

“Continuous Change or Painless Change: Which is fit for Contemporary Organizations?”

Researcher:

Dr. Hammad Alotaibi

College of business Administration, Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia

Abstract:

Change is constant and it affects all spheres including the business environment. The business environment today is characterized by technological advancements, shift in the workforce from non-skilled to skilled and mounting competitive pressures. Organizations have no option but to embrace these changes in order to remain influential and achieve their strategies. However, there are two types of change strategies organizations can implement to effect change. These are painless change and rapid and continuous change. This study vividly elucidates, compare and contrast the assumptions of the two change strategies from the past studies get a more relevant change strategy that fits the contemporary business environment. Based on the critical review of the assumptions this study suggests that organizations should opt for continuous change strategy since it is fast and focuses on significant improvements. It can deal with the contemporary changes in the business environment.

Keywords: Organizational change, Continuous change, Painless change, Transformational change, Incremental change

1.Introduction

1a. Change

It is evident that the dynamism of the environments has continuously challenged organizations with the necessity to carry out changes to their strategies, structures, processes and culture (Armenakis et al., 1993; Bailey & Raelin, 2015; Choi & Ruona, 2011; Kirrane et al 2017; Von Treuer et al., 2018; Weiner, 2020). Accordingly, change is regarded as any process of transformation in which individual, organization or group act as a whole, transient from a sum of methods and ways of behaving and acting to another, transmuting relationships in both inside and outside environments (Andreoni & Scazzieri, 2014; Robert et al., 2017; Scazzieri, 2018; Vladoš, 2019). Some studies also view change as “the process of moving to a new and different state of thing” (Smith, 2005, p.408); “new ways of thinking, acting and operating” Pardo del Val & Martínez Fuentes, 2003, p.148); “establishing new understandings, new practices and new relationships” (Thomas & Hardy, 2011, p.323).

Thus, change and its stimulation through its whole modification process reproduces and generates conflicts and resistance because all changes are generated and propagated in a multiplicative way through integrating specific actions and thoughts with the procedures and philosophies incubating them (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010; Holten & Brenner, 2015; Dahl, 2014; Ates & Bititci, 2011). Every change causes dispersion of structural contents as well as dynamics; this change always leads to reaction which will trigger another future action in a cascade manner and afterwards, a fresh reaction (By et al., 2012; Kuipers et al., 2014; Steigenberger, 2015; Suddaby & Foster, 2017; Vora, 2013). In this manner, in an organizational dynamics setting, any change is always the starting stimulus for a series of future occurrences that need mechanisms in managing the looming challenges (Ashkenas, 2013; Hechanova & Cementina-Olpoc, 2013; Raineri, 2011; Stensaker & Langley, 2010; Worley & Mohrman, 2014). Moreover, change can be planned systematically, or could appear randomly and unexpectedly as non-planned and non-scheduled (Greenberg & Baron, 2014). Practically within organizations, changes happen every day either planned or unplanned, which means emerging change is mostly a mixture of planned and unplanned change. Also, the understanding of every organizational setting shows that the process of change varies and multifaceted since it interconnects and touches all the subsystems of each organization-actor to a lesser or greater extent (Bahadin, 2020; Vladoš, 2019).

Accordingly, managers of organizations try to become acclimated with changes to ensure the organization’s activities are compatible with the contemporary business environment (El-Dirani, Hussein, & Hejase, 2019). However, as the mounting customer demands, competitive pressures and regulatory pressures impact utilities globally, change is becoming the custom rather than the exception and adapting to change may require establishing a robust strategic method for responding to changes in the business environment such as a threat from a competitor or fluctuation in the economy, or establishing coping mechanisms to respond to changes in the workplace such as new technologies or policies (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996; Robbins & Coulter, 2016). In this regard, some studies (e.g., Carter et al., 2013; Feldman, 2000; Homberg et al., 2019; Rees & Rumbles, 2012; Wee & Taylor, 2018) have argued that organizations must develop a capacity for rapid and continuous change, while others (Abrahamson, 2000a, 2004b; Daly & Walsh, 2010; Erne, 2016; Gallego, 2017; Stoica et al., 2012) stress that organizations should attempt to introduce painless change. This study evaluates these propositions in order to get a more relevant claim that fits the contemporary business environment.

1b Understanding organizational change

Organizational change creates significance through the way by which it happens (March, 1981; Jacobs et al., 2013; Singh et al., 1986); and some of these ways inclined to standardize the numerous significances of a change, however standardizing a change could be very slow and undetectable in some cases (Johansson & Heide, 2008; Obloj, 2019). When a new policy is adopted by a business firm, stipulating the meaning of the change could be challenging due to the fundamental ways of transforming changes through change processes (March, 1981; Thompson, 2003). The emerging characteristics of change makes it challenging to apply standard concepts of decision, diffusion and problem solving because there is always difficulty in describing a decision, solutions to problem, or innovations with precisions specifically decision on adoption of change and handling the process of change to the end ((Dessler, 2002; Else, 2004).

Though, organizations are also transformed in the process of change since they redefine and improve goals while adapting and making decisions on environmental pressures; small changes could result to larger changes, and the initial intent could be completely lost (Baum & Singh, 1994). For instance, a non-profit organization becomes a profit-making organization (Powell & Bromley, 2020; Thompson, 2003); a radical radio station becomes part of a big firm (Weick & Quinn, 1999); and a new government agency becoming an old agency (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Sproull, 2010). These changes seem to reveal circumstances where any action(s) taken by organizations become the basis of a new objectives. The probability that goals and preferences could change in reaction to behavior is a huge problem for theories of choice (Kezar, 2011). Organizations' goals and that of the individuals working in them, always change when deliberate innovation is introduced, or during common organizational drift. Thus, actions have effect on the preferences based on the name of which they are taken; and the discovery of new intention is a common implication of intentional behavior (Gustafson et al., 2003).

The assumption under simple organizational change models is that action is taken in reaction to the environment but that organizational action does not affect the environment. Though, the assumptions look suitable, but organizations do create their own environments in parts, and the ensuing complications are substantial. For instance, organizations are often face with combined ecological competition because the actions of one competitor will come to be the environment of another. Therefore, each of the competitors partly determine their environment as they react to each other (Prastacos et al., 2002).

The business world today requires that organizations embrace change in order to remain effective. It is becoming significant for utility managers to work not only on their traditional managerial roles but also as transitional leaders to effect change into the organization (Gioia et al., 2012; Yu & Ming, 2008). As the mounting customer demands, competitive pressures and regulatory pressures impact utilities globally, change is becoming the custom rather than the exception. Globalization has introduced competitive pressures into the business world, whereby organizations have to compete with others in terms of production and consumer preferences, which is a major reason why organizations have to adapt change. The other reasons include discontinuous technological advancements, which make it necessary for organizations to transform and adopt modern technologies. Organizations basically pursue change in order to improve their competitive capacities and grow (Kasemsap, 2017; Quinn, 1996).

1c. Resistance to Change

The main reason why organizational changes failed is considered to be the resistance to change because it is regarded as a natural befalling phenomenon when faced with organizational change (Bovey & Hede, 2001; Smith, 2005b; Ford & Ford, 2010). Latta (2015) stressed that resistance is the most usual response to organizational change initiatives. Defining resistance have faced many countless attempts which involves a high complexity level when the concept is examined (Bovey & Hede, 2001). For instance, Latta has suggests that resistance can be traced from the organizational culture, while Jansson (2013) suggest that resistance depicts employees' unwanted response to the change in their aim of maintaining the existing state of affairs. Meanwhile, Pardo del Val and Martínez Fuentes (2003) regards resistance as any occurrence that impedes the change process. Thus, it can be deduced from the approach and view of prior studies on resistance that resistance is a change recipient's negative attitude towards organizational change (Bouckennooghe, 2010; Bovey & Hede, 2001; Burnes, 2015; Ijaz & Vitalis, 2011; Latta, 2015).

However, change recipients have attitude ambivalence that entails that a change recipient can evaluate the change both positively and negatively simultaneously between and within three components of resistance (which are cognitive, affective, and intentional/behavioral), depending on the perception of change of the change recipients (Lines, 2005; Piderit, 2000; Prediscan & Bradutanu, 2012). Also, organizational change comprises of both change process and change content; hence, the resistance of change recipient may differ contingent on whether there is consideration for either the change

process or the change content. Therefore, change recipients' resistance could have focused on both change process and change content, or either of the two (Dent & Powley, 2003; Latta, 2015; Lines, 2005). Precisely, the resistance could be a direct reaction to the way the change is intended to be executed and to the anticipated result of the change. According to Latta (2015), this elucidates why change agents are challenged with resistance, despite the fact that the change recipients usually support the change content.

Moreover, previous research has argued that resistance to change has both negative and positive implications. Though, most studies have often regard resistance to change as a hindrance that has to be eliminated or overcome when an organization intended to change (Self & Schraeder, 2009; Appelbaum, et al., 2015), however, few studies have argued that there are positive implications for resistance to change in an organization (e.g. Bouckennooghe, 2010; Bovey & Hede, 2001; Ford & Ford, 2010). As for Ford and Ford (2010), they stress that resistance to change must be perceived as a normal reaction from change recipients that are committed and engaged to the organization, and wish to be involved in what they regard significant to them. Accordingly, Ford and Ford (2010) contend that resistance should be use as a feedback by organizations. This positive perception on change resistance is supported by Jansen (2000), Latta (2015), Oleg (2006), Pardo del Val and Martínez Fuentes (2003) and Smith (2005), who all assert that the resistance can be a valuable instrument when tackling organizational change in the form of enhancements of ethical scrutiny, change initiatives, and anxiety from dedicated employees.

2. Evaluation of rapid and continuous change versus painless change

Organizational change has generated much interest among practitioners and researchers with regard to which mode of change between rapid and continuous change or painless change is more relevant to the business environment today. However, some argue that rapid and continuous is more relevant while others claim that painless change is the best. In this study, we shall first examine each individual mode then consider which one is more relevant (Dessler, 2002).

2a. Continuous change

Continuous change has been regarded as the organizational changes that tend to be continuing, emerging, and cumulative which consist of invention, transformation, and learning (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997; Orlikowski, 1996; Weick & Quinn, 1999). According to Weick and Quinn (1999), continuously changing organizations possess change repertoires that enable responses preemptively or responsively to reinforce, change, enlarge and unlearn skills and knowledge, as essential. Also, Weick and Quinn (1999) stressed that organizational culture is essential to a continuous change process since it provides a belief and value structure that fosters continuous change and gives permission to those involved to test new and different actions. They also argued that alertness and the incapability of the organization to remain stable drives continuous change (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

A usual assumption is that change is evolving, which means it is the understanding of a new form of organizing when there are no prior intentions (Orlikowski, 1996; Termeer et al., 2017). The unique feature of continuous change is the notion that small continuous amendments, made simultaneously through units, could cumulate and create significant change (Weick & Quinn, 1999). This situation assumes firmly coupled interdependencies and when interdependencies slacken, these continuous amendments, now narrowed to smaller units, remain imperative as compartments of innovation that might prove suitable in impending environments (Brown & Duguid 1991; Tsoukas, 1996; Weick & Quinn, 1999). According to Brown and Eisenhardt (1997), continuous change is the capability to change continuously and rapidly which will depict the core competence of the organization (McCollum, 2008). Thus, these continuous changes are based mainly on inductive learning, stirring from concretes, visible actions to abstract concepts as minor enhancements are acknowledged, and then generalized and unified in the form of, for instance, new work routines (Berger, 1996). In addition, continuous change combines both exploration and exploitation; while includes risk taking, flexibility, variation, search, experimentation, discovery and innovation; exploitation includes refinement, production, choice, selection, efficiency, execution and implementation (March, 1991).

The image of organizations that are intrinsic in conceptualizing continuous change is anticipated from a shift to a further micro viewpoint and to the supposition that everything changes all the time (Ford & Ford, 1994). The view of organization related with continuous change is built around recurrent interactions as the feedstock of organizing, authority tied to tasks rather than positions, shifts in authority as tasks shift, continuing development of response repertoires, systems that are self-organizing rather than fixed, ongoing redefinition of job descriptions, mindful construction of responses in the moment rather than mindless application of past responses embedded in routines (Wheatley, 1992), and acceptance of change as a

constant. Images of organization that are compatible with continuous change include those built around the ideas of improvisation, translation, and learning.

The image of organization built around improvisation is one in which variable inputs to self-organizing groups of actors induce continuing modification of work practices and ways of relating. This image is represented by the statement that change is often realized through the ongoing variations which emerge frequently, even imperceptibly, in the slippages and improvisations of everyday activity (Orlikowski, 1996). Improvisation is said to occur when the time gap between these events [of planning and implementation] narrows so that in the limit, composition converges with execution. The more improvisational an act, the narrower the time gap between composing and performing, designing and producing, or planning and implementing (Moorman & Miner 1998a). Empirically, Moorman and Miner (1998b) found that improvisation often replaced the use of standard procedures in new product development and, in the presence of developed organizational memory, had positive effects on design effectiveness and on cost savings. Orlikowski (1996), in her study of changes in an incident tracking system, found repeated improvisation in work practices that then led to restructuring.

The image of organization built around the idea of translation is one of a setting where there is continuous adoption and editing of ideas that bypass the apparatus of planned change and have their impact through a combination of fit with purposes at hand, institutional salience, and chance (Sahlin-Andersson, 1996). The idea that change is a continuous process of translation derives from an extended gloss of Latour (1986) observation that the spread in time and place of anything claims, orders, artefacts, goods, is in the hands of people; each of these people may act in many different ways, letting the token drop, or modifying it, or deflecting it, or betraying it or adding to it, or appropriating it. The controlling image is the travel of ideas and what happens when ideas are turned into new actions in new localities (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). Translation is not a synonym for diffusion. The differences are crucial. The impetus for the spread of ideas does not lie with the persuasiveness of the originator of the idea. Instead, the impetus comes from imitators and from their conception of the situation, their self-identity and others, identity, and their analogical reasoning (Sevon, 1996). The first actor in the chain is no more important than the last; ideas do not move from more saturated to less saturated environments; it is impossible to know when the process concludes, since all ideas are in the air all the time and are implemented depending on the purpose at hand (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). A match between a purpose and an idea does not depend on inherent properties of the idea. Instead, it is assumed that most ideas can be proven to fit most problems, assuming good will, creativity, and a tendency to consensus. Thus, the act of translation creates the match.

The image of organization built around the idea of learning is one of a setting where work and activity are defined by repertoires of actions and knowledge and where learning itself is defined as a change in an organizations response repertoire (Sitkin et al., 1998). What this adds to the understanding of continuous change is the idea that it is a range of skills and knowledge that is altered rather than a specific action, as well as the idea that a change is not just substitution but could also include strengthening existing skills. A change in repertoire is also a change in the potential for action, which means action may not be manifest at the time of learning (Pye, 1994). To specify learning in terms of a response repertoire is also to specify a mechanism by which change is retained (Moorman & Miner, 1997). In each of these three images, organizations produce continuous change by means of repeated acts of improvisation involving simultaneous composition and execution, repeated acts of translation that convert ideas into useful artifacts that fit purposes at hand, or repeated acts of learning that enlarge, strengthen, or shrink the repertoire of responses.

The summary of the analytic framework of continuous change is that each variation of a given form is not an abrupt or discrete event, neither is it, by itself discontinuous. Rather, through a series of ongoing and situated accommodations, adaptations, and alterations (that draw on previous variations and mediate future ones), sufficient modifications may be enacted over time that fundamental changes are achieved. There is no deliberate orchestration of change here, no technological inevitability, no dramatic discontinuity, just recurrent and reciprocal variations in practice over time. Each shift in practice creates the conditions for further breakdowns, unanticipated outcomes, and innovations, which in turn are met with more variations. Such variations are ongoing; there is no beginning or end point in this change process (Orlikowski 1996).

2b. Painless Change

Painless change is aimed to slightly modify and improve the organizations overall operation. This type of change does not challenge the organizations existing cultures and assumptions, but modifies them to effect change. It often causes little disruption and has a relatively low risk. It is actually slow and may take a significant time to produce enough change (Bartunek, 1984), and it also encourage the status quo (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

Painless change basically aims at introducing small scale improvements to the organizational processes (Romanelli & Tushman, 1994). Painless change is a step-by-step movement or variations in degree along an established conceptual continuum or system framework. Painless change is based on precedent; it is intended to do more of the same but better. An underlying assumption is that the conceptual or material system is adequate to satisfy the planner's objectives; for example, if incremental changes are proposed for a budget, the programs funded by the increased budget are assumed to be acceptable-only a quantitative change is required (Kindler, 1979). Under stable circumstances, from a cost-benefit perspective, painless change is often the preferred strategy. It is inappropriate if: (1) the environment introduces new factors (new competition, technology, or government regulations) that adversely affect productivity, satisfaction, or growth or (2) constraints of the system are too confining to allow adequate movement toward the objectives. An example of a painless change may include implementation of another computer system aimed at improving efficiency (Singh, et al, 1986).

Generally, a painless change is functional, because most activities are predictable enough for this strategy to be adequate and economically effective. Specifically, it is likely to be functional when:

(1) the assumptions of the current system are acceptable to stakeholders; (2) a backlog of incremental-change possibilities is available; and (3) current rates of improvement are economical.

Katz and Kahn (1966, p. 283) conclude that executives focus primarily on painless change. They assert that "the organization represents walls of a maze and, by and large, organizational decisions

have to do with solving maze problems, not reconstructing the maze walls." Abrahamson (2000) review organizational changes and suggests a counter instinctive imperative. He suggests that to change successfully, organizations need not to be changing continually. Instead, they should intersperse major change initiatives among carefully paced periods of smaller, organic change, using processes called 'tinkering and kludging'. By doing so, organizations can manage overall change with an approach called dynamic stability. Though, achieving dynamic stability is more difficult than ramming big, hairy, audacious changes through an organization; but dynamic stability has the great advantage of leaving survivors and it allows change without pain.

3. From the Transformational versus Incremental Change Perspective

As the continuous change is referred as a transformational change, painless change is referred to be an incremental change by past studies (Feng et al., 2016; Heikkinen et al., 2019; Nussbaumer & Merkle, 2010; Roggema et al., 2012; Termeer et al., 2017). In both the organizational change and the climate change adaptation literature, the transformational - incremental dichotomy is key in the debate. Many of the arguments for a shift from incremental to transformational change are based on a number of assumptions about the depth, scope, and speed of change (Vermaak, 2013). Transformational change is often associated with change that is in-depth (fundamental, truly new, revolutionary), large scale (the whole system), and/or quick (a discontinuous jump, achieved in a relatively short amount of time), whereas incremental change is often portrayed as shallow, partial, and slow (Termeer et al., 2017).

Depth refers to the level of change: superficial change means improving current practices without altering underlying assumptions, whereas in-depth change aims to radically change these practices by altering values, frames, and logics underlying the system. The prevalent assumption is that incremental steps often do not create enough depth to deal with the projected climate risks (Kates et al., 2012; Park et al., 2012; Pahl-Wostl, 2009; Pelling et al., 2014). It builds on the idea that paradigms and structural constraints impede widespread and deep social reform (Pelling, 2010). Changing the system by adding or adjusting some instruments, processes, or structures, without altering the taken-for-granted frames of reference, is deemed insufficient (O'Brien 2012; Howell 2013). Transformation or higher order change is advocated to break through mind-sets by stimulating actors to critically reflect on existing assumptions, challenge prevailing norms and interests, and learn to deal differently with climate change adaptation (O'Brien 2012).

Scope generally refers to the scale of that which is to be changed: a broad scope generally refers to large-scale, system-wide change, whereas a narrow scope addresses specific elements or subsystems that require change. As Levy and Merry (1986) noted, transformational change addresses the whole organization instead of isolated parts and is thus inherently multi-dimensional, multi-component, multi-aspectual, and multi-level. Transformational change is thus not just about isolated instances of change brought about by a few people, but about changes in the way of looking, thinking, and acting, with sweeping consequences for the arrangement of organizations, markets, technology, social relations, and concepts (Termeer & Nooteboom, 2012). However, a narrow scope is associated with incremental adaptation where only parts of the system change (Dupuis & Biesbroek, 2013), for example, a household or neighborhood. Transformational change aims to alter regulatory, legislative, or bureaucratic regimes; financial institutions; and technological or biological systems (IPCC 2012). Fieldman (2011) even pointed to changes in political systems when he discussed how neo-liberalism has created systemic constraints that incapacitate Western democracies from going beyond incremental adaptation efforts.

Speed or the timeframe within which change can be achieved is the third dimension of change. Although speed is important, it has not very often been explicitly addressed in theories of change. Characteristics of transformational change like revolutionary jump or discontinuous (Levy & Merry, 1986) suggest that transformational change would achieve the desired amount of change in a short period of time. However, most scholars emphasize that transformational change is a long and expensive process: "the process may include moments of insights and a relatively sudden shift in views, perceptions, and attitudes; however, there is a long way to go until ideas are translated into rules, procedures, technologies, and structures, and until a new order is established" (296 - 297). Kindler (1979) nuances this argument by stating that a single transformational change step obviously requires more time than a single incremental change step, but if the incremental steps are too small, or only maintain the status quo, then the desired amount of change will more quickly be achieved with one big step than with an endless series of small steps. Despite these long time horizons, most scientists, policy-makers, and activists concerned about the impacts of climate change and its assumed irreversible character call for rapid responses (Olsson et al., 2014; O'Brien 2012). Pelling et al. (2014) add an interesting nuance to this perceived impatience by arguing that incremental change to adapt to climate change can result in short-term achievements, but can also avoid more deeply rooted change and consequently delay transformation.

In conclusion, a transformational change strategy generally takes more time and energy than an incremental approach because it represents a departure from tradition, more risks are involved. This higher investment and vulnerability may be justified when: (1) incremental change fails to yield an acceptable level of improvement; (2) discontinuities appear in the nature of the problem or in available means for dealing with it; or (3) the focal problem is so important that both strategies warrant examination. However, all change involves resistance, which stems from habit, norms, insecurity, dependence, or vested interests.

4. Conclusion

Indeed, there has been and still are, major controversies regarding which type of change suits the contemporary business environment. Some commentators propose rapid and continuous change while others stand for painless change. For the proponent of painless change, the claim is that big changes made at all once often result into failures and put the organization at a higher risk and that any arising issue has to be tackled in a series of smaller steps, which will in turn reap bigger benefits (Abrahamson, 2000; Leana & Barry 2000). On the other hand, the proponents of continuous change claim that the more relevant type of change organizations have to adapt to deal with the contemporary business environment is radical change (Bartunek, 1984). This is because the contemporary business environment is characterized by continuous developments and competitive pressures which the organization has to deal with in order to achieve its objectives. Since painless change is slow, the only way to deal with the modern changing business environment is through embracing rapid and continuous change.

According to the above propositions, it is clear that indeed the contemporary business environment is characterized by changes in all its sectors. Painless change seems ineffective in achieving these strategies and therefore the best way to deal with change and remain effective in the present business environment is through adopting rapid and continuous change (Dessler, 2002).

The contemporary business environment is characterized by rapid technological advancements, competitive pressures, changing consumer preferences, economic declines, shift to knowledge based workforce and deregulation pressures (Journal of change management). These challenges create great opportunities for modern and innovative programs, development of the existing organizational programs and the introduction of new markets. Basically, organizations need to grow and make profits from their processes and therefore this means that they have to employ efforts

to achieve these strategies (Boeker, 1997). They have to continue flourishing in an environment of continuous change therefore; they have to successfully pilot instant changes, while at the same time helping the organizational personnel develop the capacity to prosper as the present and future challenges arise (Dessler, 2002). It is usually difficult to develop a successful business change strategy under the incremental change approach.

Painless change as discussed above is expected for small scale improvements, which are almost invisible and often difficult to measure (Quinn, 1996). It is not meant to cause any evident change to the organization's structures and processes. It actually modifies them. However, in the contemporary business environment whereby change seems to be the dominant factor, painless change proves to be ineffective in achieving any organizational transformations, that will give the organization a competitive advantage over the others, since this type of change is slow and seeks to only modify the organization's operations slightly, without necessarily having to challenge the existing cultures and processes.

Therefore, the most relevant type of change required in the business environment today is the rapid and continuous change. According to Miller and Friesen (1984), radical change is a qualitative modification of the organization's rules of management, and determines how members cognitively interact and behave with their world. However, this type of change is often difficult to achieve (Singh, et al. 1986). While this type of change seems to be the most preferred by many organizations today, both change and continuity are typically simultaneously evident in any organization, and radical change is even necessary for the organization's continuous adaptation over the long term (Leana & Barry, 2000). For an organization to remain effective in the contemporary business environment, radical transformations are required (Boeker, 1997). Therefore, organizations should develop the capacity for rapid and continuous change, which is more applicable to today's business environment.

References:

- Abrahamson, E. (2000). Change without pain. *Harvard business review*, 78(4), 75-79.
- Abrahamson, E. (2004). Change without pain: How managers can overcome initiative overload, organizational chaos, and employee burnout (p. 278). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Andreoni, A., & Scazzieri, R. (2014). Triggers of change: structural trajectories and production dynamics. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 38(6), 1391-1408.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human relations*, 46(6), 681-703.
- Ashkenas, R. (2013). Change management needs to change. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/04/change-management-needs-to-cha>
- Ates, A., & Bititci, U. (2011). Change process: a key enabler for building resilient SMEs. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5601-5618.
- Bahadin, Z. (2020). Change Management: A clarification of the gap between Change Management practice and research.
- Bailey, J. R., & Raelin, J. D. (2015). Organizations don't resist change, people do: Modeling individual reactions to organizational change through loss and terror management. *Organization management journal*, 12(3), 125-138.
- Bartunek, J. M. Changing Interpretive Schemes and Organizational Restructuring: The Example of A Religious Order. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1984, 29: 355-372.
- Baum, J. A., & Singh, J. V. (1994). Organizational niches and the dynamics of organizational mortality. *American journal of sociology*, 100(2), 346-380.
- Boeker, W. Strategic Change: The Influence Of Managerial Characteristics and

- Organizational growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1997 40 (1), pp. 152-170.
- Bouckennooghe, D., 2010. Positioning Change Recipients' Attitudes Toward Change in the Organizational Change Literature. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 46(4), pp. 500-531.
- Bovey, W. H. & Hede, A., 2001. Resistance to Organizational Change: the Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(8), pp. 372-382.
- Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1997). The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 1-34.
- Burnes, B., 2015. Understanding Resistance to Change: Building on Coch and French. *Journal of Change Management*, 15(2), pp. 92-116.
- By, R.T., Burnes, B., & Oswick, C. (2012). Change management: leadership, values and ethics. *Journal of Change Management*, 12(1), 1-5.
- Carter, M. Z., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Mossholder, K. W. (2013). Transformational leadership, relationship quality, and employee performance during continuous incremental organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(7), 942-958.
- Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human resource development review*, 10(1), 46-73.
- Czarniawska B, Joerges B. 1996. Travels of ideas. See Czarniawska & Sevón 1996, pp.13-48
- Dahl, J. (2014). Conceptualizing cooperation as a process: an outline of change in cooperative and competitive interactions. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(2), 272-279.
- Daly, P., & Walsh, J. S. (2010). Drucker's theory of the business and organisations: challenging business assumptions. *Management Decision*, 48(4), 500-511.
- Dent, E. B. & Powley, E. H., 2003. Employees Actually Embrace Change: The Chimera of Resistance. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), pp. 40-56.
- Dessler, G. (2002). *A framework for management*. Prentice Hall.
- Dupuis, J., & R. Biesbroek. 2013. "Comparing Apples and Oranges: The Dependent Variable Problem in Comparing and Evaluating Climate Change Adaptation Policies." *Global Environmental Change* 23 (6): 1476-1487.
- El-Dirani, A., Hussein, M. M., & Hejase, H. J. (2019) The Role of Human Resources in Change Management: An Exploratory Study in Lebanon. *The Journal of Middle East and North Africa Sciences*. p.13-1

- Else, S. E. (2004). Organization theory and the transformation of large, complex organizations: Donald H. Rumsfeld and the US Department of Defense, 2001-04 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver).
- Erne, R. (2016). Change Management Revised. In *Organizational Change Management Strategies in Modern Business* (pp. 1-23). IGI Global.
- Feldman, M. S. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization science*, 11(6), 611-629.
- Feng, C., Huang, X., & Zhang, L. (2016). A multilevel study of transformational leadership, dual organizational change and innovative behavior in groups. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.
- Fieldman, G. 2011. "Neoliberalism, the Production of Vulnerability and the Hobbled State: Systemic Barriers to Climate Adaptation." *Climate and Development* 3 (2): 159_174.
- Ford, J. D. & Ford, L. W. (2010). Stop Blaming Resistance to Change and Start Using It. *Organizational dynamics*, 39(1), pp. 24-36.
- Gallego, J. M. (2017). Organizational trauma and change management. In *Impact of Organizational Trauma on Workplace Behavior and Performance* (pp. 140-161). IGI Global.
- Gioia, D. A., Nag, R., & Corley, K. G. (2012). Visionary ambiguity and strategic change: The virtue of vagueness in launching major organizational change. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 21(4), 364-375.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R.A. (2014). *Behavior in organizations*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- 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.
- Gustafson, D. H., Sainfort, F., Eichler, M., Adams, L., Bisognano, M., & Steudel, H. (2003). Developing and testing a model to predict outcomes of organizational change. *Health services research*, 38(2), 751-776.
- Hechanova, R.M., & Cementina-Olpoc, R. (2013). Transformational leadership, change management, and commitment to change: a comparison of academic and business organizations. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 22(1), 11–19.
- Heikkinen, M., Ylä-Anttila, T., & Juhola, S. (2019). Incremental, reformistic or transformational: what kind of change do C40 cities advocate to deal with climate change?. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 21(1), 90-103.
- Holten, A.-L., & Brenner, S.O. (2015). Leadership style and the process of organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(1), 2–16.

- Homberg, F., Vogel, R., & Weiherl, J. (2019). Public service motivation and continuous organizational change: Taking charge behaviour at police services. *Public administration*, 97(1), 28-47.
- Ijaz, S. & Vitalis, A., 2011. Resistance to Organizational Change: Putting the Jigsaw Together. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 7(3), pp. 112-121.
- IPCC (2012). *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, G., Van Witteloostuijn, A., & Christe-Zeyse, J. (2013). A theoretical framework of organizational change. *Journal of organizational change management*.
- Jansson, N., 2013. Organizational Change as Practice: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26(6), pp. 1003-1019.
- Johansson, C., & Heide, M. (2008). Speaking of change: three communication approaches in studies of organizational change. *Corporate communications: an international journal*.
- Kasemsap, K. (2017). The roles of organizational change management and resistance to change in the modern business world. In *Organizational culture and behavior: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 1034-1062). IGI Global.
- Kates, R.W., W.R. Travis, and T.J. Wilbanks. 2012. "Transformational Adaptation When Incremental Adaptations to Climate Change are Insufficient." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109 (19): 7156_7161. doi:10.1073/pnas.1115521109.
- Kezar, A. (2011). *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 28, Number 4*.
- Kirrane, M., Lennon, M., O'Connor, C., & Fu, N. (2017). Linking perceived management support with employees' readiness for change: the mediating role of psychological capital. *Journal of Change Management*, 17(1), 47-66.
- Kindler, H. S. (1979). Two planning strategies: Incremental change and transformational change. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4(4), 476-484.
- Kuipers, B.S., Higgs, M., Kickert, W., Tummers, L., Grandia, J., & Voet, J.V.D. (2014). The management of change in public organizations: a literature review. *Public Administration*, 92(1), 1-20.
- Latour B. 1986. The powers of association. In *Power, Action, and Belief*, ed. J Law, pp. 264.80. London: Routledge & Kegan
- Latta, G. F. (2015). Modeling the Cultural dynamics of Resistance and Facilitation: Interaction Effects in the OC3 Model of Organizational Change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(6), pp. 1013-1037.
- Leana, C.R., and B. Barry. *Stability and Change As Simultaneous Experiences In Organizational Life*. *Academy of Management Review*, 2000. 25: 75

- Levy, A., and U. Merry. 1986. *Organizational Transformation*. New York: Praeger.
- Lines, R., 2005. The Structure and Function of Attitudes Toward Organizational Change. *Human Resource Development Review*, March, 4(1), pp. 8-32.
- March, J. G. (1981). Footnotes to organizational change. *Administrative science quarterly*, 563-577.
- McCollum, J. (2008). Co-creating a change-adept organizational culture.
- Miller, D., and P. Friesen. *Organizations: A Quantum View*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1984. "Perspectives on Organizational Change: Systems and Complexity Theories" Francis Amagoh (20/12/2008) source>
<http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/amagoh3dec2008jag2rev1.pdf>
- Moorman C, Miner AS. 1997. The impact of organizational memory on new product performance and creativity. *J. Mark. Res.* 34:91.106
- Moorman C, Miner AS. 1998a. Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* In press
- Moorman C, Miner AS. 1998b. The convergence of planning and execution: improvisation in new product development. *J. Mark.*
- Nussbaumer, A., & Merkley, W. (2010). The path of transformational change. *Library Management*.
- Obloj, K. (2019). Footnotes to organizational competitiveness. *Economics and Business Review*, 5(3), 35-49.
- O'Brien, K. 2012. "Global Environmental Change II: From Adaptation to Deliberate Transformation." *Progress in Human Geography* 36 (5): 667_676.
- Olsson, P., V. Galaz, and W.J. Boonstra. 2014. "Sustainability Transformations: A Resilience Perspective." *Ecology and Society* 19 (4): 1. doi:10.5751/ES-06799-190401.
- Orlikowski W. J. (1996). Improvising organizational transformation overtime: a situated change perspective. *Inf. Syst. Res.* 7(1): 63.92
- Pahl-Wostl, C. (2009). "A Conceptual Framework for Analysing Adaptive Capacity and Multi-Level Learning Processes in Resource Governance Regimes." *Global Environmental Change* 19 (3):354_365.
- Pardo del Val, M. & Martínez Fuentes, C. (2003). Resistance to Change: A Literature Review and Empirical Study. *Management Decision*, 41(2), pp. 148-155.
- Park, S.E., M. Howden, and S. Crimp. 2012. "Informing Regional Level Policy Development and Actions for Increased Adaptive Capacity in Rural Livelihoods." *Environmental Science and Policy* 15 (1): 23_37.
- Pelling, M. 2010. *Adaptation to Climate Change: From Resilience to Transformation*. London: Routledge.
- Pelling, M., K. O'Brien, and D. Matyas. 2014. "Adaptation and Transformation." *Climatic Change*. 113 (1): 113_127. doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1303-0

- Piderit, S. K., 2000. Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes Toward an Organizational Change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), pp. 783-794.
- Powell, W. W., & Bromley, P. (Eds.). (2020). *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*. Stanford University Press.
- Prastacos, G., Söderquist, K., Spanos, Y., & Van Wassenhove, L. (2002). An integrated framework for managing change in the new competitive landscape. *European Management Journal*, 20(1), 55-71.
- Prediscan, M. & Bradutanu, D., 2012. Change Agent - A Force Generating Resistance to Change within an Organization?. *Acta Universitatis Danubius: Oeconomica*, 8(6), pp. 5-12.
- Pye A. 1994. Past, present and possibility: an integrative appreciation of learning from experience. *Manage. Learn.* 25:155.73
- Quinn, R.E. *Deep Change: Discovering the leader within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1996
- Raineri, A.B. (2011). Change management practices: impact on perceived change results. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(3), 266-272
- Rees, G., & Rumbles, S. (2012). Continuous organizational change and burnout. *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 11, 1-16.
- Robert, V., Yoguel, G., & Lerena, O. (2017). The ontology of complexity and the neo-Schumpeterian evolutionary theory of economic change. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 27(4), 761-793.
- Roggema, R., Vermeend, T., & Dobbelsteen, A. V. D. (2012). Incremental change, transition or transformation? Optimising change pathways for climate adaptation in spatial planning. *Sustainability*, 4(10), 2525-2549.
- Romanelli, E., & Tushman, M. L. (1994). Organizational transformation as punctuated equilibrium: An empirical test. *Academy of Management journal*, 37(5), 1141-1166.
- Sahlin-Andersson K. 1996. Imitating by editing success: the construction of organizational fields. See Czarniawska & Sevón 1996, pp. 69.92
- Scazzieri, R. (2018). Structural dynamics and evolutionary change. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 46, 52-58.
- Sevón G. 1996. Organizational imitation in identity transformation. See Czarniawska & Sevón 1996, pp. 49.68
- Singh, J. V., House, R. J., & Tucker, D. J. (1986). Organizational change and organizational mortality. *Administrative science quarterly*, 587-611.
- Sitkin SB, Sutcliffe KM, Weick KE. 1998. Organizational learning. In *The Technology Management Handbook*, ed. R Dorf. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. In press
- Smith, I. (2005a). Achieving Readiness for Organisational Change. *Library Management*, pp.

408-412.

Smith, I. (2005b). Continuing Professional Development and Workplace Learning 13: Resistance to Change - Recognition and Response. *Library Management*, 26(8/9), pp. 519-522.

Sproull, L. (2010). *Organizational learning*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Steigenberger, N. (2015). Emotions in sensemaking: a change management perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(3), 432–451.

Stensaker, I.G., & Langley, A. (2010). Change management choices and trajectories in a multidivisional firm. *British Journal of Management*, 21(1), 7–27.

Stoica, C. G. S., Popescu, D. M., & Mihalcioiu, V. (2012). Resistance to change on the organizational level. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 3(2), 115.

Suddaby, R., & Foster, W.M. (2017). History and organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 19–38.

Termeer, C. J., Dewulf, A., & Biesbroek, G. R. (2017). Transformational change: governance interventions for climate change adaptation from a continuous change perspective. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 60(4), 558-576.

The Art of Continuous Change. Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1983. 42: 1-34

Thomas, R. & Hardy, C. (2011). Reframing Resistance to Organizational Change. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(3), pp. 322-331.

Thompson, J. D. (2003). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. Transaction publishers.

Tushman, M. L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. *Research in organizational behavior*.

Vakola, M. (2013). Multilevel readiness to organizational change: A conceptual approach. *Journal of change management*, 13(1), 96-109.

Vermaak, H. 2013. "Planning Deep Change Through a Series of Small Wins." Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Conference 2013, Orlando, FL, August 9_13.

Vlados, C. (2019). Change management and innovation in the "living organization": The Stra. Tech. Man approach. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 7(2), 229-256.

Von Treuer, K., Karantzas, G., McCabe, M., Mellor, D., Konis, A., Davison, T. E., & O'Connor, D. (2018). Organizational factors associated with readiness for change in residential aged care settings. *BMC health services research*, 18(1), 77.

Vora, M. (2013). Business excellence through sustainable change management. *The TQM Journal*, 25(6), 625–640.

-
- Wee, E. X., & Taylor, M. S. (2018). Attention to change: A multilevel theory on the process of emergent continuous organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(1), 1.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual review of psychology*, 50(1), 361-386.
- Weiner, B. J. (2020). A theory of organizational readiness for change. In *Handbook on Implementation Science*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wheatley M.J. (1992). *Leadership and the New Science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler
- Whelan-Berry, K.S., & Somerville, K.A. (2010). Linking change drivers and the organizational change process: a review and synthesis. *Journal of Change Management*, 10(2), 175–193.
- Worley, C.G., & Mohrman, S.A. (2014). Is change management obsolete? *Organizational Dynamics*, 43(3), 214–224
- Yu, B. T. W., & Ming, T. W. (2008). Effects of control mechanisms on positive organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.