational capacity for change. Some of them include leadership and managerial capabilities, organizational capacity for change and the link between evaluative inquiry and organizational learning.

### ***Leadership and managerial capabilities***

The literature examined the relationship between employees and leaders as a factor in leading innovation, change and willingness to change and innovate.

Yasir et al (2016) examined leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire) and employees' trust toward organizational change capacity (OCC) (Yasir et al, 2016: 1). The authors collected data from a convenient sample of managers, coordinators, officers, community facilitators, social organizers, and activists using questionnaires. A total of 250 respondents were sent questionnaires, resulting in 204 usable questionnaires. Their results revealed positive and significant relationships between transformational leadership and employees' trust, an insignificant relationship between transactional leadership and employees' trust, and a negative relationship between laissez-faire and employees' trust. Findings were a positive and significant relationship for transformational leadership and transactional leadership with OCC. Employees' trust mediated the relationship between leadership styles (transformational, laissez-faire) and OCC. Employees' trust did not mediate the relationship between transactional leadership and OCC.

Shipton, Budhwar and Crawshaw (2012: 777) examined whether and how human resource management (HRM) influences organizational performance against a backdrop of complex change. They presented a preliminary framework integrating the diverse themes explored in the special issue, and proposed a mediating role for organizational change capacity (OCC), a subset within the resource-based literature labeled "dynamic capabilities." Not well researched, there is nonetheless evidence that OCC is positively associated with organizational performance and that this relationship is stronger in conditions of high uncertainty. The framework includes external and internal parameters they suggest moderate the relationship between human resource management (HRM), OCC, and organizational performance.

---

<sup>2</sup> Csikszentmihaly found the same intrinsic motivators at work in the celebrated creative people he studied.

Bucciarelli (2015) conducted a literature review of the main models for leading innovation and change. She found the most important theories of innovation and change and compared the most managerial ones with the soft/people-oriented ones. This qualitative approach paid particular attention to human interaction and stakeholders' power in the change process. The most important theories found were the eight-stage theory proposed by Kotter (1996), establishing a sense of urgency to create stronger people engagement, balance of forces analysed and represented through Force Field Analysis to visualise the balance of engagement and power influences toward the change. Bucciarelli proposed change was mostly to realign values and the owner mindset that did not allow a proper change management process because of misaligned strategy regarding corporate goals, and the stages model of change. She suggested the stages model interacts with strategies, stakeholder balance, power, culture and forces.

### ***Organizational Capacity for Change***

Spaulding, Kash, Johnson and Gamm (2017) developed a measurement tool to understand a health care organization's capacity for attempting and completing multiple and sometimes competing change initiatives. They asserted that capacity for change implementation is a critical success factor as the health care industry is faced with ongoing demands for change and transformation. The aim of the study was to develop and validate a tool to measure health care organizations' capacity to change by building upon previous conceptualizations of absorptive capacity and organizational readiness for change. A survey was sent to two populations asking for answers to questions about the organization's leadership, culture and technologies in use throughout the organization. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to validate the survey as a measurement tool for organizational capacity for change in the health care setting. The resulting organizational capacity for change measurement tool proved a valid and reliable method of evaluating a hospital's capacity for change through the measurement of the population's perceptions.

The authors suggested the tool could help health care managers and leaders evaluate the capacity of employees, departments, and teams for change before large-scale implementation. While the authors alerted the reader to the possibility that the values that the individuals that make up the culture hold may be contrary to the values that the executive administration is attempting to change and that individuals may develop a mistrust of executive leadership during this change process, thus making new routines and procedures difficult to implement, they did not address this issue in their findings. Using employees' willingness to answer surveys as a way to encourage to accept change may reduce not enhance trust.

According to Glor (1998), once a new idea has been conceived, through *individual* extrinsic or intrinsic motivation, readiness has been achieved. Glor (2007a, b) also explored *organizational* readiness (fitness) for change. Fitness is an evolutionary term describing survival within an environment. She addressed two questions related to organizational fitness for change: (1) How can the fitness of organizations be identified? (2) How do the results of different fitness assessments compare? Glor employed three different methods to assess the fitness of organizations, addressing the capacity: to communicate about the need for change, for change to emerge (in complexity) and to handle different magnitudes of change.

Schweiger, Kump and Hoormann (2015/16) developed a concept for diagnosing and developing organizational change capabilities in firms. Their model of capabilities distinguished search, reflection, seizing, planning, implementation and strategy-making capabilities. Concepts for diagnosing and improving change capabilities and a generic innovative intervention design for organizational development were developed.

Errida, Lotfi and Chatibi (2023) developed a model for assessing organizational change readiness. Based on a literature review, they developed a conceptual model of change readiness, with enablers, criteria, and attributes. Using fuzzy logic, they calculated two core indexes: the fuzzy organizational change readiness index (FOCRI) and the fuzzy performance importance index (FPII). The indexes were computed to identify the level of organizational readiness for change and its weak attributes, thereby allowing managers to formulate plans for improving change readiness within their organizations. A Moroccan private sector case study was examined.

Ting (2011: 245), more generally, argued that organizational capacity is critical to the effective implementation of policy. Strategic legislators and bureaucrats must take capacity into account when designing programs. Ting developed a theory of endogenous organizational capacity, modeled as an investment that affects a policy's subsequent quality or implementation level.

Talbot (2002: 8) commented: “to be worthwhile an agency needs to be able to bring about a significantly greater improvement [innovation] than could be achieved by improving the existing organisational system [change], given the extra effort needed to create it, usually in an environment where capacity to bring about reform is in short supply.” An organization’s capacity to change is an important consideration in deciding whether to innovate or change. It sometimes seems to be ignored.

### ***Evaluative inquiry and organizational learning***

In terms of developing innovation capability in organizations, Lawson and Samson (2001) discussed using a dynamic capabilities approach. An extensive review of the literature on innovation management, along with a case study of Cisco Systems, were used to develop a conceptual model of the firm as an innovation engine. This new operating model saw substantial investment in innovation capability as the primary engine for wealth creation, rather than the possession of physical assets. Building on the dynamic capabilities literature, an “innovation capability” construct was proposed, with seven elements—vision and strategy, harnessing the competence base, organisational intelligence, creativity and idea management, organizational structures and systems, culture and climate, and management of technology. A number of these capabilities seem similar to the ones developed by several others, such as Schweiger, Kump and Hoormann (2015/16), and do not truly seem much different from good management elements.

Goh, Cousins and Elli (2006) reviewed the literature and suggested there is a link between evaluative inquiry and organizational learning in schools. Prior to their article, there had been no published studies examining the views, perceptions and importance teachers and administrators attached to these practices and activities in their schools. Their article reported results from a survey of 970 educators about their views on organizational learning and evaluation. Teachers and school administrators in 41 middle and secondary schools in Manitoba,

Canada, responded to questions about current evaluation practices, attitudes towards evaluation and experience with systematic inquiry, organizational learning capacity, school support structures and their readiness for evaluation and change. The survey results suggested educators perceived their schools had a moderate capacity for organizational learning. Similarly, they indicated that a moderate to low level of evaluation activity was taking place in their schools. Some implications for change in building a learning capacity and an evaluative inquiry culture in schools was discussed.

## **Change Management**

Although organizational capacity for change and change management are conceptually different, the literature treats them rather similarly and identifies similar factors in their success.

Change and innovation begin with identifying a needed change and negotiating approval to introduce it (Glor, 1997, 1998). Negotiating approval to introduce innovation or change is crucial. It has two aspects—convincing management and convincing staff. For problem-solving innovations, management approval is much easier to secure than it is for problem-seeking innovations that have been observed by public servants/the public but not necessarily by managers or Cabinet ministers. Whether the problem has sufficient priority, and whether it is worth facing the losers<sup>3</sup> from the change are inevitable questions that decision-takers face. Will to change is a complex factor to create in both management and employees. Frequently change is meant to create a more efficient organization and can involve employee lay-offs. Employees are thus naturally hesitant to support change if it may harm them or their programs in which they believe. Often employees have ideas for improvements but their ideas are often more acceptable to employees than management. In unionized environments, management tends to be especially reluctant to respond positively to employee ideas, as management protects its prerogatives. The term change management is regularly used to describe management's attempt to manage (or, frankly, manipulate) employees into change that is not to their advantage. Even left-wing governments have trouble with strikes, but for a different reason, as employees seek to fulfill objectives considered impossible under right-wing governments.

Errida and Lotfi (2021), through a literature review, identified factors affecting change management success and examined their relevance in a case study of a Moroccan construction company. They reviewed 37 organizational change management models to identify the factors that affect change management success. Further research validated the factors. The factors were identified and grouped into 12 categories relevant to the successful implementation of organizational change initiatives within the case. They concluded additional research is needed to explore the relevance of the identified factors in other organizations and sectors.

The 37 factors they identified are listed in Appendix 1. The similarity between these factors and the antecedents Glor (2021b) found in her systematic literature review of antecedents of public innovation was striking, although Glor's research of innovation did not find as much

---

<sup>3</sup> Michael Fullan believed there will inevitably be losers (Fullan, 1982).

focus on management control. Both literature searches found mostly typical management strategies and, in some cases, the same authors were referenced for both change and innovation, for example, Amabile, Kotter and Kanter. The similar factors included as external and internal support, commitment and motivation, and leadership, although Glor also emphasized external and systemic factors while Errida and Lotfi emphasized individual factors.

The concept of change management addresses Glor's (1998) innovation process stages of creating will and accomplishing implementation. It is sometimes used to describe three quite different approaches to change, however—top-down change, bottom-up change and consultation with the public. Change management can be used as a set of strategies for bringing unwilling employees or reluctant affected public groups along with a decision taken in a top-down manner, and often involves limited consultation, if consultation occurs at all. This approach to change management is more likely to be employed with a problem-solving approach or when substantial winners and losers would be created. It is not the only possible way to proceed, however. A more problem-finding and inclusive approach can be used to deal with both narrow and broad problems. One of the advantages of bottom-up approaches and consultation with stakeholders, the public, political parties, elected officials and public servants lies in the potential for gaining additional proponents through these processes. Moreover, the civil society movement and demands for public consultation and even participation in decision-taking have pushed progressive governments to more participative models of reform rather than top-down models. A disadvantage of consultative approaches has been the time it takes, sometimes considered delays, and the way they bring out differences as much or more than consensus. Opponents tend to be more involved than supporters. The increase in political partisanship in recent years has made bottom-up change more unlikely as some governments are convinced they know the solutions to complex problems, distrust the public service and its expertise and distrust parts of the public and are not interested in what they have to say about approaches and solutions to problems.

The concepts of change management and the manager as a change leader support the belief that planned change is possible—this belief is a choice among several possible presumptions. The concept of empowering managers to plan for change tends to ignore wider forces and implications of actions. Putting management of individuals at centre stage means implementing preconceived models of change and achieving a particular set of expected, predetermined, desired outcomes. Internally to the organization, however, change can be seen in several ways—occurring, for example, in an open system, within a population ecology or in an organizational life cycles (Wilson, 1992: 41-49).

Many authors addressed how to do change management. For example, Dempsey et al (2022) identified the success and failure factors for change management and provided a method for dealing with failure factors. In their systematic literature review, 38 success factors and 23 failure factors were identified in literature published from 2006 to 2021. Comparing the frequency of mentions of the factors, four success and three failure factors emerged. The success factors included communication, creating a vision/change message, early active participation of all individuals, and top management commitment. The failure factors were resistance to change, using standardized concepts, and viewing change initiatives as short-term. Complementarity and dependence links between failure and success factors were identified. Solutions for resolving three failure factors were offered. Identifying key factors affecting project success was part of

handling change. A consistent change management framework that is adaptable to individual organizations was recommended.

How change management is done is thus related to the type of motivation driving the innovation, the outcomes decision-takers and public servants are intending and willing to accept, how wedded they are to pre-determined approaches, and their understanding of the dynamics that lead to change. That Errida and Lotfi (2021) found 37 organizational change management models suggests that consensus has not yet formed around change management but also that authors are not paying enough attention to what others have said about change management.

## **Discourses and People**

Discourse analysis can play a role in understanding organizational change. Grant et al (2006: 6) concluded discourse analysis contributed in five key ways. Its contributions revealed the important role of discourse in the social construction of organizational change; demonstrated how the meaning attached to organizational change initiatives comes about as a result of a discursive process of negotiation among key actors; showed that the discourses of change should be regarded as intertextual; provided a valuable multi-disciplinary perspective on change; and exhibited a capacity to generate fresh insights into a wide variety of organizational change related issues.

McMillan (2016) provided an example of how discourse analysis could inform change. Examining the work experience of nurses, McMillan argued that discourses that inform organizational change have the capacity not only to support change but also to silence it, especially in the healthcare field, for nurses. With changes in healthcare organizations being inevitable and occurring at unprecedented rates, such changes greatly impact nurses and their work. Yet their experiences are rarely explored. Organizational change discourses remain grounded in perspectives that explore and explain systems, but often do not address the people within them. Change processes in healthcare organizations informed by organizational discourses validate only certain perspectives and forms of knowledge. This fosters exclusionary practices, limiting the capacity of some individuals or groups of individuals to effectively contribute to change discourses and processes. Reliance on mainstream organizational discourses in healthcare organizations has left little room for the exploration of diverse perspectives on the subject of organizational change, particularly those of nurses. Michel Foucault's work challenged dominant discourses and suggested that strong reliance on specific discourses effectively disqualifies certain forms of knowledge. Foucault's writings on disqualified knowledge and parrhesia (truth telling and frank speech) facilitate the critical exploration of discourses that inform change in healthcare organizations and nurses' capacities to contribute to organizational discourses. The McMillan paper explores the capacity of nurses to speak their truths within rapidly and continuously changing healthcare.

## Organizational Culture

The term culture, like terms innovation and motivation, are well-used terms that have become imprecise because of overuse and authors creating their own definitions rather than using those shared by others. Uttal (1983) described culture as "shared values (what is important) and shared beliefs (how things work), that interact with an organization's structural and control systems to produce behavioural norms (the way we do things here)" (Thomas, 1993; 1996). To this definition Talbot added the concepts of basic assumptions and artifacts (visible manifestations) (Cummings and Huse, 1989).

Handy (1986) defined four types of organizational culture, focussed on the division of labour. A *power culture* is centrally controlled by a single individual or group that determines the culture. It favours and nurtures strong individuals. Fisher (2022) described this as the innovative Silicon Valley culture.<sup>4</sup> In *role cultures* processes are subject to rule, precedent and regulation, and people are organized in a pyramid, with large power distances and reduced ambiguity. The culture of bureaucracy is often defined this way. The culture of the *task* or *business project*, on the other hand, is often reflected in decentralized, consensual organizations that favour group over individual work in matrix structures. The culture of the task and cultures of *people or professionalism*, the fourth culture, favour individualism and avoid bureaucratization and large power distances, and also often lack structure. Each of these four cultures leads to very different interpretations of the process of organizational change.

Another way of looking at culture is structurally or interpretively. The "excellence" approach of Peters and Waterman (1982), for example, is a *structural* model, that focuses on organizational structure and is critical of bureaucratic structure. It identified the importance of organizational culture for performance, and the need for a decentralized, project-based organization. Their model favoured a unidirectional approach. The one-best-way approach was first used by Frederick Taylor, who believed it was the role and responsibility of manufacturing plant managers to determine the best way for workers to do a job. Taylor developed the assembly line. People are emphasized, and the culture requires almost fanatical devotion from employees. Empirically, however, Peters and Waterman's approach may not be strong, as 20 of the 62 companies they studied as models of excellence in face of change were experiencing severe problems within two years of the publication of the Peters and Waterman book (Wilson, 1992: 75). As Wilson noted, "The question is whether organizational culture and excellent performance consist of anything more than the ceremonious, the ritual and the symbolic, aimed at securing emotional attachment to the organization" (Wilson, 1992: 75-91).

An *interpretive* view of culture, on the other hand, analyzes change from the perspective of the individual's definition of the situation. The important factors are the interpretive and cognitive processes by which individuals support change, facilitate it or resist it. Symbols, language and interpretation are essential to this view. Through the cultures approach, corporate culture is personalized and the change process is seen to be fuelled by a variety of

---

<sup>4</sup> An acquaintance of mine who headed a Canadian high-tech company defined innovation as what he told his employees to invent. He was recruited by a Silicon Valley company.

interpretations, each of which contributes to spurring action, creating vision and sustaining energy in those participating.

The cultural responses to change literature rarely address the often legitimate fear of employees that change will affect them negatively. The structural and interpretive approaches are thus not mutually exclusive: both are at work in an organization. Nor should the individual or the organization be the sole elements considered in cultures. Broader societal and institutional values impact change in organizations, and involve such issues as the sense of individualism or collectivity, the power distance that is acceptable, and the degree to which uncertainty is or is not tolerated.

Culture became a central theme in management and organization literature during the 1980s (Peters and Waterman, 1982). A combination of culture change, human resource management and total quality management were said to be key to organizational performance and produced employees who shared organizational values and gave of their best at work. In his sceptical article about culture, Willmott (1992) pointed out the potential for the prescriptions of corporate culturalism to have subjugating and even totalitarian implications, and asserted the benefits of and the need to work for autonomy, self-conscious formulation of values (Weber, 1968), democratic practices, and the benefits of *cool alternation* (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) and *emancipatory contingencies* (Deetz, 1992).

## **Politics of Change**

In the public sector, politics of change can be found in both formal politics and politics internal to the organization. Glor (1997, 2002) examined innovation within a government context where the government wanted change and innovation to occur, change was supported by its political party, its candidates, its electoral platform, and a large majority within its Legislature. This political environment created consensus before the government took power, secured approval for the innovations more easily and assured human and financial resourcing for the innovations.

Au-Yong-Oliveira (2022) defined negative organizations as organizations where powerful people manage to keep a negative strategy in place. It does not benefit the firm but perpetuates their power. Positive organizations, led by positive leaders who do not feel threatened by brilliant employees who have brilliant ideas, may be less prominent than we think and should not be taken for granted. The status quo tends to be very strong. Innovating and disrupting that balance is dangerous and seldom succeeds. The article was based on the author's personal experience; a look at Nokia (the former handheld mobile phone division), seen to be a negative organization; in-depth personal interviews with three experts on the topic of positive versus negative organizations; and the results of two surveys of Millennials (n = 116) (born 1981 – 1996) and Generation Z (n = 115) (born 1997 – 2012). The Generation Z respondents (94.8%, 109) believed negative organizations existed, where the status quo prevailed over innovative individuals and innovation was seen to be to the detriment of the global organizational strategy.



## **Impact**

The scope and degree of organizational change are important determinants of the impact of change. Hickson et al. (1986) developed a classification system for organizational change that described four degrees of change: status quo, expanded reproduction, evolutionary transition and revolutionary transformation. *Status quo* and *expanded reproduction* leave power dynamics and organizational strategies in place and are focused on operational changes. *Evolutionary and revolutionary change* primarily involve strategic as opposed to operational decisions and require a shift in the current ways of operating or thinking about an organization's function. They tend to have the greatest impact on both individuals and organizations. Glor (2024) found that operational changes were more common than either evolutionary or revolutionary changes.

Schaffer, Sandau and Diedrick (2013) provided an overview, summary of key features and evaluation of the usefulness of six evidence-based practice models for organizational change frequently discussed in the literature with nursing practice in mind. They found that the Johns Hopkins Model and the Academic Center for Evidence-Based Practice Star Model emphasized the processes of finding and evaluating evidence that is likely to appeal to nursing educators. Organizations may prefer the Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services Framework, Advancing Research and Clinical Practice through Close Collaboration, or Iowa models for their emphasis on team decision-making. They recommended an evidence-based practice model that is clear to the clinician and fits the organization as it will guide a systematic approach to evidence review and practice change.

Talbot (2004) considered whether the UK's Next Steps program achieved its immediate goals of structural and institutional change, and whether these led to behavioural change and improved performance. He concluded that Next Steps had mostly met its goal of structural changes to the civil service, though questions remained as to whether this was sufficiently radical or particularly well thought out. He considered there was a serious issue about whether the single status adopted for 'agencies', as opposed to the variety considered in the actual Next Steps report, was the best course of action. This debate likely resurfaced as part of the discussion about NHS Foundation Trusts, Public Interest Companies and "earned autonomy" and was alluded to in a review. Concerning whether Next Steps improved management in government, he concluded the answer was yes and no.

## **Discussion**

This section addresses the implications of using the Google Scholar database as the source of articles reviewed and the learning created through this review.

### ***Whether the database chosen made a difference***

Gusenbauer and Haddaway (2020) investigated and compared the systematic search qualities of 28 widely used academic search systems, including Google Scholar, PubMed, and Web of Science. Using a query-based method, they tested how well users were able to interact with and retrieve records from each system. They recommended against the approach taken in the current paper—use of the Google Scholar database as the sole source of publications for

literature reviews (SLR) and meta-analyses in general. They highlighted Google's unwillingness to reveal the size of its database. I can personally attest, as a journal publisher, that Google seeks permission to include an open source journal's data and does not include it unless permission is given. It does not compensate journals for this permission. Most other databases of scholarly publications also only include a journal if permission is given. As far as I know, only EBSCO compensates journals, minimally.

Nonetheless, Google Scholar has several important advantages over other databases. First, it is freely available on every computer with a search engine. Other databases charge for access to their databases. This means non-university-based scholars and students everywhere have easy access. Second, Google Scholar includes some grey literature, an unknown proportion. In a field like innovation, this can be an advantage. Non-university-based scholars, especially, have a hard time getting published in the major or even any journals. If a broad range of articles is sought, as opposed to the publications of the best-known scholars, Google Scholar and ResearchGate have an advantage over other databases, such as ICI/Imago/Scopus, which only lists, for example, 172 public administration journals in January 2025. The current paper has sought to reach a broader range of publications than previous publications by the author, and hence had an advantage.

Harzing and van der Wal (2008) agreed with my conclusion that Google Scholar is an appropriate source for a systematic literature review:

Traditionally, the most commonly used source of bibliometric data is Thomson ISI Web of Knowledge, in particular the Web of Science and the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), which provide the yearly Journal Impact Factors (JIF). This paper presents an alternative source of data (Google Scholar, GS) as well as 3 alternatives to the JIF to assess journal impact (h-index, g-index and the number of citations per paper). Because of its broader range of data sources, the use of GS generally results in more comprehensive citation coverage in the area of management and international business. The use of GS particularly benefits academics publishing in sources that are not (well) covered in ISI. Among these are books, conference papers, non-US journals, and in general journals in the field of strategy and international business. The 3 alternative GS-based metrics showed strong correlations with the traditional JIF. As such, they provide academics and universities committed to JIFs with a good alternative for journals that are not ISI-indexed. However, we argue that these metrics provide additional advantages over the JIF and that the free availability of GS allows for a democratization of citation analysis as it provides every academic access to citation data regardless of their institution's financial means (Harzing and van der Wal, 2008: 61).

Jacso (2005) noted that Eugene Garfield's ideas of citation-based searching, resource discovery and quantitative evaluation of publications serves as the basis for many of the most powerful online information services these days. He compared the major features of the Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar citation-based and citation-enhanced databases. Martin-Martin and Thelwall (2021) compared the proportion of citations found by six major aggregators and found Google Scholar was the most comprehensive source.

Google Scholar is thus an acceptable source of references on public administration innovation and change concepts.

### ***What Have We Learned About Change and Innovation?***

This paper considered a number of public administration factors influencing change and innovation—paradigms, definitions, the concept of organizational change, motivation to change, organizational capacity for change, change management, discourses and people, organizational culture, politics of change, and impact. It found that the literature reviewed on innovation had not been considered differently from change and that both focus for the most part on the organization and its people rather than the external environment and politics. Glor (2021b) is an exception, for public innovation. Both innovation and change have been treated as public administration challenges, with similar solutions at that.

Glor (2021a) argued that change is different from innovation because innovation is so new. Not all innovations are harder to implement than changes, however. This is true not only because of the nature of the change/innovation but also because innovations often have new resources while changes are often funded from existing resources, even though they may imply new costs, at least in the short run. In the current environment, changes and innovations are often seen as ways to save resources rather than ways to offer new programs or services. Moreover, given the strength of conservative movements, new programs or services often face a hard time surviving once a conservative government is elected. In the past conservative governments usually left changes and innovations in place, but no longer. Glor's (2023) research on the survival of Saskatchewan's innovations found that survival rates of innovations were lower than the survival rates of normal organizations, even though innovations were meant to be better approaches to real problems.

## **Conclusion**

A good leader understands not only that change is needed, when it is needed, and the strategy that should be used to achieve it but also considers a range of possible approaches to creating motivation, managing the change, understanding the environment, and the potential impact of the change.

## **About the Author:**

***Eleanor D. Glor*** is Editor-in-Chief and Founding Publisher of *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal (TIJ)* ([www.innovation.cc](http://www.innovation.cc)) and Fellow, McLaughlin College, York University, Toronto, Canada. As a practitioner, she worked for the Government of Canada, two Canadian provincial governments, a regional municipality and a city. Eleanor has published about public innovation in the areas of aging, rehabilitation, public health, aboriginal health, the Province of Saskatchewan, and other Canadian governments. She has published seven books, five chapters and 46 peer-reviewed articles on public sector innovation from an organizational, especially a public service perspective. Eleanor published five articles in a special issue on Public Innovation in Saskatchewan, Canada, *TIJ*, 28(1), 2023, <https://innovation.cc/all->

issues/ Her most recent publication is Innovative Differences among Canadian Federal and Provincial Governments, in *TIJ*, 29(3), 2024. Email address: glor@magma.ca

## References:

- Amabile, T. M. 1988. A Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10: 123-167.
- Aucoin, P. 1997. The design of public organizations for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: why bureaucracy will survive in public management. *Canadian Public Administration*, 40(2) (summer): 290-306.
- Au-Yong-Oliveira, M. 2022. Negative Organizations and [Negative] Powerful Relationships and How They Work against Innovation—Perspectives from Millennials, Generation Z and Other Experts. *Sustainability*, 14: 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142417018>
- Barnett, W. P. and G. R. Carroll. 1995. Modeling Internal Organizational Change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21: 217-236.
- Basadur, M., G.B. Graen & S.G. Green. 1982. Training in Creative Problem-Solving: Effects on ideation and problem solving in an industrial research organization. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30: 41-47.
- Beckhard, R. 1969. *Organization development: Strategies and models*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Berger, P. L. and T. Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Bucciarelli, L. 2015. A Review of Innovation and Change Management: Stage Model and Power Influences. *Universal Journal of Management*, 3(1): 36-42. <http://www.hrpub.org> DOI: 10.13189/ujm.2015.030106
- Bourgon, J. 1997. Fourth Annual Report to the Prime Minister on the Public Service of Canada. Ottawa, Canada: Privy Council Office.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. Fifth Annual Report to the Prime Minister on the Public Service of Canada. Ottawa, Canada: Privy Council Office.
- Burrell, G. and G. Morgan. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London, UK: Heinemann.
- Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6: 1-22. Collected from the Sage Social Science Collection.
- Csikszentmihaly, M. 1996. *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and*

*Invention*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial, a Division of HarperCollins Publishers.

Cummings, T. G. and E. F. Huse. 1989. *Organization development and change*. 4th Edition. New York, NY: West Publishing.

Cyert, R. & J. March. 1963/2015. Behavioral theory of the firm. *Organizational Behavior*, 2.

Deetz, S. 1992. *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.

Dempsey, M., L. Geitner, A. Brennan & J. McAvoy. 2022 A review of the success and failure factors for change management. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 50(1): 85-93. doi: 10.1109/EMR.2021.3130989

Errida, A. & B. Lotfi. 2021. The determinants of organizational change management success: Literature review and case study. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, 13: 1–15. DOI: 10.1177/18479790211016273

Errida, A., B. Lotfi & Z. Chatibi. 2023. Development of an Assessment Model of Organizational Change: Readiness by using Fuzzy Logic. *Procedia Computer Science*, 219: 1909–1919.

Fullan, Michael. 1982. *The Meaning of Educational Change*. Toronto, Canada: OISE Press/The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Glor, E. D. (Ed.) 1997. *Policy Innovation in the Saskatchewan Public Sector. 1971-82*. Toronto, Canada: Captus Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1998. Public Sector Innovation in Canada. Chapter, pp. 300-340 in Randy Hoffman, Diane Jurkowski, Victor MacKinnon, Janice Nicholson, and James Simeon (eds). *Public Administration: Canadian Materials*, Third Edition. Toronto, Canada: Captus Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2001a. Has Canada Adopted the New Public Management? *Public Management Review: an international journal of theory and research*, 3(1): 122-130.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2001b. Innovation Patterns. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 6(3), article 2.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Ed.). 2002. *Is Innovation a Question of Will or Circumstance?* Ottawa, Canada: The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal. <https://innovation.cc/document-library/books/>

\_\_\_\_\_. 2007a. Identifying Organizations Fit for Change. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 12(1), article 5. <https://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol12-no1.htm>

\_\_\_\_\_. 2007b. Assessing Organizational Capacity to Adapt. *Emergence: Complexity & Organization (E:CO)*, 9(3): 27-40. <https://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol12-no1.htm>

\_\_\_\_\_. 2021a. Defining, Distinguishing and Studying Public Sector Innovation and Change. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 26(3), article 4.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2021b. Analysis of Antecedents of Trailblazing and Adoption of Public Policy Innovation Identified by a Systematic Literature Review – II. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 26(2), article 3. <https://innovation.cc/all-issues/volume26-issue2/>

\_\_\_\_\_. 2023. Establishing a First Demography (Implementation, Fate) of 183 Public Innovations and Comparison of Policy and Administrative Innovation Demography to Normal Policy and Organization Demography. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 28(1), article 2. <https://innovation.cc/all-issues/volume28-issue1/>

\_\_\_\_\_. 2024. Innovative Differences among Canadian Federal and Provincial Governments. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 29(3), article 3. <https://innovation.cc/all-issues/volume29-issue3/>

Goh, S. C., J. B. Cousins & C. Elli. 2006. Organizational Learning Capacity, Evaluative Inquiry and Readiness for Change in Schools: Views and Perceptions of Educators. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7: 289–318. DOI 10.1007/s10833-005-5033-y

Gouldner, A. W. 1980. *The Two Marxisms: Contractions and Anomalies in the Development of Theory*. London, UK: Macmillan.

Graetz, Fiona & Aaron C. T. Smith. 2010. Managing Organizational Change: A Philosophies of Change Approach. *Journal of Change Management*, 10(2) (June): 135–154.

Grant, David, Grant Michelson, Cliff Oswick & Nick Wailes. 2006. Guest editorial: discourse and organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 18(1): 6-15. DOI: 10.1108/09534810510579814

Greenwood, R. & C. R. Hinings. 1996. Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(4) (Oct.): 1022-1054.

Gusenbauer, M. & N. R. Haddaway. 2020. Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Res Syn Meth*, 11: 181–217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378> <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jrsm.1378> open access.

Hage, J. T. 1999. Organizational Innovation and Organizational Change. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 25: 597-622.

- Handy, C. B. 1986. *Understanding Organizations*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Harzing, A.-W. K. & R. van der Wal. 2008. Google Scholar as a new source for citation analysis. *Ethics in science and environmental politics*, 8: 61–73. doi: 10.3354/ese00076
- Hickson, D.J., R.J. Butler, D. Cray, G. Mallory and D.C. Wilson. 1986. *Top Decisions: Strategic Decision Making in Organizations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell; San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacso, P. 2005. As we may search – Comparison of major features of the *Web of Science*, *Scopus*, and *Google Scholar* citation-based and citation-enhanced databases. *Current Science*, 89(9), 10 November: 1537-1547.
- King, N. 1990. “Innovation at Work: The Research Literature”. Pp. 15-59 in M. A. West and J. L. Farr, *Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies*. New York, NY and Toronto, Canada: John Wiley and Sons.
- Klarner, P., G. Probst & R. Soparnot. 2007. From Change to the Management of Organizational Change Capacity: a conceptual approach. Geneva, Switzerland: Université de Genève Archive. <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:5739>
- Kotter, J. P. 1996. *Leading Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lawson, B. & D. Samson. 2001. Developing Innovation Capability in Organizations: A dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 5(3) (September): 377–400.
- Lewin, K. 1951. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Mackworth, N. 1965/1997. Originality. *American Psychologist*, 20: 51-66.
- Martin-Martin, A. & Mike Thelwall. 2021. Google Scholar, Microsoft Academic, Scopus, Dimensions, Web of Science, and OpenCitations’ COCI: a multidisciplinary comparison of coverage via citations. *Scientometrics*, 126: 871–906. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03690-4> 1 3
- Massey, A. 1997. *Globalization and Marketization of Government Services*. New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press.
- McMillan, K. 2016. Politics of change: the discourses that inform organizational change and their capacity to silence. *Nursing Inquiry*, 23(3): 223-231. DOI: 10.1111/nin.12133
- Peters, T. and R. Waterman. 1982. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America’s Best-run Companies*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. Understanding the role of power in decision making. *Power in organizations*, 404: 423.

Potocnik, K. & N. Anderson. 2016. A constructively critical review of change and innovation related concepts: Toward conceptual and operational clarity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(4): 481-494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1176022>

Reed, M. 1985. *Redirections in Organizational Analysis*. London, UK: Tavistock.

Rogers, E. M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. New York, NY: The Free Press, a division of Simon and Schuster Inc.

Ryan, R. M. & Edward L. Deci. 2000. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25: 54–67. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Schaffer, M.A., K. E. Sandau & L. Diedrick. 2013. Evidence-based practice models for organizational change: overview and practical applications. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(5): 1197–1209. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.06122.x

Schweiger, C., B. Kump & L. Hoormann. 2015/16. A Concept for Diagnosing and Developing Organizational Change Capabilities. *Journal of Management and Change*, 34/35(1/2): 12-28.

Shipton, H., P. S. Budhwar and J. Crawshaw. 2012. HRM, Organizational Capacity for Change, and Performance: A Global Perspective. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/tie

Spaulding, A., B. A. Kash, C. E. Johnson & L. Gamm. 2017. Organizational capacity for change in health care: Development and validation of a scale. *Health Care Management Review*, 42(2): 151-161. DOI: 10.1097/HMR.0000000000000096

Talbot, C. 2001. UK public services and management: Evolution or revolution? *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 14(4): 281-303.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2002. March. *So Who Needs Agencies? A Handbook exploring the issues of using 'agencies' as a reform device in central governments*. Glamorgan, Wales, UK: University of Glamorgan. ISBN: 1-840540-53-2.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004. Executive Agencies: Have They Improved Management in Government? *Public Money & Management*, April: 104-112. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9302.2004.00402.x

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006. Performance regimes and institutional contexts: Comparing Japan, UK and USA. Paper for the International Symposium on Policy Evaluation, 24-25th June 2006, Tokyo, Japan. Found on Google Scholar.



Thomas, P. 1993. "Coping with Change: How Public and Private Organizations Read and Respond to Turbulent External Environments." Pp. 31-62 in F. Leslie Seidle (Ed.), *Rethinking Government: Reform or Reinvention?* Montreal, Canada: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Beyond the Buzzwords: Coping with change in the public sector. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 62: 5-29.

Ting, M. M. 2011. Organizational Capacity. *The Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 27(2): 245-271. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41261721>

Uttal, B. 1983. "The corporate culture vultures." *Fortune*, 17 October.

Weber, M. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (3 volumes). New York, NY: Bedminster Press.

Willmott, H. C. 1992. Postmodernism and excellence: The de-differentiation of economy and culture. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 5(1): 58-68.

Wilson, D. C. 1992. *A Strategy of Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management of Change*. New York, NY and London, UK: Routledge.

Yasir, M., R. Imran, M. K. Irshad, N. A. Mohamad and M. M. Khan. 2016. Leadership Styles in Relation to Employees' Trust and Organizational Change Capacity: Evidence from Non-Profit Organizations. *SAGE Open*, October-December: 1–12. DOI: 10.1177/2158244016675396

Zaltman, G., R. Duncan, R. and J. Holbek. 1973. *Innovations and Organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.

**Appendix 1: Factors in Change Management**

<b>Critical factors</b>	<b>Sub-factors</b>	<b>References</b>
Motivation of employees and change agents	Motivation of change agents Creating short wins Motivation Rewards, celebration, & recognition Incentives Building a support system for change agents Consideration of individual needs and values	Lippitt et al.  Kotter, Kanter, Mento et al. Cummings and Worley, Burke and Litwin Kanter, Garvin, Prosci, ACMP, Anderson and Anderson Knoster Cummings and Worley  Burke and Litwin
Stakeholder engagement	Engagement and commitment of supervisors, midlevel managers, and senior managers Stakeholder engagement Personal and employee commitment Organizational engagement Internal support External support Change agents' commitment	Prosci <sup>59</sup>  ACMP, Faest and Hemerling, Smith et al. Change First  Faest and Hemerling  Fernandez and Rainey, Kickert Fernandez and Rainey, Kickert Lippitt et al., Change First
Training, coaching, and empowerment	Coaching of employees Mobilizing commitment Knowledge, ability and learning development Training Employee empowerment Skill development	Prosci Luecke, Garvin, Change First, Jick Smith et al., Hiatt, ACMP  Garvin, Prosci, Kanter, ACMP Kotter, Kickert Greer and Ford
Resistance management	Transition management Resistance management Behavior management	Lewin, Cummings and Worley, Carnall, Prosci, Smith et al., Cawsey et al. Beckhard and Harris, Judson, Prosci Greer and Ford
Leadership	Political support and external support Leadership; enabled leaders Champions and sponsors, sponsorship	Fernandez and Rainey, <sup>57</sup> Kickert <sup>58</sup>  E first, Faest and Hemerling, Burke and Litwin, Garvin, Jick, Mento et al., Kotter, Kanter Jick, Prosci, ACMP, IMA, Mento et al.
Structured approach for change	Continuous improvement Planning	Anderson and Anderson Knoster, Bullock and Batten, Judson, Prosci, Smith et al.

<b>Critical factors</b>	<b>Sub-factors</b>	<b>References</b>
	Action planning Develop a change plan  Planning and road mapping Structure, systems (policies and procedures) Formal policies, procedures, and systems Management structure and processes Structured approach of change Governance and PMO Integration of project and change management	ACMP, Cawsey et al., Anderson and Anderson Greer and Ford Mento et al., Jick, Fernandez and Rainey, Kickert Faest and Hemerling  Prosci, Change First, Perkins, Kanter, ACMP  Luecke  Kanter  Faest and Hemerling, Prosci, ACMP, IMA, Cummings and Worley Faest and Hemerling, Smith et al., Perkins Prosci, ACMP, Smith et al., Perkins
Monitoring, measurement	Tracking, measuring, reporting, and feedback  Progress monitoring	Kanter, Mento et al., Prosci, ACMP, Faest and Hemerling Perkins, Smith et al., Galpin Luecke, Garvin, ACMP
Reinforce and Sustain change	Reinforce new behaviors Reinforce, maintain, and institutionalize change  Anchor change in corporate culture Consolidate gains and improvements, integrate lessons learned, establish best practices Develop reinforcement strategy and create cultural fit Pursue comprehensive and systemic change	Cummings and Worley, Hiatt Kotter, Lippitt et al., Bullock and Batten, Jick, Judson, Garvin, Prosci, ACMP, IMA, Change First, Smith et al., Fernandez and Rainey, Kickert Kotter  Mento et al., ACMP, Anderson and Anderson  IMA, Smith et al.  Fernandez and Rainey, Kickert

**Source:** Errida and Lotfi 2021, Appendix 1.