

CHANGE THAT DRIVES INNOVATIVE MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY

Noviaty Kresna Darmasetiawan

Faculty of Economics, Universitas Surabaya, email: noviatykds@yahoo.com

Abstract

Innovation requires change. In the business environment, resistance to change is deleterious to organizations. The ability to continuously adapt to change enables firms to achieve sustainable value creation and competitive advantage. Major organizational changes for innovation can anticipate resistance, especially if proposed changes alter values and visions related to the existing order. Change may be viewed in terms of the alteration in activities and tasks of the organization. These may range from subtle modifications in procedures and operations (such as continuous improvement or small incremental steps); to transformational radical changes (such as rapid expansion into international markets, mergers or major restructuring in an organization). On the other hand, for firm to be innovative there must be awareness throughout the organization of the need for innovation. Along with the streamlining of operations and processes to improve product and service delivery, the mindset of employees needs to change. Since innovation is an important factor for future growth of any business venture, change management is required for achieving the required business strategies and practices. This case study was conducted to review change that drives innovative management. It was an exploratory study and had been done by using semi-structured interviews with ten managers. The research questions explored were: What were the drivers of change? How did the drivers support organizational objectives and goals? And what was the resistance to change? This firm had Continuous Innovation or Improvement for its corporate culture, and this research showed that it was the most important driver for its change. It was also found that the most important ingredient for successful change management was employee involvement. Therefore, management should pay more attention to human dimensions when implementing change. They have to invest more time in communicating, training and following up on the change system or process. It is important for management to seek and take into consideration the input from employees into procedures for implementing change.

Keywords: innovation, change, exploratory study, corporate culture

Abstrak

Inovasi membutuhkan perubahan. Dalam lingkungan bisnis, menolak perubahan akan membahayakan organisasi. Kemampuan secara terus menerus untuk beradaptasi terhadap perubahan, memungkinkan perusahaan untuk mencapai penciptaan nilai secara berkesinambungan dan keunggulan kompetitif. Perubahan besar organisasi untuk inovasi dapat mengantisipasi penolakan terhadap perubahan, terutama jika perubahan yang diusulkan mengubah nilai dan visi yang telah ada. Perubahan itu sendiri, dapat dipandang sebagai

terminologi perubahan dalam kegiatan dan tugas dari organisasi. Luas lingkungannya dapat mulai dari modifikasi prosedur dan kegiatan operasional (seperti *continuous improvement* atau langkah kecil yang mendasar); sampai ke perubahan transformasi yang radikal (seperti ekspansi yang cepat ke pasar internasional, merger atau restrukturisasi besar dalam organisasi). Di sisi lain, agar perusahaan menjadi inovatif, harus ada *awareness* di seluruh organisasi akan kebutuhan inovasi. Bersama dengan perampingan kegiatan operasional dan proses pengembangan produk dan pemberian layanan, harus ada perubahan mindset karyawan. Karena inovasi adalah faktor penting untuk pertumbuhan masa depan dari bisnis modal apapun, manajemen perubahan dibutuhkan untuk mencapai strategi dan praktek bisnis yang dibutuhkan. Studi kasus ini dilaksanakan untuk mengulas perubahan yang mendorong dilaksanakannya manajemen inovatif. Ini adalah studi eksploratori dan telah dilaksanakan dengan menggunakan wawancara semi-terstruktur dengan sepuluh manajer. Pertanyaan penelitian ini adalah: Apa yang menjadi pendorong perubahan? Bagaimana pendorong tersebut mendukung tujuan dan sasaran organisasi? Dan apa faktor penolak perubahan? Perusahaan ini menjalankan inovasi berkesinambungan atau pengembangan berkesinambungan sebagai budaya perusahaan, dan riset ini menunjukkan bahwa hal tersebut adalah pendorong terpenting untuk perubahan perusahaan. Hasil juga menunjukkan bahwa kunci penting untuk suksesnya manajemen perubahan adalah keterlibatan karyawan. Karena itu manajemen harus menaruh perhatian lebih terhadap dimensi manusia ketika mengimplementasikan perubahan. Mereka harus melakukan investasi waktu yang lebih banyak dalam hal komunikasi, pelatihan dan tindak lanjut terhadap perubahan sistem atau prosesnya. Penting bagi manajemen untuk mencari dan menjadi pertimbangan, masukan dari para karyawan tentang prosedur untuk implementasi perubahan.

Kata kunci: *innovation, change, exploratory study, corporate culture*

1. Research Background

Definition of change management according to Moran and Avergun (1997) is “the process of continually renewing the organization’s direction, structure and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of the marketplace, the organization and employees.” This does not go far enough as successful change management also requires the alignment of an organization’s internal architecture, individual actions and collective goals in order to achieve optimal results. Clearly, achieving this is unlikely to be an entirely smooth process.

Various authors have written about change management. Tushman and Romanelli (1995) for instance proposed the equilibrium model of organizational change, where there is an interaction between radical and incremental change. They argue that organizations progress through convergent periods and reorientations. Convergent periods are relatively long time spans of incremental change and adaptation, whereas reorientations are relatively short periods of radical, discontinuous change. It was proposed that organizations embark on change to achieve consistencies in activities or operations for high performance.

Two main reasons were identified that drive change. They are the sustained low performance resulting from a lack of consistency among activities in the activity domains, regardless of the appropriateness of the overall strategic orientation, and major changes in competitive, technological, social and legal conditions of the environment that make the current strategic orientation, regardless of its initial success, no longer effective (Tushman and Romanelli, 1995). Other authors have written about the profound economic, demographic and technological and management trends driving organizational change (Butler, 1993).

One question should be asked that why organization needs to change to be innovative. It is because innovation requires change, and in the business environment, resistance to change is deleterious to organizations. The ability to continuously adapt to change enables firms to achieve sustainable value creation and competitive advantage. Major organizational changes for innovation can anticipate resistance, especially if proposed changes alter values and visions related to the existing order.

For firms to be innovative there must be awareness throughout the organization of the need for innovation. Along with the streamlining of operations and processes to improve product and service delivery, the mindset of employees needs to change. Since innovation is an important factor for future growth of any business venture, change management is required for achieving the required business strategies and practices.

This case study was conducted to review change that drives innovative management at certain corporation that disguise as X Corporation. It was an exploratory study and had been done by using semi-structured interviews with ten managers at "X" Corporation. This firm had Continuous Innovation or Improvement for its corporate culture and this study had the aim to prove whether its corporate culture had main role to drive change, or there will be other explanations. The research questions are as follows:

- a) What were the drivers of change at "X" Corporation to be innovative organization?
- b) How did the drivers support organizational objectives and goals?
- c) What was the resistance to change?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Imperative for Change

Various authors have written about change management. Tushman and Romanelli (1995) for instance proposed the equilibrium model of organizational change where there is an interaction between radical and incremental change. They argue that organizations progress through convergent periods and reorientations. Convergent periods are relatively long time spans of incremental change and adaptation, whereas reorientations are relatively short periods of radical, discontinuous change. It was proposed that organizations embark on change to achieve consistencies in activities or operations for high performance. Two main reasons were identified that drive change. They are the sustained low performance resulting from a lack of consistency among activities in the activity domains, regardless of the appropriateness of the overall strategic orientation,

and major changes in competitive, technological, social and legal conditions of the environment that make the current strategic orientation, regardless of its initial success, no longer effective (Tushman and Romanelli, 1995). Other authors have written about the profound economic, demographic and technological and management trends driving organizational change (Butler, 1993).

A case study of Heineken Inc. by Beugelsdijk et al. (2002) on organizational change indicated that the main drivers for change were cost reduction and organizational restructure in the company. Another study by Johnson and Leenders (2003) investigated the drivers for major changes in supply chain responsibilities. They postulated that drivers existed both outside and within the firm. They refer to dominant environmental pressures (such as cost, market changes, political issues and parent company), corporate strategic initiatives (such as downsizing, mergers, acquisitions, divestitures and new corporate vision) and personal preference (such as ERP system, outsourcing, tax compliance, technology and efficient improvement).

2.2. Managing Change

Major organizational changes for innovation can anticipate resistance, especially if the proposed changes alter values and visions related to the existing order. Programs that satisfy one group often reduce the satisfaction of other groups, because the survival of one set of values and visions may be at the expense of the other (Trader-Leigh, 2002). People respond to change indifferent ways, with employees often settling into a comfort zone, in terms of their working practices. If those practices are challenged, then resistance to change may result (Potter, 2001). Effective managers should be aware of this and focus on building confidence, competence and self-esteem, by giving individuals the opportunity to experience success at the new ways of working as soon as possible. Potter (2001) gives an example of introducing new technology, particularly information and communication systems. It is crucial to introduce the individual to the new system in small, bite-sized chunks in which they can experience total success. These small steps then start to build up to create a critical mass of positive experiences, leading to confidence in the new system.

Management should pay more attention to human dimensions when implementing change. They have to invest more time in communicating, training and following up on the change system or process. It is important for management to seek and take into 4 considerations the input from employees into procedures for implementing change. Hultman (1995) believes that most employees expect to have their views considered, and to be treated with respect. Otherwise, this will result in mistrust and resentment, making change more difficult to implement (New and Singer, 1983). Leading an organization through change involves constructively balancing the human needs of the employees with those of the organization. As organizations consist ultimately of people, organizational change essentially involves personal change (Bond, 1995; Steinburg, 1992; Dunphy and Dick, 1989) and requires the participation of people, who must first change themselves for organizational change to succeed (Evans, 1994).

The people aspect is critical. Introducing change is not just about changes in systems and processes; it is about people believing in change and wanting it to happen. Ford et al. (2002) note that for successful change, everyone must share the same objectives and initiative for successful change implementation. In addition, creativity breeds innovation (Gundry et al., 1994; Pascale and Carland, 1997; Perry, 1995; Ramsey, 1997), and bureaucratic, hierarchical organizations are less flexible, less amenable to change and less likely to empower staff (Jacob, 1995; Jeffane, 1995; Markovich, 1997; Milakovich, 1994/1995). Management has to consider aspects such as teamwork, organizational culture and staff commitment, which are important to managing change (Baba, 1995; Korsgaard et al., 1995; Uhlfelder, 1994). Rather than just focusing their attention on technical aspects, it is equally important for management to work with the human factors, to minimize resistance and aid the change process. Intervention strategies needed to assist employees to identify and interpret their own perceptions of change, and as a result create greater personal awareness and understanding of the individual self. This personal growth and development is likely to alter an individual's perceptions of organizational change, reducing the level of resistance (Bovey and Hede, 2001).

Table 1. Tools and Techniques to Facilitate Change

Education	Education or training is the best way to initially create awareness among management, supervisors and employees.
Assigning project managers for the change	The firm should deploy project managers solely dedicated to the management of change. These individuals are generally attached to one initiative, and attend much more in depth training, helping them to identify pockets of resistance, understand the readiness for change, map the roles involved in the initiative, create change plans and generally act as change consultants.
Partnership with external consultants	It is rare to find an organization that has the resources to address change across an enterprise. Sometimes external consultants are required to facilitate. The organization should ensure that roles, responsibilities and expectations are clarified for all, and that relationships are understood.
Having a plan for change	This is to ensure success of the initiative to managing change.
Incorporating a holistic approach	This approach considers various dimensions in the organization. The key is to manage from a high level perspective. Including awareness of other change efforts or initiatives that are occurring across the enterprise or within groups, departments, divisions, etc. There must be coordination among change managers, to ensure that activities are appropriately blended, or introduced in a timely manner. This approach looks at areas such as addressing people, the vision, leadership development, communications, individual and team development, and culture.
Evaluation of efforts	Accepting change is not a simple task that can occur overnight. It takes a long time for employees to adjust and accept. Constant monitoring and evaluation is required. The lessons learnt could be extremely applicable to subsequent large change initiatives as well.

Ford, Ford and McNamara (2002) propose three generic types of socially constructed realities that provoke resistance to change in the individual. Firstly, the employee may be complacent. This complacent background is constructed based on historical success, and the employee establishes that current success will continue or be easily repeated if things are left the way they are (Hedberg et al., 1976; Johnson, 1988). In this regard, employees avoid making disruptive changes (Gutman, 1988). Secondly, another factor contributing to resistance is the resigned background. Resigned backgrounds constructed from historical failure and reflect employee's pessimism (Reger et al., 5 1994). The result of a change implementation characterized by half-hearted actions, having no life or power in them, and reflecting a lack of motivation, and an apparent unwillingness to participate (Ford, Ford and McNamara, 2002). The third cause of resistance is the cynical background, similar to the resigned background of pessimism. The individual constructs a reality of disappointment, and expects change to fail (Reichers et al., 1997). A proposed suggestion to overcome these backgrounds or constructed realities is to 'reframe' the minds of employees (Dunbar et al., 1996). They have to recognize their way of thinking, and take responsibility or re-interpret the reasoning behind their negative behavior. This acknowledgment and discovery can assist the employee to overcome constructed feelings, and open opportunities for new responses (Ford, Ford and McNamara, 2002). Bechtel and Squires (2001) suggested tools and techniques to facilitate change. These are summarized in the Table 1.

2.3. Impact of Cultural Differences to Change

Authors such as Trompenaars and Woolliams (2003) offer a new approach to change. The overall core framework requires an assessment of the differences between current corporate culture and some envisaged ideal future corporate culture. However, established models for change then develop a change strategy based on transforming the organization from the current to an ideal culture. All organizations need stability and change, tradition and innovation, public and private interest, planning and laissez-faire, order and freedom, growth and decay. The authors illustrate four main stereotypes of culture within an organization on Table 2.

According to Lewin (1947), organizations are in dynamic tension between forces pushing for change and forces resistant to change. Established change management practice has stated that it is management's task to reduce the resistance to change and increase forces for change. Culture in organizations has a great impact on the success of change. Values are not artifacts that can be ignored. They are continuously created by interactions between humans. As such, culture is only meaningful in the context in which the change process unfolds (Trompenaars and Woolliams, 2003). The cultural differences are hidden, yet unifying aspects that provide meaning, direction and mobilization that can exert a decisive influence on the overall ability of the organization to deal with resistance to change.

Table 2. Four Main Stereotypes of Culture

The Incubator	The Guided Missile
a) This culture is like a leaderless team b) Characteristics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Person oriented 2) Power of the individual 3) Self-realization 4) Commitment to oneself 5) Professional recognition 	a) This task-oriented culture has a low degree of centralization and a high degree of formalization b) Characteristics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Task orientation 2) Power of knowledge/expertise 3) Commitment to tasks 4) Management by objectives 5) Pay for performance
The Family Culture	The Eiffel Tower Culture
a) This is characterized by a high degree of centralization and a low degree of formalization b) Characteristics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Power orientation 2) Personal relationship 3) Entrepreneurial 4) Affinity / trust 5) Power of person 	a) This role-oriented culture is characterized by a high degree of formalization together with a high degree of centralization and is symbolically represented by the Eiffel Tower (steep, stately and robust). b) Characteristics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Role orientation 2) Power of position/role 3) Job description/evaluation 4) Rules and procedures 5) Order and predictability

2.4. Innovative Management

To be a sustainable organization, it needs innovative management. Change in the organization or management can drive innovative management, because innovation requires change. To start change, organization needs driver of change and there are many drivers of change for organization, such as competitive pressure, customer demand and continuous improvement policy. Innovative management will make organization radically different from most organizations. The innovation will appear in the organization activities or processes to deliver innovative products or services. This will make the organization competitive and can become the market leader, growth and sustain.

According to Hamel (2005), management innovation is innovation in management principles and processes that ultimately changes the practice of what managers do, and how they do it. It is different from operational innovation, which is about how the work of transforming inputs into outputs actually gets done. How we can differentiate it. We should think of a company as a set of business processes that turn inputs into outputs. Business processes that turn labor and capital into services and products, for example. The business processes govern the workflow. Things such as logistic systems, order processing, call centers, customer support, and manufacturing.

Hamel also gives an example of management innovation in the workplace. The case of Toyota or Toyota’s lean manufacturing. At one level, we can say that lean manufacturing is predominately an operational innovation. Nevertheless, what sits a level of two above the operational changes is the radical management idea that there could be a positive return on investment

through using the problem-solving skills of your employees. A few decades ago, if there was an efficiency or quality problem in the business, companies sent in staff experts. They studied the system, and then rewrote the standard operating procedures. Moreover, the employees were asked to conform to those procedures. The idea that a company would actually give its employees the responsibility for making those changes, that was just unthinkable. Therefore, what looks like a purely operational innovation through one lens, actually turns out to stem from a radical new management principle.

Eisenberg (2002) told another perspective of innovation management. Despite the effort involved, innovation management, which refers to the requisite organizational values, resources and processes that enable a high level of consistent innovation, is now an imperative for organizations to survive and thrive in this era of non-linear change. It is also the only sustainable way of working “smarter”, rather than harder.

A recent international survey by Arthur D. Little, an international management-consulting firm, found that 84% of business leaders agreed that Innovation had become a more critical success factor than it had been five years previously. However, only 25% of businesses were satisfied by the current level of innovation in their own organizations.

Progressive, innovative companies, such as 3M, DuPont, Royal Dutch and Shell, enable all of their employees to have additional time and financial resources to pursue the development of their innovative proposals. Other outstanding innovators, such as Toyota, track manager’s success in encouraging direct reports to generate suggestions for improvement and include the results in performance appraisals. This results in more than one million such improvement suggestions annually (95% of them are implemented). Some innovative companies even mandate innovations. For example, at 3M the divisions expected to generate 30% of sales each year from products developed within the preceding four years. This prevents employees from becoming complacent by relying on the tried and true.

Innovation management requires employee training in creative thinking, plus modification of the corporate culture to encourage risk-taking and the provision of logistical resources to enable the progression from developing creative ideas to successfully rolling them out as innovations.

3. Research Methods

This exploratory study was done by using semi-structured interviews with ten managers at “X” Corporation. The justification for the adoption of the exploratory approach for this particular study lies in the nature of the subject area, and the set of interacting variables that influence innovation. The research question is focused essentially on drivers and change for innovation in “X” Corporation. It is congruent with Yin’s (2003) argument that such research, when requiring no control over behavioral events, should be carried out with case study.

In this exploratory study the unit analysis, managing change, was carefully constructed from an extensive search of the literature and our initial field studies. The research into the relationship between the drivers of change

and support for organizational goals was essentially exploratory. In investigating the issues of change management and how it enabled the firm to be innovative, the qualitative approach employed. Consequently, the data was collected from senior manager sat “X” Corporation, by using semi-structured interviews.

4. Result and Discussion

When the ten senior managers asked how they perceived change in the organization, different managers gave different responses. Some of them regarded change as keeping up with technology, restructuring the organization, improving the systems and processes, training employees to be more competent, and having improvement activities. Nevertheless, all the ten managers portrayed a positive attitude towards change.

The first aspect investigated was the overall direction of the firm. The managers were interviewed on the company mission and vision. Managers reported the operations depended on the overall goals and direction of the firm. From there, strategies were set in line with the operations of the firm. The managers were clearly stated that the firm’s vision is being market leaders through growth, efficiency and Continuous Improvement. Therefore, it has to be innovative all the time to achieve its vision.

When the managers asked the main reason for change, they all stated that the main imperative for embarking on change initiatives found in “X” Corporation centered on competitive pressure and customer demand. It was discovered that the drivers for change corresponded with innovation strategies and company objectives to achieve Continuous Innovation or improvements.

The managers indicated that there had been a change in the organizational structure, allowing for a leaner organization with fewer levels of authority. Employees were assigned to work in teams with a flat structure, allowing for generation of new ideas or improvements. Therefore, this firm strategically had the same objective for its company mission and vision. The managers also stated that their company becomes innovative organization and has innovative management, merely because the company gives its employees the responsibility for making those changes and becoming creative and innovative.

All the managers interviewed also stated that the employees of the firm were generally receptive to changes. It took from four weeks to about three months to implement a new system or process, before the employees became familiar and proficient at managing it. When asked about resistance to change, the managers held that the resistance was minimal and came from less than 10% of the employees. Some of the managers said that there had to be effective leadership and strategies to minimize resistance. They explained that middle management and supervisors were trained, enabling them to be knowledgeable and skilled in handling change. There upon, they could be allowed to further train their subordinates.

During the change implementation, senior management often met with middle managers for their views and consideration. They also stated the importance of obtaining support from all levels, so as to minimize resistance from employees. It was also found that the most important ingredient for

successful change management was employee involvement. Therefore, management should pay more attention to human dimensions when implementing change. They have to invest more time in communicating, training and following up on the change system or process. It is important for management to seek and take into consideration the input from employees into procedures for implementing change.

In this case study, the managers were also asked where most of the resistance came from. The finding showed that from less than 10% of the employees who took resistance to change, 20% came from supervisors and middle management. To minimize it, they had done many things as stated above. It is concluded that this case study can be benchmarked by other firms, which have similar corporate culture that also stated in their vision and mission, especially for those firms with Continuous Improvement or Innovation. Resistance to change is inevitable, that individuals express resistance both covertly and overtly and that an emotional cycle of change resistance and acceptance should be expected and actively managed.

Change management considered a crucial capability for innovation occurs. Innovation requires change, and in the business environment, resistance to change is deleterious to organization. People have to continuously adapt to change. This capability will enable firms to achieve sustainable value creation and competitive advantage. Effective managers should be aware of this by focusing on building confidence, competence and self-esteem in employees to manage change. The "X" Company has become innovative organization by having innovative management because it gives its employees the responsibility for making those changes and becoming creative and innovative to deliver products and services.

References

- Baba, M., 1995, The Cultural Ecology of The Corporation: Explaining Cultural Diversity in Work Group Responses to Organizational Transformation, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 31(2), 203-233.
- Bechtel, R.L., and J.K. Squires, 2001, Tools and Techniques to Facilitate Change. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 33(7), 249-255.
- Beugelsdijk, S., A. Slangen, and M. Herpen, 2002, Shapes of Organisational Change: The Case of Heineken Inc, *Journal of Organizational Change* 15(3), 311-326.
- Bond, M.P., 1995, *The Development and Properties of The Defence Style Questionnaire*. In Conte, H.R, and Plutchik, R. (Eds.) *Ego Defences: Theory and Measurement*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bovey, W.H., and A. Hede, 2001, Resistance to Organizational Change: The Role of Defence Mechanisms, *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 15(7), 534-548.
- Butler, M.A., 1993, *Libraries as User-Centred Organizations: Imperatives for Organizational Change*, Haworth, New York.
- Dunbar, R., R. Garud, and S. Raghuram, 1996, A Frame for Deframing in Strategic Analysis, *Journal of Management Inquiry* 5(3), 23-24.

- Dunphy, D.C., and R. Dick, 1989, *Organisational change by choice*, Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Evans, R., 1994, The Human Side of Business Process Re-Engineering, *Management Development Review* 7(6), 10-12.
- Ford, J.D., L.W. Ford, and R.T. McNamara., 2002, Resistance and The Background Conversation of Change, *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 15(2), 105-121.
- Eisenberg, H., 2002, *Innovation Management: Working Smarter with The Power of Collaborative Intelligence*, <http://www.syntrek.com>.
- Gundry, L., C. Prather, and J. Kickul., 1994, Building The Creative Organisation, *Organisational Dynamics* 22(4), 22-37.
- Gutman, D., 1998, Winners Into Losers, *Psychology Today* 22(5), 59-61.
- Hamel, G., 2005, *Management Innovation*, <http://www.management-innovation.com>
- Hedberg, B., P. Nystrom, and W. Starbuck., 1976, Camping on Seesaws: Prescriptions for a Self-Designing Organization, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21(1), 41-65.
- Hultman, K.E., 1995, Scaling The Wall of Resistance, *Training and Development* 49(10), 15-18.
- Jacob, R., 1995, The Struggle to Create an Organization for The 21st Century, *Fortune* 131(6), 90-99.
- Jeffane, R., 1995, Organisational Commitment and Perceived Management Styles: The Public-Private Sector Contrast, *Management Research News* 18(6/7), 9-20.
- Johnson, P., 1988, Why I race against phantom competitor, *Harvard Business Review* 66(5), 105-112.
- Johnson, P.F., and M.R. Leenders, 2003, Gaining and Losing Pieces of The Supply Chain, *The Journal of Supply Chain Management* 39(1), 27-39.
- Korsgaard, A., D. Schweiger and H. Sapienza, 1995, Building Commitment, Attachment and Trust in Strategic Decision Making Teams: The Role of Procedural Justice, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 60-84.
- Lewin, K., 1947, *Resolving Social Conflicts: Selected Papers on Group Dynamics*, Harper: New York.
- Markovich, P., 1997, Mobilising Your Human Potential, *Journal for Quality and Participation* 20(2), 48-53.
- Milakovich, M, 1994/1995, How Quality-Oriented Have State and Local Governments Really Become? *National Productivity Review* 14(1), 73-84.
- Moran, J. and A. Avergun, 1997, Creating Lasting Change, *The TQM Magazine* 9 (2), 146-151.
- New, J.R., and D.D. Singer, 1983, Understanding Why People Reject New Ideas Helps Ies Convert Resistance Into Acceptance, *Industrial Engineering* 15(5), 50-57.
- Pascale, R., J. Carland, 1997, A Comparative Analysis of Two Concept Evaluation Methods for New Product Development Projects, *Project Management Journal* 28(4), 47-52.

- Perry, T., 1995, How Small Firms Innovate: Designing a Culture for Creativity, *Research Technology Management* 38(2), 14-20.
- Potter, J. 2001, Creating a Passion for Change-The Art of Intelligent Leadership, *Industrial and Commercial Training* 33(2), 54-59.
- Ramsey, R., 1997, Where do Good Ideas Come From? *Supervision* 58(12), 12-14.
- Reger, R., J. Mullane, L. Gustafson and S DeMarie, 1994, Creating Earthquakes to Change Organisational Mindsets, *Academy of Management Executive* 8(4), 31-46.
- Reichers, A., J. Wanous and J. Austin, 1997, Understanding and Managing Cynicism About Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Executive* 11(1), 48-59.
- Steinburg, C., 1992, Taking Charge of Change, *Training and Development* 46(3), 26-32.
- Trader-Leigh, K.E., 2002, Case Study: Identifying Resistance in Managing Change, *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 3(2), 25-37.
- Tushman, M.L., and E. Romanelli, 1995, Organisational Evolution: A Metamorphosis Model of Convergence and Reorientation, *Research in Organisational Behaviour* 7(1), 33-37.
- Uhlfelder, H., 1994, Leadership+teamwork+commitment = success, *Journal for Quality and Participation* 17(3), 29-32.
- Yin, R., 2003, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.