January 2015

Operationalizing Organizational Change Theory: Implications for Practice in the Fraternity/Sorority Movement

Tim Reuter
Indiana University, tim@growthguiders.com

Steve Backer
Monmouth University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/oracle

Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

OPERATIONALIZING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE THEORY: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE IN THE FRATERNITY/SORORITY MOVEMENT

TIM REUTER AND STEVE BACKER

The literature exploring organizational change theory, while rich in conceptual frameworks, is limited on longitudinal studies of fraternity and sorority organizations, and/or the higher education environments in which they exist, undergoing long-term change initiatives. Based on a review of the literature on organizational change theory, this article has outlined a specific model of change related to the relational culture of fraternities and sororities. As this article explicates the operationalization of change theory through a model specific to the fraternity/sorority context, aspects of the literature related to this unique population and industry are as follows: defining change in an organizational context, inertia, role of environment, performance aspects and criteria, readiness, barriers and resistance to change, organizational learning and unlearning, consequences of change, and models for planning and implementing change.

Introduction

Operationalizing organizational change theory is an immense undertaking, especially when considering the number of factors and steps involved in an organizational change effort. Extensive literature exists which explains conceptual frameworks for organizational change. However, there is limited research focusing upon member-based organizations undergoing long-term change initiatives within the fraternity/sorority movement. Further, the fraternity/sorority movement is comprised of many stakeholders with disparate notions of fraternity/sorority's purpose and overall utility; this produces complications when operationalizing change and measuring it in such a way that appeals to both the quantitative and qualitative bias (Reuter, 2013). To address these complications, this paper presents a review of literature on organizational change theory and subsequent model through which practitioners can implement and scholars can assess change in the fraternity/sorority context at the inter/national office and campus levels.

This paper focuses on specific aspects of organizational change theory: defining change in an organizational context, inertia, the role of environment, performance aspects and crite-

ria, readiness, barriers and resistance to change, organizational learning and unlearning, consequences of change, and models for planning and implementing change. In each of these areas, it is important to understand the context in which change occurs.

Organizational change is the product of intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivations (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993; Buckho, 1994; Hannan & Freeman, 1984; Miller & Chen, 1995) to alter the organization's trajectory (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Eisenback, Watson, & Rajnandini, 1999). While the notion that dissatisfaction with the organization's trajectory is a necessary and/or common motivator for change (Eisenback, et al., 1999; Greve, 1998), the impact of momentum, growth, and velocity should not be overlooked as important organizational dynamics that also motivate change.

Two types of change found in the literature provide context for this paper: incremental change and transformational change. Incremental change is a less risky, smaller scale type of change referred to as first order change; transformational change is radical in nature, associated with higher risk, intended to result in deep, lasting change, and involves changes in values, structure and organizational learning (Boyce, 2003;

Greenwood & Hinnings, 1996). The process of enacting transformational change necessitates an exploration of both the nature of change (planning for change) and process of change (implementing change). The various aspects of change identified earlier lay the foundation from which the nature and process of change are explained.

The theories included in this literature review are utilized to develop a model of change that operationalizes how change occurs. However, fraternities and sororities are unique organizations because of the central emphasis on relationships and the relatively dispersed and multi-layered nature of decision-making and program development (Reuter, 2013). It is significant to note that this model of change emphasizes that authentic transformation is essentially a function of individual members and stakeholders who must be central to any explication of how change is planned or understood. The contemporary culture of fraternities and sororities is a function of several core groups, including undergraduate members, alumni/ae, and significant campus administrators who may operate to maintain an environment which blocks change. Therefore, the importance of unlearning ritualized traditions is a critical anticipatory component to precipitating any sort of meaningful and lasting change.

Literature Review

Defining Organizational Change

Cooperrider and Whitney (2005) define change utilizing a positivist frame and believe that the change process involves multiple stakeholders engaging in an appreciative inquiry dialogue that bridges the gap between stakeholder knowledge and an organization's change initiative. This definition supports the notion that change is multifaceted (Boyce, 2003; March, 1981; Pettigrew, 1990; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and is strengthened by specifically noting the examination of an organization's relationship with its environment as a primary component of the organizational change process (Mintsberg &

Westley, 1992; Pettigrew, 1990; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Simsek & Louis, 2000). During the process of changing an organization, unlearning and learning occur sequentially and repetitively through exploring and understanding the organization's assumptions and values at all levels. This produces new assumptions, competencies, shifts in organizational paradigms, adaption to environmental norms and expectations which serves to envision and produce the desired state and integration during the process of creating successful organizational change (Boyce, 2003; Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001; Schein, 2004; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

When defining change, a definition of the process of change, the "how", becomes equally important in setting the stage for models defined both within the literature review and in our proposed model. Modeling the process of change provides opportunities to test theories and variables over time through clarifying the sequence of events, gathering data, facilitating interactions between stakeholders, noting system tasks and stimuli, and tracking and analyzing interactions, effects, and consequences, both intended and unintended.

Inertia

Inertia plays a compelling role in the nature of organizational change and awareness of its presence and scope, as its influence is a significant variable in determining organizational readiness to change (Amburgey, Kelly, & Barnett, 1993). An organization's decision to resist change in action or to continue its current trajectory is affected by many factors, including the age of the organization and the way in which efforts at change have been historically experienced and metabolized. Barnett and Carrol (1995) report an empirically supported prediction that the likelihood of organizational change decreases with an organization's age and state that "structural inertia theory also predicts that the likelihood of change increases once a change occurs, since the 'clock' of inertia is essentially restarted

when structures, roles, and procedures are re-generated in the process of change" (p. 221). Similar to the aspect of momentum in organizational change, this gives credence to the idea that organizations which have undertaken change initiatives in the past are more likely to initiate change initiatives in the future (Kelly & Amburgey, 1991). To maintain continuous change, organizations must foster a culture of learning and intelligent adaptation (Levinthal, 1991). Building upon Lewin's (1947/1951) change theory, the organizations with momentum in the arena of organizational change are constantly in a state of unfreezing and changing. While at various times an organization's parts will remain in various states of unfreezing, changing, and again freezing, the sum of parts will remain in a relative state of continuous change due to the overall fluidity of the sum of its parts.

Pfeffer (1997) defines inertia as an "inability for organizations to change as rapidly as their environments" (p. 163). This recognition of the relationship between an organization and its environment provides a conceptual framework through which inertia can be explored. Inertia can both be understood as an organization's behavioral capabilities in conjunction with its environment or its interdependencies upon its environment (Hannan & Freeman, 1984; Weick & Quinn, 1999). Remaining inert or failing to meet the expectations of an organization's environment increases the likelihood of failure for an organizational change initiative (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Armenakis, et al, 1993). This produces both environmental and organizational pressures that affect inertia. Organizations are driven to meet the expectations of their environment, incorporate industry practices and legitimize themselves through practice and procedure (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), yet are potentially limited by internal forces (e.g., structure, politics). As a necessary planning component of any change initiative, organizations must examine their own inertia and those forces that push or pull the organization into or out of an inert state.

Role of Environment in Organizational Change

Organizations exist in a transactional relationship with their environment, since the two rely upon one another for necessary resources (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Katz & Kahn, 1966; March, 1981; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2011) take this one step further by stating "resource dependency theory stresses that all organizations exchange resources as a condition for survival" (p. 403). This mutually dependent relationship is increasingly important during times of organizational change. Continually changing environments challenge organizations to examine their purposes, values, structures and processes and potentiate the implementation of new strategies (Armenakis, et al, 1993; Katz & Kahn, 1966). These processes and resulting new strategies can possibly stall current organizational objectives or alter those already in place and designed to bolster organizational performance (Akgün, Byrne, Lynn, & Keskin, 2007).

To examine its congruence with the environment, an organization committed to successful change should "be rigorous in inquiry, skillful in dialogue, and fearless in examining the institution (organization) in the context of its environment" (Boyce, 2003, p. 133). Exploring the environment and its boundaries allows an organization to understand how a change initiative is affected by those environmental factors upon which the organization is dependent (Meyer & Rowan, 2003; Thompson, 2003). Adjusting the organization's structure in such a way that conforms to the norms and expectations of the environment demonstrates fitness with the environment and potentiates legitimacy and support from environmental institutions (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Shafritz, et al., 2011).

Performance Aspects & Criteria

Not to be overlooked in the process of organizational change are performance criteria. In order to study organizational change, an organization must both clarify and identify criteria

and outcome variables to measure the efficacy of the change process (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Barnett & Carrol, 1995). New standards for evaluation and organizational performance are important to understanding the impact of an organization's shift in values, behaviors, and trajectory (Boyce, 2003; Schein, 1996). In framing the aspects of performance criteria, Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) note efficiency, an internal standard for performance, and effectiveness, acceptability of the organization by those judged outside the organization, as performance measures. Using external assessment criteria allows the organization to move forward in partnership with its environment and produces layers of support that shield it from failure (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Performance measures and criteria should support the organization's current state or desired state (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999), be conducted longitudinally, and serve as an anchor for the entirety of the change initiative (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Pettigrew, et al., 2001). Failing to measure change and performance at the organizational, member, or sub-cultural level can obfuscate outcomes and contaminate the data necessary to inform decision-makers and members. This failure will also interfere with the ability to determine fitness with environmental norms and expectations.

Readiness

Armenakis, et al. (1993) describe readiness for change through the context of an organization's members' beliefs and attitudes, stating that an organization's readiness for change is correlated with the readiness of its members. Readiness includes understanding the various cultures within the organization and their propensity to vie for dominance (Palmer, Jennings, & Zhou, 1993), motivation to change, opportunity to change, and capacity to change (Miller & Chen, 1995). Our model further emphasizes individual motivations and capabilities in order to accurately assess readiness to change.

Aspects of readiness also include anticipation, defined as the timeframe during which members are likely to experience denial and resistance (Armenakis, et al., 1993). This can motivate organizations to alter the message of change in adjusting to members' levels of anxiety (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Weick & Quinn, 1999). An organization's sub-cultures may polarize member readiness due to individual psychological boundaries and produce organizational dissatisfaction at various levels due to the pressures of change (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996). It is the issue of loss, be it of purpose, role, etc., and the experience of anxiety derived from these potential threats to self-interest which become the focus of individual members and organizational sub-cultures (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Schein, 2004). This means that communication and anticipation of how members will receive the message of change are fundamental components, which determine readiness both within and outside the organization (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

While the process of building readiness should start with opinion leaders, the organization should include the design of psychological interventions that translate the goals of readiness into behavior among individuals and sub-cultures (Armenakis, et al., 1993; Sniehotta, Scharzer, Scholz, & Schüz, 2005; Thompson, 2003). The literature identifies strategies for building readiness within members and sub-cultures, including: education and communication, participation and involvement, facilitation and support, and negotiation and agreement (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979). Before an organization or its leadership can initiate this process of building readiness, it must take the necessary steps to address these core needs for security and stability among individual members and sub-cultures.

The pre-intervention component to building readiness emphasizes assessing the organization through its sub-cultures and individual members and thereby determining their state of readiness for change. Miller, Johnson, and Grau (1994)

note that few studies actually measure an organization's capacity for change by assessing those individual and sub-culture variables which predict if change will be "supported, viewed with indifference, or opposed" (p. 61). By measuring willingness to change, organizations can develop interventions and experiential learning opportunities to meet the differing needs of individuals and sub-cultures within the organization (Armenakis, et al., 1993). This also allows the organizational leadership to understand perceptions and needs based on data and context, rather than assumption and conjecture.

Barriers and Resistance to Change

Another construct that intersects with readiness for change is the concept of barriers and resistance to change. Barriers to change are organizational variables, which may be produced both intrinsically and extrinsically. Intrinsic barriers such as anti-change influence efforts or contra-change behavior (Sniehotta, et al., 2005) are founded and moderated by the politics of the organization, brought about by conflicts among competing interest groups which may be compounded by nepotistic performance measures (Greve, 1998; Pfeffer, & Salancik, 1978). Extrinsic barriers such as the achievement of ceremonial criteria or demonstration of legitimate function (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) are those changes which derived from the external environment and threaten organizational legitimacy, leading to the loss of support (Hannan & Freeman, 1984). In a review of empirical research, Piderit (2000) "reveals three different emphases in conceptualizations of resistance: as a cognitive state, as an emotional state, and as a behavior" (p. 785). The root of barriers and resistance is the perception of change among individuals and the ways in which power dependencies can enable or suppress organizational change (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996).

The dynamics by which individuals experience and resist change provide insight into those cognitive and emotional responses which impact cultural and organizational readiness for change. Navigating the anxieties about change is central to engaging support for change processes and outcomes (Schein, 1996). These dynamics explicate how cognitive and emotional responses interact in reaction to the experience of change (Piderit, 2000). How the change message is communicated and the means through which members and sub-cultures are educated are central tenants in addressing and overcoming barriers and resistance. Additionally, the stress that change causes may itself be a barrier and determines differential responses to the change process (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). The regularity and transparency between individuals and sub-cultures within the organization and the organization's leadership may factor into the emotional response to the message of change and the process through which the organization enacts change. Members and sub-cultures in "relatively 'poor' information environments may receive less information about the change, feel hostile toward the change since it promises to bring further role ambiguity, and possibly feel caught-off-guard by the announcement" (Miller, Johnson & Grau, 1994, p. 74). These emotional responses and potential consequences of loss of role, purpose, and need for learning and growth to maintain membership or status within the organization form the basis for barriers and resistance and a platform which must be addressed by organizational leaders as they plan for and message change initiatives.

Organizational Unlearning and Learning

Unlearning and learning also play a powerful role in organizational change (Boyce, 2003) and represent another way in which Lewin's (1947/1951) unfreeze, change, and freeze model becomes manifest. During change, organizations' critical factors and developmental processes include searching, learning, and deciding (Thompson, 2003). The organization then creates the context and environment through which learning occurs and can reduce the subjective interpretations of members and sub-cultures that

impact the unlearning and learning process (Pettigrew, 1990). Age and length of membership within the organization, cultural and geographic norms, lasting effects of previous initiatives, etc., all affect the unlearning and learning processes. As noted by Hamel and Prahalad (1994, p. 71), organizations "are going to have to unlearn a lot of their past…" and must do so to both produce behavioral changes in members and deconstruct innate, previously learned responses to situations (Greve, 1998; Martin, 2002; Sniehotta, et al., 2005).

The role of unlearning and learning in organizational change is well documented in the literature and spotlights the role of organizational values and beliefs in the unlearning/learning process. Unlearning may be re-inventive, with high emphasis on changes in beliefs or routines; or formative, with more emphasis on beliefs and less on routines. (Akgün, et al., 2007). Learning, however, is adaptive and incorporates a re-orientation process to changes taking place, links the learning to members' cognitive constructs, and forms the basis for a new perspective rooted in the organizations vision, mission, and core values (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Levinthal, 1991; Mintsberg, & Westley, 1992).

Theoretical models for unlearning and learning emphasize the need to change members' and sub-cultural beliefs, routines, and organizational artifacts (Akgün, et al., 2007) and emphasize the need to redefine how members and organizational sub-cultures think (Schein, 1996). Through both strategic and tactical interventions and the employment of readily available and detailed models, organizations can alter assumptions and change normative values and practices of an organization (Schein, 1996; Schein, 2004).

Consequences of Change

Consequences of change, even if not intended, play a role in determining if an organization will achieve lasting change (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Change involves planning for change, introducing change through communication and unlearning/learning interventions, and ongoing dedication and attention to the "sum of parts" as the organization moves from its previous state to the desired state of change. This is a lengthy process during which the ongoing nature of change reverberates throughout the organization. Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) term this period as "aftermath" and note it "is the time when organizational members decide the extent to which they will commit to a change process" (p. 304), due to the consequences of lost skills and resistance; denial and resistance; and dissatisfaction.

There are other organizational processes which may also take place in the aftermath of change: unexpected transformations occur and resources are diverted to reorganization, both of which may reduce efficiency, may affect the bottom line, and may disrupt routines and relationships (Barnett & Carrol, 1995; Haveman, 1992; Merton, 1936).

When, then, is change worth the risk? Change is always worth the risk, since failure to change inevitably reduces an organization's relevancy and effectiveness (Levinthal, 1991). In a reactive, survivalist sense, change is worth the risk because otherwise an organization faces potential extinction (Haveman, 1992; Kelly & Amburgey, 1991). In order to merit the risks and costs involved, change must be "guided by the performance relative to the goal currently active in the organization" (Greve, 1998, p. 82). "Transformational change requires rigorous organizational inquiry: continuous practice of examining assumptions, surfacing and challenging mental models, and acting on what is learned" (Boyce, 2003, p. 128).

Models for Planning and Implementing Change

This review of change theory results in a model which emphasizes the cyclical process of change and which requires an ongoing process of planning for change (pre-intervention), implementing change (intervention), and organizational learning. Through these three steps,

the many variables of organizational change may be understood and appropriately managed. The chasm between short-term, incremental change and deeper, long-term change is significant. Once an organization achieves the learning step, long-term change requires a return to the beginning of the change process. In this sense, the process of change is a continuous dynamic loop.

Planning for change involves understanding the nature of change conceptualized through the various models in the literature. Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) found four themes or issues common to all change efforts: Content Issues (largely focus on the substance of contemporary organizational changes); Contextual Issues (principally focus on forces or conditions existing in an organization's external and internal environments); Process Issues (address actions undertaken during the enactment of an intended change); and Criterion Issues (deal with outcomes commonly assessed in organizational change efforts) (p. 293). Spector (2010) also provides his Sequential Model of Effective Change Implementation for consideration when undertaking an organizational change initiative:

- Step 1: Redesign (roles, responsibilities, relationships);
- Step 2: Help (training, mentoring);
- Step 3: People Alignment (assessment, promotion, replacement, recruitment); and
- Step 4: Systems & Structures (reporting relationships, compensation, information, measurement & control). (p. 43)

Numerous other models exist within the literature to address how to plan for change. Palmer, Dunford, and Akin highlight a variety of these in their review of prevalent change models from 1992 − 2006 (2009). A review of these various models helps to clarify what factors to consider when planning an organizational change initia-

tive. However, in the planning process, whether it is strategic planning, organizational development or some related approach, consensus must be developed among the leadership regarding the nature and desired outcomes of change for the organization. Subsequently, the leaders must engage individuals from various organizational sub-cultures and allocate the necessary resources to implement and to support the change effort (Boyce, 2003; Mintsberg & Westley, 1992). At the unique intersection of organizational change between the leaders and those they are attempting to engage is the requirement that all must be aligned and moving in the same direction.

Once an organization has planned for change and charted its "pre-intervention" course, process models for implementation are required. Kotter's (1996) widely accepted model provides a template from which organizations can build implementation processes: establishing a sense of urgency, creating the guiding coalition; developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering broad-based action; generating short-term wins, consolidating gains and producing more change, and anchoring new approaches in the culture (p. 21).

Communication regarding change must be decentralized and multifaceted. This communication model is emphasized in many existing theories about change processes (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Martin, 2002). As noted by Schein (1996), Kotter's model supports the notion that the key to producing human change "whether at the individual or group level, was a profound psychological dynamic process that involved painful unlearning without loss of ego identity and difficult relearning as one cognitively attempted to restructure one's thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes" (p. 59). Through this model and a decentralized communication approach, the organization is able to co-opt sub-units, individuals, members and interest groups and then use them as agents of change within their own sub-cultures.

From Theory to Practice

A Model for Planning and Implementing Change in the Fraternity/Sorority Movement

In order to operationalize change theory, those driving change within the context of fraternity/sorority must integrate relevant conceptual ideas to form a process delineating the steps needed to produce desired change. Such a model of change must recognize that the relational nature of fraternity/sorority organizations is the crucible that facilitates individual transformation and experiential learning (Reuter, Baker, Hernandez, & Bureau, 2012). In relationship-based organizations such as fraternities and sororities, transformational change occurs through programmatic shifts which impact the education and development of members, stakeholders, and others who shape the development of brotherhood and sisterhood. Emerging from an analysis of the literature is a model that addresses with specific attention and intention the context of the fraternity/sorority movement for individuals and organizations aspiring to map, drive, and achieve lasting, organizational change. Significant aspects of the literature and related practical experiences may be integrated into this comprehensive model to understand and facilitate transformational change in the fraternity/sorority context:

1. *Identify the opportunity and need for organizational change*: Before an organization can map out, much less implement, transformational change, it must first clarify the purpose driving the organization's change by exploring the opportunity and need (Kanter, Stein, & Jick, 1992; Kirkpatrick, 2001; Mento, Jones, & Dirndorfer, 2002; Taffinder, 1998). The current zeitgeist in this area is wrapped around the thinking and position of Simon Sinek (2009) that, in the context of an organizational change initiative, organizations must start with why, a drive, cause, or belief that will give the

change initiative purpose. Again, given the relational nature of fraternities/sororities, change leaders must be clear on if their change is intrinsically or extrinsically motivated. If an organization is reacting to an outside influence, it may not believe as much in the change initiative as one that is intrinsically motivated. Step one is best addressed through the lens of appreciative inquiry, rather than traditional reaction-based thinking and planning. Cooperrider and Whitney (2007) define appreciative inquiry as follows:

Appreciative inquiry (AI) is the cooperative, coevolutionary search for the best in people, their organization and communities, and the world around them. It involves systematic discovery of what gives "life" to an organization or community when it is most effective, and most capable in economic, ecological, and human terms. AI assumes that every organization or community has many "untapped and rich accounts of the positive" – what people talk about as past, present, and future capacities – the positive core. AI links the knowledge and energy of this core directly to an organization or community's change agenda, and changes never thought possible are suddenly and democratically mobilized. (p. 75).

Specifically, this approach involves the following components: clarify the needs and opportunities for change, explore and clarify why this organizational change is needed, and integrate these considerations into a clear statement of the purposes and goals which will anchor and drive the change process.

2. *Task and trust a coalition to serve as the primary stewards of the organizational change initiative*: Designing, administering, and adapting to broad-scale organizational change is a significant undertaking for any individual. Organizations aspiring to achieve transformative change must task a

8

coalition to serve as the primary stewards of the organizational change initiative (Kotter, 1996; Nadler, 1998). To do so, fraternity/sorority inter/national offices should form a multidisciplinary team that includes professional staff members and key stakeholders (e.g, a board member, multiple volunteer members whose professional and volunteer experiences are such that provide expertise and credibility for the planning team). For a student life department this could include primary staff members and key stakeholders (e.g., appropriate staff from other departments/divisions, a Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO), appropriate faculty, potentially a trustee and/or a community leader, fraternity/sorority chapter advisors). This planning team should act as the designers and stewards of the organizational change initiative (OCI), as well as serve as its advisory committee (AC). Chaired by a member of the board (HQ) or department head (College/University), this team performs the background research that creates the conceptual framework for the components of organizational change and engages experts as needed for relevant subject matters. This multidisciplinary group should all believe in the central tenants, which drive the initiative and share a common vision regarding the end goals of this change initiative. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: create a change design team of 5-7 individuals, appoint a board member/department head to chair the workgroup, include 2-4 volunteers or individuals with expertise in the areas which conceptually form the framework for the change initiative, and include staff who will "own" the project.

3. *Map a model for organizational change supported by viable research and theory, and then gain support of organizational leaders and decision-makers*: After establishing the organizational change initiative's purpose and its AC, the AC must then map a model around which the organization can design its change initiative (Anderson & Anderson, 2001; Kanter, et al., 1992; Kotter, 1996; Leppitt, 2006; Taffinder, 1998). Once the AC accomplishes this, it should prepare a formal proposal for the organizational change initiative. The proposal should include the entire change model, supported by a conceptual framework, literature, and best practices, and be supported by the chief staff member, (e.g., executive director (HQ) or appropriate College/University SSAO). This model should then be taken to the organization or division's governing body. Essentially, the AC should request approval to act as the workgroup, providing updates and feedback to the governing body. A board member or division head on the AC maintains connection to the governing body but reduces the need for micro-management from it. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: this model or vision of change must include metrics and performance criteria which not only address core competencies of the organization but which also measure the impact of the change initiative component. These new criterion should relate to environmental "fitness"; the model or vision should also include expectations and specific dates by which organizational change components must be achieved; and determine how long the organization will commit to this specific change initiative. Not only does this give the individuals and sub-cultures an idea of "by when" they need to change, but it also allows for a subsequent change initiative to take place, i.e., what happens next. This potentiates momentum and ongoing organizational change.

4. *Develop & confirm the initial implementation strategy*: after gaining the support of the chief staff member, the AC should develop and confirm the initial implementa-

tion strategy (Anderson & Anderson, 2001; Pendlebury, Grouard, & Metson, 1998). This should include a pilot process, during which initial organizational change components will be implemented with select individuals and/or chapters and communication with key stakeholders would occur. This pilot process should incorporate all individuals who will influence the implementation of changes with the pilot member(s) and/or chapter(s). During this pilot process the AC, and, as a result, the organization has a significant opportunity to learn and understand how culture and environment influence the achievement of organizational change objectives at "sub-culture" levels. Specifically, this approach involves identifying a pilot process for change component implementation and communicating with key stakeholders regarding the change initiative's purpose, conceptual framework, literature and best practices that support the initiative, and nature of the pilot process.

5.   *Pilot the core organizational change components and build organizational awareness and readiness through communication with key stakeholders*: Multiple lenses of learning can occur formally and informally through the pilot process. Both formal and informal learning contribute to increased awareness within the organization about the change initiative (Anderson & Anderson, 2001; Taffinder, 1998). Formal learning occurs through the pilot process, and informal learning occurs as the AC conducts meetings and discussions regarding the initiative during sponsored programs meeting (e.g., regional and inter/national program (HQ) or regularly scheduled programs and meetings (College/University). Concurrently, the staff member assigned to manage the pilot process should work with a specific number of members or groups to understand the needs associated with the change

initiative. Clear metrics must be utilized to determine an accurate cross section and representation of the organizational/institutional makeup through the pilot chapters. The AC should create a clear rationale for the pilot participants, as well as explore as many variables as possible to create an intentional and informed pilot process. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: utilize volunteer and staff members of the AC to lead formal and informal discussions about change with key stakeholders, create a cross-section of the organization through pilot participants to include as many organizational variables and facets as possible, and use the staff member from the AC to manage the pilot process to gain feedback on what works, does not work, and associated additional needs with this change initiative.

6.   *Create the resources necessary for individuals and sub-cultures to learn, implement and adapt to the change initiative*: Prior to and during the pilot process, the organization should maintain a process of redesigning and developing those educational resources necessary for stakeholders to learn, understand, and implement core OCI components. Such educational programs are especially important in relationship-based organizations where the impact of tradition and emotionally charged rituals may compromise the availability of immediate support (Anderson & Anderson, 2001; Kirkpatrick, 2001). Initial resources should be provided to pilot program participants, who then assess what works, does not work, and what additional resources are needed to successfully achieve the unlearning and relearning associated with the change initiative. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: develop initial educational resources required to initiate the change process at the "sub-culture" level, gain feedback on initial resources

10

and understand additional needs from pilot groups, and subsequently update initial resources and develop additional resources in preparation for the formal rollout of the organizational change intervention.

7. *Build organizational momentum through marketing the announcement and rollout of the change initiative*: In the months leading up to a major program or meetings, organizations must develop and implement a communications plan related to the change initiative (Kanter, et al., 1992; Kotter, 1996; Light, 2005; Mento, et al., 2002; Nadler, 1996). This marketing campaign, directed at its members/program participants, stakeholders, environmental influencers, and others should promote a new initiative for the organization being undertaken and include feedback from pilot participants, organizational leaders, and other key stakeholders. Additionally, at all future major programs and meetings, the organization should continue to communicate the roll and/or state of the change initiative. This communication should include support materials and educational programming aimed at helping increase individual, chapter, and key stakeholder/influencer awareness and understanding of the change initiative and its positive impact on the organization. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: market the announcement of the change initiative at a major event, announce the initiative through a formal presentation led by the board member/ department head and staff members of the AC, recognize the pilot participants publicly, and allow individuals from the pilot process to share their stories as champions for the change initiative, and organize all educational programming at regular meetings, conferences, events, etc. around the change initiative, and include educational materials to accompany programs.

8. *Change and adapt structures and processes through the organizational learning that occurs*: Structures and systems that support and maintain change must become integral to all aspects of the organization's structure and culture (Anderson & Anderson, 2001; Kanter, et al, 1992; Kotter, 1996; Nadler, 1998). Both in-person and technical learning processes become a vehicle through which the change initiative is communicated. The organization will likely have to evaluate, refine, and even discontinue a number of traditional learning experiences and programs that no longer reflect the changing organization or align with its trajectory. During this process, the organization should co-opt a number of stakeholders as key agents of change. A wide range of individuals should be utilized in order to maximize the relational opportunities available and to increase the alignment of all aspects of the organization. This process will mobilize the "sum of parts" toward a common goal and consolidate shared perceptions, values, and believes. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: identify administratively what is needed to support this change, identify what human and educational resources are needed to support the change initiative, and identify which individuals outside the board and staff are best prepared to serve as champions and agents of organizational change.

9. *Assess the state and needs of members and sub-cultures and personally engage them to affect change*: Throughout the process of an organizational change initiative, the organization must continue to engage members and sub-cultures (Kanter, et al., 1992; Mento, et al., 2002; Pendlebury, et al., 1998). The nature of engagement should be proactive for those sub-cultures implementing or initiating the components of change, but may become reactive for those sub-cultures fighting and resisting change. Everett Rogers (1962) would identify those sub-cultures

fighting change as a party of "late majority" adopters and would definitely consider them "laggards" who would be the last and least likely members of the organization to adopt change. As a result, the organization may need to adjust its support processes to meet the needs and various states of its sub-cultures. In effect, the process results in an inspirational approach to keep high performing sub-cultures motivated in their ongoing implementation of the OCI components. It may also necessitate an approach likened to benevolent coercion for those members and sub-cultures who may never be inspired to change, due to the dominant level of influence exerted by the environment in which they operate and the culture of which they are a part. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: regardless of implementation level, sub-cultures and members require ongoing, in-person support; use inspirational approaches for those sub-cultures and members which have already adopted, embraced, and implemented change; and identify benevolent ways through which the consequences of non-adoption outweigh the influence of culture and environment preventing change in sub-cultures.

10. Build relational equity with key environmental stakeholders who define "fitness", engage them in the change initiative, and share successes and outcomes which show "fitness" with the environment: Given the nature of resource dependency and an organization's transactional nature with its environment, building relational equity and determining "fitness" with the environment is a critical component of a transformative organization (Anderson & Anderson, 2002; Mento, et al., 2002). Given that this model specifically focuses on the fraternity/sorority movement, this step emphasizes the need to bridge the gap between inter/national offices and host institutions. More specifically, this step is about strengthening the relationships between the staff members that work for the inter/national offices and the host institutions. If an inter/national offices rarely explores the trends of higher education in the arena of student development or does not offer programming and services that foster the co-curricular nature of the fraternity/sorority experience, then it has a reduced potential to show "fitness" with its environment. Conversely, if a host institution never engages the inter/national offices on the initiatives of the campus, its programming, etc., then it may or may not offer and/or foster a member experience that is consistent with that of the inter/national offices and its expectations for its chapters and members. Simply put, in a relational sense, this step is about turning issues into opportunities regarding host institutions and inter/national offices. Collaboratively, they can create a sphere of influence for all other stakeholders. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: assemble research, process, and outcomes associated with the organizational change initiative and submit program proposals to meetings of professional organizations which emphasize "fitness" to the environment; and build relationships with individuals and leaders of professional associations.

11. Communicate organizational change successes and outcomes both within the organization and with environmental stakeholders to promote and validate the change initiative: As the organization achieves outcomes and mines meaningful data, it can both quantitatively and qualitatively understand the impacts of the change initiative. With this information, organizations must communicate change successes to both promote and validate the change initiative (Kanter, et al., 1992; Kirkpatrick, 2001; Kotter, 1996; Light, 2005; Mento, et al., 2002; Nadler, 1998; Pendlebury, et al., 1998). Beyond

12

marketing campaigns, organizations should also draft and disseminate regular reports for appropriate audiences regarding the change initiative. These reports then create a meaningful set of data and outcomes that drive the content for an annual report. Through the annual report, the organization should both clarify outcomes and successes with all stakeholders, as well as document benchmarks and aspects of organizational change as years pass. This report should be shared with organizational members and the external environment as part of the organization's larger marketing campaign. This keeps the change initiative on the radar of members and sub-cultures and continues the organization's demonstration of fitness with its environment. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: create and publish an annual report on the change initiative, and share the report with the organization's members, sub-cultures, and external environment stakeholders; and incorporate the organizational change reports, data, outcomes, and successes into the organization's larger marketing and communication plans and strategies.

12. Continue organizational development via a vision clarification or future state mapping plan that produces benchmarks and deadlines to formally reaffirm the organization's commitment to the change initiative: Once multiple years of data show evidence that the change initiative is positively impacting the organization at the individual and group levels, the organization must formally reaffirm its support for the OCI through ongoing organizational development exercises, a (re)establishment of priorities, and general governance. After reaching out to members, stakeholders, and vested individuals from its environment, the organization should clarify how it will continue to support the accomplishment of its organizational change initiative (Kanter, et al., 1992; Kotter, 1996; Nadler, 1998).

This level of organizational development should include benchmarks for those individuals and chapters for whom the change initiative is designed. The result of this step is twofold: it both reinforces the importance of the change initiative across the organization and confirms for the laggards that they must change or accept clear consequences. This should be done in such a way that gives the staff and overall AC ample time to educate, support, and restructure the organization to facilitate the change process and achieve desired outcomes associated with the change initiative. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: reinforce the importance of the organizational change initiative through ongoing organizational development; and include change implementation expectations for members and/or sub-units of the organization, with clear consequences for failure to meet expectations.

13. Reaffirm the organization's commitment to the change initiative through restructuring the organization's formal structures and expectations of individual members and sub-cultures: As a final step in affirming the organization's long-term commitment to the change initiative, it must implement those structural changes necessary to maintain success (Anderson & Anderson, 2002; Kanter, et al., 1992; Kotter, 1996; Mento, et al., 2002). The organization should task a new workgroup, which could include at least two members from the AC, to review the structure of the organization at all levels and to determine necessary changes. It should also task the new workgroup with determining any new expectations of members, chapters, and/or stakeholders and influencers. This step is the way through which the organization can institutionalize the changes that have been accomplished. Specifically, this approach involves the following components: determine what restructuring of the orga-

nization at all levels is required to achieve the desired state with the change initiative; determine what new and/or refined sets of expectations of members and/or sub-cultures are needed to move the organization forward in its operationalization of change; and identify consequences for failing to meet new expectations at individual and sub-cultural levels.

14. Maintain awareness that steps 1 − 13 will need to be repeated at various times during the ongoing process of change: Through adaptive learning, the organization should continue to design resources, support mechanisms, and necessary organizational initiatives to transform the organization to its desired state (Anderson & Anderson, 2002; Light, 2005). Varying consequences of change will create new opportunities and needs for further change, ongoing models will be mapped out, and programs and resources will continue to be designed, piloted, and added to the necessary learning opportunities for members and sub-cultures to maintain change. Specifically, this approach involves identifying which steps must be repeated and evolved to ensure the organization maintains momentum in its change initiative.

Conclusion

Based on the review of the literature, this article has outlined a specific model of change related to the relational culture of fraternities and sororities. This model emphasizes fourteen major components that, when intentionally combined and aligned, allow for both the operationalization and research of change initiatives within the fraternity/sorority movement. The implementation of this model will allow for important opportunities for both conceptual and programmatic research to determine its validity in actual use. Such research should consider what would determine success in terms of outcomes, objectives, deliverables, and associated timelines. Additionally, such variables should accurately predict the process and be specifically germane to the relational environment of fraternities and sororities. Researchers should also examine adequate integration of individual and organizational variables, as well as what changes would be needed, to increase the model's effectiveness and overall efficacy. Hypotheses for research should depend upon the overall aims and aspirations of the change initiative, yet encompass both organizational and member-based components. For example, if the desired outcome of an organizational change initiative is to reposition the college fraternity/sorority as a co-curricular, developmental institution, research can and should focus on the affective learning and development that is produced by programming interventions. This affords researchers the ability to measure member development against interventions and understand the overall value of the change initiative and impact it has on participants. Additionally, traditional organizational metrics that are quantitative in nature (e.g., recruitment, retention, chapter size, G.P.A., insurance fees per member, community service hours, foundation dollars raised) can also be measured to understand, inform, and calculate the return on investment. This level of research requires that scholars and administrators collaborate to understand the needs and scope of the change initiative and accompanying research, so that the data analyzed produces outcomes relevant to both individual/ member and organizational development, transformation, and, as is impetus for this paper, meaningful organizational change.

14

References

Anderson, D., & Anderson, L.A. (2001). Beyond change management: Advanced strategies for today's transformational leaders. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Akgün, A. E., Byrne, J. C., Lynn, G. S., & Keskin, H. (2007). Organizational unlearning as changes in beliefs and routines in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(6), 794-812.

Amburgey, T. L., Kelly, D., & Barnett, W. P. (1993). Resetting the clock: The dynamics of organizational change and failure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 51-73.

Armenakis, A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, *25*(3), 293-315.

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, *46*(6), 681-704.

Barnett, W. P., & Carroll, G. R. (1995). Modeling internal organizational change. In: J. Hagan (Ed.), *Annual Review of Sociology* (Vol. 21). (pp. 217–236).

Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *28*(2), 119-136.

Buchko, A. A. (1994). Barriers to strategic transformation. In: P. Shrivastava, A. Huff & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Advances in strategic management* Vol. 10 (pp. 81–106).

Burns, T. E., & Stalker, G.M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship.

Cooperrider, D., & Whitney, D. (2007). Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change. In P. Holman, T. Devane, & Cady S. (Eds.) *The change handbook* (pp. 73-88). San Francisco, CA: Berett-Koehler.

Eisenback, R., Watson, K., & Rajnandini, P. (1999). Transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change*, *12*(2), 80.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*(4), 1022-1054.

Greve, H. R. (1998). Performance, aspirations, and risky organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43*(1), 58-86.

Goldberg, S. (2009). *Billions of drops in millions of buckets: Why philanthropy doesn't advance social progress*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1994). *Competing for the future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review, 49*(2), 149-164.

Haveman, H. A. (1992). Between a rock and a hard place: Organizational change and performance under conditions of fundamental environmental transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*(1) 48-75.

Kanter, R.M., Stein, B.A., & Jick, T.D. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Kelly, D., & Amburgey, T. L. (1991). Organizational inertia and momentum: A dynamic model of strategic change. *The Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 591-612.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (2001). *Managing change effectively: Approaches, methods, and case examples*. Boston,

MA: Butterworth Heinemann.

Kotter, J., & Schlesinger, L. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, *32*(3), 49-57.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Leppitt, N. (2006). Challenging the code of change: Part 1. Praxis does not make perfect. *Journal of Change Management, 6*(2), 121-142.

Levinthal, D. A. (1991). Organizational adaptation and environmental selection—Interrelated processes of change. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 140-145.

Lewin, K. (1947/1951). Frontiers in group dynamics. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin* (pp. 188-237). New York: Harper & Row.

Light, P.C. (2005). *The four pillars of high performance: How robust organizations achieve extraordinary results.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

March, J. G. (1981). Footnotes to organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(4), 563-577.

Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain.* Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

McHugh, M. (1997). The stress factor: Another item for the change management agenda? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *10*(4), 345-362.

Mento, A.J., Jones, R.M., & Dirndorfer, W. (2002). A change management process: Grounded in both theory and practice. *Journal of Change Management, 3*(1), 45-69.

Merton, R. K. (1936). The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American Sociological Review*, *1*(6), 894-904.

Meyer, J. W., &Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22*(1), 59-80.

Miller, D., & Chen, M. (1995). Sources and consequences of competitive inertia: A study of the U. S. airline industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(1), 1-23.

Mintsberg, H., & Westley, F. (1992). Cycles of organizational change. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*(8), 39-59.

Nadler, D.A. (1988). *Champions of change: How CEOs and their companies are mastering the skills of radical change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, D. A., Jennings, P. D., & Zhou, X. (1993). Late adoption of the multidivisional form by large U.S. corporations: Institutional, political, and economic accounts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*(1), 100-131.

Pendlebury, J., Grouard, B., & Meston, F. (1998). *The ten keys to successful change management.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1990). Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. *Organization Science*, *1*(3), 267-292.

Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W., & Cameron K. S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *The Academy of Management Journal, 44*(4), 697-713.

Rogers, E.M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations.* New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.

Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New directions for organization theory.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Piderit, S. P. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view

16

of attitudes toward an organizational change. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 783-794.

Reuter, T.H.. (2013). Fraternity sorority movement or inertia? Why we cannot achieve a better future when we are constantly responding to debilitating issues. *Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Perspectives,* 8-11.

Reuter, T., Baker, E., Hernandez, M., & Bureau, D. (2012). A values-based learning model to impact maturational change: The college fraternity as developmental crucible. *Oracle: Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, *7*(2), 19-36.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems Practice, 9*(1), 27-47.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (2011). Theories of organizations and environments. In Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (Eds.) *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 401-472). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Simsek, H., & Louis, K. S. (2000). Organizational change as paradigm shift. In M. C. Brown II (Ed.), *ASHE Reader on organization and governance* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action.* New York, NY: Penguin Group.

Sniehotta, F. F., Schwarzer, R., Scholz, U., & Schüz, B. (2005). Action planning and coping planning for long-term lifestyle change: Theory and assessment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(4), 565-576.

Spector, B. (2010). *Implementing organizational change: Theory into practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Taffinder, P. (1998). *Big change: A route-map for corporate transformation*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Thompson, J. D. (2003). *Organizations in action*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Vollman, T. (1996). *The transformation imperative.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*(1), 361-386.

Woodman, R. W. (1989). Organizational change and development: New arenas for inquiry and action. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 205-228.

Author Biographies

Tim Reuter is co-founder and principal consultant for Growth Guiders, LLC. Reuter is a certified change management practitioner through Prosci and the Change Management Learning Center. He has a MPA with a special concentration in governance and organizational change from Indiana University's School for Public and Environmental Affairs (IUPUI). Tim has presented empirical research at the annual meetings of AFA, NASPA, ACPA, and the Association for Psychological Science and supports proactive change opportunities by volunteering on center and association boards and committees in the areas of higher education, fraternal organizations, and talent development. Questions regarding this article should be directed to tim@growthguiders.com.

Steve Backer is the Assistant Director of Greek Life, Leadership, and Involvement Monmouth College in Monmouth Illinois. He received a M.A. in Higher Education Administration from Southeast Missouri State University.