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Committee Chair: Richard Lyle, Ph.D.

Dissertation dated May 2013

This study examines public housing authority employees' perceptions of readiness, climate and process of change and employee status. Sixty-six (66) survey participants were selected for this study utilizing convenience sampling. The survey participants were current public housing authority employees who underwent organizational change. The survey in this study, Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes and Readiness (OCQ-CPR), utilized a four-point continuum Likert scale. Frequency distribution, cross tabulations and the statistical test of chi-square were used to analyze the relationship between the variables. The findings of the study indicated that there was no statistical relationship between the variables.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Across the United States, public housing communities are being transformed. Over the past 30 years, public housing authorities (PHAs) have encountered a multitude of federal policies that have created both challenges and opportunities for local PHAs. The National Housing Act of 1937 established the first public housing program in the Unites States. Local housing authorities constructed, managed and maintained public housing, while the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulated their operations (Kleit & Page, 2008).

From the inception of the public housing program in 1937 well into the 1990s, PHAs have been limited in their mission and services by federal law, state regulations and local statutes. The main purpose of this act was to provide low-cost housing and create jobs (Lane, 1995). Initially, the target population for public housing was working-class people who were temporarily unemployed due to the Great Depression. However, due to low-interest mortgages made available through the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Federal Housing Administration, the working class was able to move out of public housing and into privately owned housing. As a result, the target population of public housing shifted to the people in the lower socioeconomic class (Stoloff, 2004).
Through the 1937 Housing Act, the federal government provided local public housing agencies capital grants and loans. This form of financial support set a precedence for housing the working poor and lowering the cost of rent. The working poor were considered to be the group of people whose financial position did not allow them to buy their own home (Listokin, 1991). The federal policies that regulate PHAs have become more flexible. Accordingly, the duties of PHA have expanded from stimulating economic growth and providing affordable housing to redeveloping the housing stock, administering housing vouchers, managing residential social services, and deconcentrating poverty in public housing (Kleit & Page, 2008).

Due the broadening of federal housing policies, PHAs have a greater capacity to develop strategic plans that are unique to each agency’s needs. To support the organization’s strategic plan and to respond to federal mandates, PHAs have implemented organizational change strategies to reset their business models, organizational structures, culture, human resources, business practices, systems and corporate policies and procedures (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Planned organizational change is a calculated, collaborative process that leads gradually or radically to structured realignments between the environment and an organization’s strategic orientation, which results in improvements in employee performance and effectiveness. An effective strategy for overcoming opposition is to directly involve organization members in designing and executing change (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

Embedded in organizational change is employees’ resistance to change. Factors that contribute to resistance include, the threat of job change or loss brought on by re-engineering and the logistical burden of business transformation. In order to carry out
the planned organizational change, agency leaders must develop techniques to control employee resistance to change. Gauging employees’ perceptions of the benefits of change or the organization’s readiness for change is an important strategy to counteract employee opposition (Cunningham et al, 2002).

Chapter I describes the background of public housing transformation, which will provide a historical overview on the issue being addressed. A statement of the problem along with the study’s purpose and significance will be discussed. Included in this chapter are the research questions, hypotheses, definitions, and chapter summary.

Statement of the Problem

Organizational change practices are prevalent amongst both the private and public sector. Although, planned change is performed in both public and private sector organizations, research indicates that public human service organizations have lower success rates of organizational change when compared to similar organizations in the private sector (Galambos, Dulmus, & Wodarski, 2005). Human service organizations in the public sector face more complex challenges than those in the private sector. Human service organizations function within an environment in which they are constrained by conflicting political, social and economic forces. Public and private sector organizations differ mainly in their structure, stakeholder diversity, intergovernmental relationships and decision-maker characteristics. The distinctive features embedded in human service organizations make it more difficult to implement change techniques (Cummings & Worley, 2008).
Common for most organizational change efforts is their low success rate. Studies have shown that up to 83% of organizations that underwent organizational change failed to achieve their targeted objectives (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Employee participation is important in carrying out the specific activities involved in making modifications to the policies, programs and procedures. Therefore, employee participation in change initiatives is a key factor in the success or failure of planned organizational change (Galambos et al., 2005).

Implementing organizational change can be difficult because transformation can create anxiety for employees within the organization. Employees are resistant to change because they feel pressured to let go of the status quo and move toward an uncertain future (Cummings & Worley, 2008). Resistance can also be associated with an employees' lack of motivation to alter behavior and employees' interest not aligning with the organization's mission and objectives. Resistance to planned change can lead to low productivity, disengagement, conflict and turnover among employees (Razali & Vrontis, 2010).

In terms of employee resistance to change, a link exists between value alignment and successful change. To promote employee acceptance and commitment to organizational change, organizations must align the objectives proposed in the change initiatives with the values of their employees (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). The level of employee training, quality of communication and amount of managerial support are important to the change process. Employees will be unprepared to carry out change efforts if they do not receive clear communication, adequate training and continuous supervisory support on change initiatives. During the implementation stage,
organizations may lose sight of the components that are essential to the change process. For instance, when a budget crisis occurs, organizations have a tendency to reduce funding for training opportunities (Galambos et al., 2005).

Saksvik et al. (2007) suggest that employee communication with managers is an important aspect of organizational change. However, in an attempt to gain control of change processes, middle mangers are apt to withdraw from the change process and provide limited information to their employees. Because middle managers serve as a major connection between front line employees and the executive team, it becomes important for employees to have access to managers who have knowledge about the change and how the change will affect employees.

Organizational climate is another significant component for developing employees' motivation for change. Employees are less likely to participate in organizational change if they possess negative perceptions about the organizations climate of change. The relationship between a manger and employee influences the employees' perception of the organization’s climate (Tierny, 1999).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the readiness for change, climate of change and the process of change within human service organizations. The participants of the study are current employees at local public housing authority in a major metropolitan city in the United States. The study will explore employees’ readiness for planned organizational change along with the agency’s climate and processes of change.
Operationalization

Generally, organizational change is defined as an organization’s response to internal and external pressures, as well as, adjustments to normal duties and responsibilities of employees. It is important to note that although organization development and organizational change are connected, a clear distinction exist between the two concepts. Organization development refers to modifications in strategy, structure, and processes of an entire organization. Design, implementation and reinforcement of change are emphasized to ensure that the change is long-term. Additionally, to make certain that the organization can manage future change, organization development usually involves the systematic application and transfer of behavioral science knowledge and practice, such as psychology, social psychology, sociology, adult education, psychotherapy, social work, economics and political science.

On the contrary, although organizational change applies some aspects of organization development, organizational change is a more comprehensive concept. While changes within organization development focus mainly on creating a more developed organization, organizational change has a wider focus and can be applied to any type of change, such as policy modifications, service additions, program restructuring and organization decline and/or evolution. Overall, organization development strategies are employed to manage organizational change; therefore, the two concepts are interrelated (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

Packard (2008) notes that organization development is the most common application utilized in organizational change. Organization development techniques can be used across all types of organizations, including human service organizations.
Roberson and Seneviratne (1995) recognize that the field of organizational change originated primarily from knowledge and techniques acquired from the organization development movement. For the purposes of this study, both organization development and organizational change will be examined.

The purpose and implementation of organizational change varies from organization to organization. Through organizational change, human service organizations respond to goal displacement, which is an agency's tendency to focus on their own maintenance and survival while disregarding the organization's established goals (Galambos et al., 2005). Schmid (2010) defines organizational change in human service organizations as modifications to an organization's key activities, objectives, plans, structure, and service programs as a result of both internal and external constraints. Organizational change involves various strategies that are executed to ensure survival in dynamic and changing environments.

Employees' attitudes towards planned organizational change can be determined by examining readiness for change, process factors of change and the climate of change. Individual readiness for change involves the combination of intentional readiness for change (amount of commitment towards the change process), the cognitive readiness for change (beliefs regarding change) and the emotional readiness for change (feelings surrounding change). The climate of change pertains to the internal environment in which change occurs. The process of change describes the way in which change occurs (Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).

Employee status refers to an employee's rank in the organization's hierarchy. During the implementation of organizational change strategies, front-line or non-
supervisory employees are considered change recipients and administrative or supervisory employees are considered change managers (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2006). No general definition of human services exists. Overall, human services agencies are mixture of a variety of programs that address the specific needs of individuals in marginalized populations (Martin & Hazlett-Knudsen, 2012).

Examples of vulnerable populations include, but are not limited to, children, the elderly, the homeless, immigrants, people with disabilities and people with mental illness. Human service organizations encompass a range of services such as vocational rehabilitation, employment services, adult corrections and transitional and affordable housing. These organizations promote the improvement of the quality of life by alleviating specific problems. They are often operated through state or local government; however, a large number of human service organizations are nonprofit (Moffat, 2011).

Public housing agencies are a subcategory of human service organizations. These local agencies attempt to address inner-city poverty and isolation by providing affordable housing to low-income families (Stoloff, 2004). PHAs are primarily responsible for managing HUD’s public housing program and administering the housing choice voucher program (formerly Section 8). The public housing program was created to provide safe and adequate housing for low-income families, aging adults and persons with disabilities. Presently, over 3,300 PHAs operate approximately 1.2 million public housing units across the United States. PHAs main duties in regards to public housing include assuring that residents comply with leases, conducting annual recertifications of family income, repairing and renovating developments and providing homeownership counseling.
employment training opportunities and supportive programs for the elderly (HUD, 2012b).

The housing choice voucher program also aids in providing safe and affordable housing to low-income families, the elderly and persons with disabilities. Recipients of the housing choice voucher program are able to find housing in the private market and are not limited to living in public housing units. PHAs are responsible for providing housing payment assistance to landlords on behalf of program recipients, conduct annual reexaminations of family income and maintain annual inspections of units to ensure that the minimum standard of housing quality standards are being met (HUD, 2012a).

Research Questions

The following questions will be addressed in this study:

1. Is there a relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the readiness for organizational change within human service organizations?
2. Is there a relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the climate of organizational change within human service organizations?
3. Is there a relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the process of organizational change within human service organizations?

Hypotheses

The following are the null hypotheses for this study:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the readiness for organizational change within human service organizations.
2. There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the climate of organizational change within human service organizations.

3. There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the process of organizational change within human service organizations.

Significance of the Study

According to Abravanel et al. (2004), as a result of congressional concern regarding the huge administrative burden, adverse effect on humans, and the heightened public disapproval of maintaining severely distressed public housing inventory, public housing authorities have been compelled to enhance operational effectiveness by realigning organizational structure, processes, personnel, and technology systems. An increased demand for public housing authorities to undergo deregulation and devolution prompted significant changes in public housing programs.

Extensive research exists which examines the reconstruction of affordable housing resources made possible through public housing reforms. Limited studies evaluate the factors that impact employee readiness for implementing public housing reforms (Kleit & Page, 2008). Although planned change is apparent in human service agencies, aspects of organizational change within this area are under researched (Galambos et al., 2005). This study will help fill the gaps in literature in reference to planned organizational change in the human service, specifically within public housing authorities.
The external environment drives human service organization to change. External factors such as social, economic and political change require human service organizations to become involved in a strategic change effort (Proehl, 2001). The bureaucratic nature of organizations such as public housing agencies, tend to be inflexible and resistant to change. Constraints imposed on public social service agencies, such as public scrutiny on the decision-making process, outdated views on change and diffusion of power, present unique challenges when implementing organizational change (DuBrow, Wocher, & Austin, 2001).

Upper level staff have a tendency to adjust better than middle and lower level staff to organizational change. Although differences in the reaction to organizational change may vary among employee status, many studies fail to separate the status of employees when examining employees' perspectives on organizational change. Limited studies exist on the link between an employee's position and the varying perceptions on overall organizational change, the communication of change and the acceptance of change. However, some studies show that hierarchical levels within organizations can impact organizational change (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2006).

Organizational change can improve client outcomes and create a fiscally sound agency. Refusal to embrace organizational change can prove to be detrimental to an agency. The type of reaction that public housing authorities display in response to federal policy changes directly affects their clients. It is imperative that employees are fully engaged and actively participate in organizational change (Galambos et al., 2005).

Resistance to change can be reduced if employees and the organization as a whole possess a readiness to change. Factors that play instrumental roles in employees'
readiness for change include the extent and quality of employee involvement (climate of change) and the way in which change is administered (process of change). This study will take a closer look into the relationship between change climate and readiness to change, which is an area that is rarely investigated. The information found in this study will provide further insight into factors that lead to successful organizational change within human service organizations (Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).

This chapter presented the concept of planned organizational change and provided an overview of the role public housing policies have played in transforming public housing agencies. Select issues human service organizations face when implementing planned organizational change within the human service agencies were discussed. Additionally, the significance of the study was also discussed regarding select factors that promote successful organizational change.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Employee outlooks regarding planned organizational change within a public housing organization were examined in this study. Chapter II provides a review of historical perspectives that have shaped public housing policy. Additionally, organizational change within the private sector and public sector organizations will be discussed, along with the concepts of the climate of change, the processes of change and the readiness for change, which are embedded in organizational change. This chapter also outlines various organizational change measurement instruments in order to determine the most suitable tool to administer to gauge employee’s views on planned organizational change. Lastly, the theoretical framework that guided this study will be presented.

Public Housing Policy

Modern public housing policies can be traced back to the early 1930’s. Quigley (2000) reports that from America’s founding to the 1930’s, the federal government provided no formal type of housing assistance for low-income families. Bennett, Smith, and Wright (2006) report that the government had some involvement in housing the poor in the late 1890s. Through the diligence of activist tenant laws that established health and safety requirements for slum buildings were enacted in several states. Despite continuous efforts, legislators did not enact federal tenement policies. Federal policymakers viewed
housing as an issue that should be handled by local government. Although tenement laws failed to pass on a national level, this period marked set precedents. During this time, a formal process for government regulation of housing development to protect the health and safety of poor people was introduced. This period also affirmed the central role of local government in providing housing for the poor.

In 1933, the National Industry Recovery Act was passed. Through this Act, the Public Works Administration was created, which authorized the purchasing, and clearing of slum property as well as approved the building of public housing (Schill & Wachter, 1995). The primary focus of the National Industry Recovery Act of 1933 was to create jobs, eliminate devastated urban and rural areas and revive American industry. Although fifty low-rent housing projects containing over 21,000 units in thirty-seven cities were constructed through the authorization of the Public Works Administration, the housing activities of the National Industrial Recovery Act were short-lived (von Hoffman, 1996).

Shill and Wachter (1995) report that in the 1935 case, *United States vs. Certain Lands in Louisville*, the federal court stopped all activities authorized by National Industrial Recovery Act citing that providing housing to low-income individuals of slum districts went beyond the scope of the government’s eminent domain. The court believed that housing low-income workers was not an issue of public concern.

**Housing Act of 1937**

The first formal commitment to public housing made by the federal government was established through the passage of the Housing Act of 1937, also known as the Wagner-Stegall Act of 1937. The purpose of this act was to provide state and local
housing authorities financial assistance to create safe and sanitary housing for low-income families (Aiken & Alford, 1970). Public housing was viewed as a remedy for the economic ills of poor families. In attempt to alleviate one aspect of the nation’s issues the Housing Act of 1937 was passed. Similar to the National Industry Recovery Act, the Wagner-Stegall Act focused on the development of employment opportunities and the removal of urban slums (Quiercia & Galster, 1997).

This law established a permanent federal agency to manage subsidized housing. The Housing Act of 1937 also created a method for transferring federal money to local authorities, introduced the principle of charging rent relative to income and provided a policy of local tax exemption of property to subsidize rent (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006). The 1937 Housing Act received support from moral reformers who believed that city slums exposed the nation’s poor to an unsafe, unhealthy and immoral environment. Supporters of this new federal housing program, who advocated to house these poor city dwellers in European-style public housing projects, believed that re-housing low-income families would ultimately do away with the slums and cure families of there urban social ills (von Hoffman, 1996).

Through this act, Congress established public housing admission requirements. One major requirement specified that public housing agencies could only serve low-income families. Low-income families were defined as “those who [were] in the lowest income group and who [could] not afford to pay enough to cause private enterprise to build adequate supply of decent, safe and sanitary dwellings for their use” (Schill & Wachtet, 1995, p. 1294). The United States Housing Act of 1937 defined low-income families as “families whose incomes [did] not exceed eighty percent of the
median income for the area” (Schill & Wachter, p. 11). Very low-income families were defined as “families whose incomes [did] not exceed fifty percent of the median family income for the area” (p. 11).

The Housing Act of 1937 also led to the creation of the United States Housing Authority. Due to the decision made in the Louisville case, local public housing authorities would possess and operate public housing instead of the federal government. As an alternative, the federal government would oversee local public housing authorities (Schill & Wachter, 1995). By 1942, the United States Housing Authority constructed 100,000 housing units in approximately 140 cities. Despite the high expectations of housing projects and the idealistic beliefs that public housing reforms would produce social betterment for low-income families, public housing was later viewed as a failure, and it was discovered that public housing by itself could not solve the social crisis of the urban poor. Parallel to the urban slums, public housing became associated with concentrated poverty, impoverished dependency, vast amounts of racial segregation and high levels of crime and unemployment (von Hoffman, 1996).

**Housing Act of 1949**

The Housing Act of 1949 is marked as both the high and low of U.S. public housing policy. Many businesses and trade organizations were against the redevelopment of slums and held the position that federal intervention was not necessary because the private housing industry provided a substantial and adequate housing inventory for low-income families (Flanagan, 1997). Due to the United States’ heavy involvement in World War II, public housing programs were discontinued.
The Housing Act of 1949 refocused the federal government’s attention on public housing in the United States. Supporters of the act believed that the government could provide suitable, affordable housing and public housing should be the only option for low-income families (von Hoffman, 2008). The target of this act was to commit federal funds to develop 810,000 new public housing units within six years. This act also provided financing for slum clearance projects. The goal of building 810,000 units was not reached partly due to lack of sufficient funding (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006).

President Harry Truman reduced the number of units produced per year from 135,000 units to 30,000 units at the beginning of the Korean War. Following the President’s action, the majority of Republicans, economically conservative Southern Democrats, and rural representatives in Congress voted against public housing based on ideological principles. As a result, the number of units built continued to fluctuate over the years, from 50,000 units in 1952 to 35,000 in 1953 (Hunt, 2005). Much of the public housing stock that was deemed unsafe and uninhabitable was demolished. This action was problematic for lower income families because demolition moved at faster rates than new construction, and many cities preferred to replace the low-income renters with high-income renters (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006).

**Housing and Community Development Act of 1974**

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 created the Section 8 affordable housing program, which provides tenant-based assistance and funding for private sector organizations to construct affordable housing. The act shifted development funds from PHAs to the private sector (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006). The purpose of
This subsidy program was to create more affordable housing through new construction or rehabilitation. The subsidy comes in the form of the tenant paying no more than 30% of their income for rent and the local PHA paying the difference. This program has given families at the lowest income level access to affordable, privately owned housing (Salsich, 2004).

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 also changed federal grant programs by consolidating them into the community development block grant (CDBG) program. Similar to previous housing legislation, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 was passed as an effort to create viable communities in urban areas by making suitable housing and economic opportunities available for low and moderate income families (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006).

The CDBG program was established to replace categorical grant programs that created several isolated programs with inflexible standards set by the federal government. Instead, the CDBG program provided grants to cities and states to help them develop and implement local programs that address specific community needs (Salsich, 2004). Currently, grant recipients must serve mostly low- and moderate-income people. A variety of community activities are created that focus on revitalizing neighborhoods, economic development and improved community facilities and services (HUD, 2011a).

**Housing and Community Development Act of 1992**

Quigley (2000) reports that the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 allowed the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development to reserve approximately twenty percent of development funds for major reconstruction or
demolition of outdated public housing projects. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 designated funding for the Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) program, also known as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration program. The HOPE VI program was derived from work of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing in 1989.

This congressional committee was commissioned to examine the factors that contributed to the structural, economic, and social distress of public housing, provide solutions to rectify the problems, and develop a national action plan to ameliorate the distressed conditions by 2000. The committee reported that 6% of the 1.4 million public housing units were the most distressed developments in the country, and revealed that the areas were plagued with crime, poverty, unemployment and dependency. Fundamentally, HOPE VI aimed to transform public housing by modifying its physical space, establishing incentives for self-sufficiency, deconcentrating poverty by promoting mixed-income communities and leveraging support and resources by building community partnerships (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006).

In a study conducted in 2004, Popkin et al. reported the primary goals of the HOPE VI program were to improve the living environment for residents of severely distressed public housing through the demolition, rehabilitation, or replacement of obsolete public housing developments; revitalize public housing sites and be instrumental in the improvement of the surrounding neighborhood; provide housing that reduces the concentration of very low-income families, and to build sustainable communities. To accomplish the outlined goals, the HOPE VI program was comprised of grants for revitalization and funding for management improvement and supportive services (Popkin
et al., 2004). Along with the direct program goals, HOPE VI served as avenue to introduce asset management practices into public housing. Under HOPE VI, PHAs performed site inspections and reviewed quarterly property performance reports (Gentry, 2009).

**Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998**

The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA) redefined and enhanced the target population of housing assistance. This act mandated that seventy-five percent of all new Tenant-Based Section 8 Vouchers be issued to families whose incomes were below thirty percent of the local median incomes (Quigley, 2000). According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (2011c), Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act had several key points. This act aimed to decrease the concentration of poverty in public housing development, provide access to housing subsidies for poor families and support families that transitioned from “welfare to work.” This act also raised performance standards for public housing agencies, transformed the public housing stock through new policies and procedures, reformed the Section 8 certificate and voucher programs by allowing public housing agencies to implement a Section 8 homeownership program and supported HUD management reform efficiencies through deregulation, streamlining and program consolidation.

Bennett, Smith, and Wright (2006) note that the QHWRA represents the official transformation of national public housing and made substantial amendments to the Housing Act of 1937. The key provisions include the following: (1) rent ceilings were established (prior to the Act, tenants paid no more than 30% of their income and as
income went up so did the rent); (2) public housing residents were required to perform community service or participate in a self-sufficiency program; (3) PHAs were given more flexibility to evict tenants and conduct background checks on applicants; (4) PHAs were required to build a five-year strategic plan that linked capital, operations, and management. (The strategic plan also needed to align with local Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies and Consolidated Plans within the PHA jurisdiction); (5) the HOPE VI program became permanent; and (6) PHAs were allowed to own, operate and assist in the development of mixed-finance projects.

Moving to Work Demonstration Program

In 1996, Congress authorized the Moving to Work Demonstration program. The Moving to Work Demonstration program encouraged deregulation by giving public housing authorities the flexibility to design and implement cost effective federal housing assistance that addressed local housing needs for low-income families (National Housing Law Project, 1999). Section 204 of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 permitted only thirty public housing authorities to participate simultaneously in the demonstration program at any given time. Initially, twenty-four PHAs were selected to participate in this time-limited program; however, only eighteen PHAs entered into a formal agreement with HUD and implemented MTW activities (Abravanel et al., 2004).

To be selected to participate in this program, PHAs must meet certain criteria. These requirements include encouraging citizen input of planning housing activities through public hearings, ensuring that at least seventy-five percent of the families served
are "very low-income families" (as defined in the Housing Act of 1937), providing assistance to an equal or greater amount of families that would have been served before entering the program and maintaining a comparable mix of families by household size (S. 89, 2009).

The Moving to Work Charter Program Act was introduced to the 112th Congress. The Moving to Work Charter Program Act of 2011 seeks to expand the Moving to Work Demonstration program. For instance, under the current bill, 80 public housing authorities would be authorized to participate in the Moving to Work program by the end of fiscal year 2012, 160 public housing authorities would be authorized to participate in the program by 2013 and 250 public housing authorities would be authorized to participate in the program by 2014. The Moving to Work Charter Program Act of 2011 would also establish permanent Moving to Work activities in each authorized public housing authority, considering that the original program in 1996 was only a temporary demonstration (S. 89, 2009).

The Moving to Work program encourages public housing participants to become more self-sufficient. This act proposes that public housing authorities facilitate participants' transition to work by providing services, such as vocational training, job search assistance, job retention training, GED and ESL classes, and case management. Some public housing authorities will impose time limits, with the belief that participants will be more motivated to seek and keep jobs if they know that they will eventually have to pay market rents (Abravanel et al., 2004). From the inception of the Moving to Work Demonstration program, HUD's vision for the program was to provide incentives for families with head of households who were either employed or participating in
employment/educational programs and to reduce federal housing cost for public housing agencies. To achieve this, participating PHAs are exempt from many of the rules and regulations set forth by the United States Housing Act of 1937 (HUD, 2011b).

This act aims to cut costs and increase funding. Moving to Work sites receive the same amount of federal funding they would have received had they not participated in the program. Participating housing authorities have the option of combining public housing operating grants, capital (modernization) grants and housing choice tenant-based assistance funds (formerly Section 8 vouchers) into one single fund. By combining these funds into one flexible pool, participating public housing authorities will have the ability to generate savings. Public housing agencies that do not participate in the Moving to Work program have to use each subsidy (operating grants, capital grants and housing choice voucher funds) for specific housing activities designated by HUD. Participating Moving to Work sites are allowed to determine the amount they want to designate for each housing initiative (National Housing Law, 1999).

Through the Moving to Work program, participating housing authorities can also secure funding by increasing participants’ rent. Currently, most public housing authorities require participants to pay between 30%-40% of their household income; participating housing authorities have the ability to raise the rent-to-income ratio. In addition to this, because the Moving to Work program supports employment activities, more participants have the opportunity to become gainfully employed. This factor increases the amount of rent they pay to public housing authorities. Public housing authorities have the option of requiring participants to pay a percentage of Fair Market Rent. For example, the Keene Housing Authority implemented flat rent based on market
rate levels. This particular housing authority requires its participants to pay forty-five percent of the Fair Market Rent in their third and fourth years participating in the program, and sixty-five percent of the Fair Market rent the following years (National Housing Law, 1999).

Summarily, it becomes evident through the examination of public housing policies over the last seven decades that public housing has undergone a considerable amount of transformations. The physical sights have been modified in conjunction with the structure of housing authorizes and the system of rules and regulations. To improve the quality of life for low-income families that live in public housing communities and receive rental assistance, the federal government continues to revise policies that shape public housing. As a result, local PHAs continuously realign their objectives to meet federal mandates (Abravanel et al, 2004).

Organizational Change Overview

Organizational change can be employed in both the private and the public sector; however, historically, organization development and change literature has centered on industrial and manufacturing organizations. Distinctive differences exist between the public and private sector. As a result, there is some uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of organizational change in public organizations. This ambiguity is due in part to the debate on whether or not the private sector differs in areas that would limit the effectiveness of organization development in the public sector. While differences are apparent, review of public organizations have shown that they are adopting characteristics of private organizations. For example, many public organizations are
utilizing network and team-based systems, customer-orientated approaches and decentralized frameworks. Moreover, research suggests that the two sectors overlap and boundaries between the public sector and private sector are becoming blurry. Many organizations are becoming hybrid, displaying elements of both sectors. Consequently, organizational change can be executed in the private sector as well as the public sector (Robertson & Seneviratne, 1995).

Although the application of organizational change strategies can extend into the public sector, evidence shows that the application of organizational change strategies in the public sector must be refined. Organizational change strategies should be modified to account for the unique and complex challenges private sector organizations face during organizational change (Cummings and Worley, 2008). French, Bell, and Zawacki (1989) (as cited in Dubrow, Wocher & Austin, 2001) identify several factors that influence implementation of organization development in public sector human service organizations. For instance, public sector organizations lack tangible and quantifiable outputs, which can lead to subjective measurement. The public sector also limits administration’s capacity to make long-term resolutions to issues due to the checks and balances system put in place. Along with this, subordinates authority is restricted, which minimizes the ability to practice administrative discretion.

Public sector organizations are challenged with improving government accountability, quality and effectiveness. While attempting to meet these demands, public sector organizations operate in an intricate environment with competing political, social and economic forces. Within the public sector, the application of organization development is impacted by the distinct values and structures, the unlimited access to
authoritative decision makers, diversity of stakeholders and the nature of intergovernmental relationships (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

Human service organizations face growing pressure from policy makers, funders, constituents and other key stakeholders to improve service quality and cost effectiveness as well as management systems that support them. Specifically, within public sector human service organizations, administrators encounter intense probing from elected officials, complex systems and improper standards (Packard, Patti, Daly, & Tucker-Tatlow, 2012). These organizations are constantly changing due to external influences from environmental, social and political forces. Organizational change within public sector human service organizations becomes a vital strategy for improving client outcomes and increasing agency revenues (Galambos, Dulmus, & Wodarski, 2005).

A vast majority of the organizational change literature indicates that organizations experience shifts in structure and operations in order to improve organizational performance, however; some scholars contend that organizational change is a result of an organization’s desire to achieve greater legitimacy. Essentially, organizations modify their internal behavior and process in order to comply with external pressures from key stakeholders (Ashworth, Boyne, & Delbridge, 2007).

Organizations undergo organizational change to conform and achieve legitimacy. The pressures that organizations encounter when attempting to strengthen legitimacy include, coercive forces, mimetic forces and normative forces. Coercive forces are political and societal pressures exerted on organizations by government or regulatory organizations to adopt systems that they endorse. Mimetic forces, which is the tendency for organizations to model themselves on other organizations stem from coercive forces.
Coercive forces lead to ambiguous goals and an uncertain organizational environment, which creates mimetic behavior. Normative behaviors are derived from professionalization. Normative forces describe the expectations set forth by professional standards and the techniques that are needed to receive legitimacy from appropriate professional associations. The norms are transferred through training and educating professionals as well as providing professional certifications by accrediting bodies (Ashworth, Boyne, & Delbridge, 2007).

Organizational change within public sector human service organizations is common. Many scholars refer to organizational change within the public sector as government reform. Government reform emerged in the United States during the Herbert Hoover commission. During the Hoover Administration, focus was shifted to the restructuring of process in order to improve government programs. The shift to centering in on government structure to enhance public organizations has guided the government reform movement for most of the twentieth century (Kettl, 2005).

A new era of government reform became the prominent theme in the 1980's during the Reagan Administration. In response to the decline in the economy and the consumer demand for quality production, public organizations fell in line with private organizations by adopting comprehensive concepts to improve organizational performance. This new approach included fundamental elements, such as, commitment to customer satisfaction; engagement in human capital development; continuous improvement to systems and processes; encouragement of employee involvement; creation of a shared vision; development of entrepreneurial strategies with government
agencies; establishment of organizational culture as the focal point of business, and empowerment of employees (Carnevale, 2003).

A continuous need for changes in public organizations' structure and management exist. Public human service organizations could benefit from implementing organizational change strategies (Robertson & Seneviratne, 1995). According to Kelman (2005), government organizations are often ineffective with meeting objectives such as reducing poverty, educating marginalized children, applying the latest technology to various systems, and maintaining customer satisfaction. As a result, organizational change becomes necessary if government agencies intend to improve performance.

Success and Failure of Organizational Change

Organizations must continuously undergo incremental and fundamental change. Organizational change is embedded in most private and public sector organizations; yet, evidence shows that 70% of change initiatives fail. Scholars have pointed to numerous reasons explaining the high failure rate, which include inadequate planning and execution of the change process and lack of commitment from individuals who administer the change process (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Some of the most common types of change efforts that are evaluated include the following: strategy deployment, restructuring and downsizing, technology change, total quality management (TQM), mergers and acquisitions, re-engineering and process design, software development and installation, business expansion and culture change. Accordingly, approximately 40% of organizational change efforts involve at least two change interventions (Smith, 2002).
Several researchers offer best practice approaches to business transformations. For instance, Kanter, Stein, and Jick (1992) identified ten commandments for implementing and managing change, which include the following: (1) managers should analyze the organization and determine how the proposed changes will affect the organization; (2) a vision should that reflects the organization’s values should be created; (3) the organization should move toward the future vision by abandoning previous structures and processes that did not work; (4) leaders should create a sense of urgency to evoke action (5) the organization should support the leader to guide, drive and inspire change; (6) the change should be supported by all of the organization’s stakeholders; (7) an implementation plan should be created; (8) structures that facilitate change should be established; (9) leaders should communicate honestly to employees and encourage employee involvement; and (10) leaders should reinforce and institutionalize the change.

Pugh (1993) proposes four principles of change. These principles include: (1) organizations are organisms not machines; therefore, change must be approached cautiously; (2) organizations are rational, occupational and political systems, therefore; consideration must be given to how the change affects people’s jobs, status, power and prestige; (3) all members of an organization operate together within the rational, occupational and political systems; therefore, all types of justifications for change must be taken seriously; and (4) successful, confident and motivated people are more likely to accept change; therefore, relevant methods should be used for employees who are more likely to accept change.

Kotter (1996) presented eight steps for implementing successful change. These steps include: (1) create urgency; (2) create a power coalition; (3) create a vision for
change; (4) communicate the vision; (5) remove obstacles; (6) create short-term wins; (7) build on the change, and (8) anchor the changes in the organization's culture.

Schaeffer (1987) provided the following as critical steps to managing change in human service organizations. The steps identified were: (1) clarify the change that is necessary; (2) present the new or changed system; (3) identify required resources; (4) detail the resource development activities; (5) plan the activities; (6) allocate financial resources for implementation; and (8) manage the implementation of the project.

Galambos, Dulmus, and Wodarski (2005) also examined organizational change in human service agencies and developed the following principles to increase success in organizational change. These steps involved: (1) creating a system of continuous discussion and feedback; (2) preparing the organization for change; (3) ensuring that education and training tools regarding new technologies and policy changes are in place; (4) developing a rewards systems to encourage employee participation; and (5) using the organizational change effort as a tool to promote continuous change within the agency.

Fernandez and Rainey (2006) draw upon previous studies to develop propositions that address the challenges of change in the public sector. These researchers concluded that the public sector organizations should employ the following strategies to tackle problems that may occur when undergoing organizational change: (1) ensure the need for change; (2) provide a plan for carrying out the change initiative; (3) build external support for change and overcome resistance; (4) ensure support and commitment from top-management; (5) build external support; (6) provide resources; (7) institutionalize change; and (8) pursue comprehensive change.
No one approach exists that guarantees successful change each time it is implemented. The congruity between the organization as a whole, the content of change process and the approach the organization selects must be taken into account when examining the outcomes of organizational change (Burnes, 2009). Burnes and Jackson (2011) argue that successful organizational change is associated with the value alignment of the individuals directly involved in the intervention, the objective of the intervention and the method of change. Organizational values and goals must correspond and should be shared by the majority of the employees of the organization in order for successful organizational change to be achieved.

The success of organizational change can be measured in several ways. Smith (2002) categorizes success measures into seven groups. These include rating measures, project measures, operations measures, management measures, customer measures, enterprise measures and owner measures. Rating measures are participants’ perceptions on the success of the change effort. Project measures focus on how well the change effort was managed. Operations measures determine the effect the change had on the internal organization processes. Management measures identify the impact the change has on the management team’s behavior. Customer measures examine consumers’ opinion and behavior as a result of the change effort. Enterprise measures provide indicators of the organization’s financial and competitive health. Lastly, owner measures explain the impact of shareholder value.

There are some distinct indicators to determine the success and failure of organization development interventions. A clear sign of organization development success is that project goals and objectives are met or exceeded. Additional criteria that
are beneficial in gauging organization development success include support in the form of funding and time from the organization's administration, employee commitment and buy-in and positive cost-benefit analyses. On the other hand, if an organization development project is cancelled prior to completion due to lack of time, funding or organizational resistance, this is an indication that the intervention has failed (Kahnweiler, 2010).

**Employee Involvement**

Employees play a pivotal role in organizational change. Essentially, at the core of any organizational change effort is the change that occurs in each individual employee’s behavior. In fact, organizations can only act and transform through their members and lasting change can only take place when employees modify their work-related behaviors appropriately. Although, the concept of employee involvement in organization development and change is widely researched, many change initiatives fail because organizational leaders minimize the significant role of employees (Choi & Ruona, 2011).

Employees have unique outlooks on the actual change that is occurring because they are usually on the front line carrying out those changes. They are the best sources for determining whether or not changes are being adopted properly. Therefore, it is important for employees to make assessments regarding the success or failure of change initiatives. Employee perceptions of the anticipated results can predict their attitudes and behaviors toward change initiatives and the methods used to implement the change. Employee cooperation is also essential to the success of most organizational change initiatives (Lewis, 2006).
Employee involvement leads to positive outcomes for organizations. For instance, employee participation in change produces healthy relationships and healthy organizations. Participation can enhance employee support for change, foster better decision-making, decrease worker burnout and promote interpersonal trust. Employee participation in organizational change can also lead to decreased resistance to change (Bruhn et al., 2001).

Resistance to change can be described as a conflict between management and front line employees. It is the reactive response that employees actively oppose initiatives enforced by their superiors (Jermier, Knights, & Nord, 1994). Employees resist change due to reasons such as loss of status, fear of change and the unknown, lack of trust, discomfort with adapting to changes, and perceived disadvantages to work alterations. A key indicator of successful organizational change is effective communication between implementers of change initiatives and the employees that experience those changes. Furthermore, the downward distribution of information from top managers to employees reduces anxiety and increases willingness to participate in change initiatives (Lewis, 2006).

Piderit (2000) proposes that employees respond to organizational change along three dimensions, which include emotional, cognitive and intentional. Resistance to change is represented by negative reactions to change throughout each dimension. Along the cognitive dimension, resistance can be manifested by an employee’s belief that the proposed changes could destroy the organization. Along the emotional dimension, resistance can be displayed by an employee’s negative feelings about the change such as fear or anger. Along the intentional dimension, employee resistance can be demonstrated
by a negative desire to oppose any changes. An employee’s status can also impact their attitudes and behavior towards organizational change. Senior level staff view change more positively than lower level staff. Senior level staff embrace change more frequently than lower level staff because senior staff members displaying higher levels of perceived control over the changes. Senior staff also adjusts better to change because a higher level of organizational commitment is present among upper lever staff (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2004).

The interaction between leaders and employees is important to organizational change. Senior staff facilitate the initiation and sustainment of change initiatives by monitoring progress towards change, eliminating barriers that threaten successful implementation of organizational change and communicating the relationship between change efforts and the overall organizational mission to employees (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). Studies support the notion that interpersonal communication, such as face-to-face communication, regarding the implementation of change should be between the direct supervisor and employee. Specifically, utilizing interpersonal channels are beneficial when addressing the needs of employees and controlling the risks and complexities involved in organizational change. Utilizing mediated channels, such as mass media or technology is beneficial when providing general information about change (Lewis, 2006).

Self, Armenakis, and Schraeder (2007) found that the leader-member exchange, the relationship between an immediate supervisor and their employees, can help employees interpret change communication, but justification for change initiatives and how they connect with the organization’s mission must come from the actual change
initiators. Change agents have a stronger influence than immediate supervisors over employees’ reactions to change efforts especially when organizational change may pose massive job loss. In these circumstances, the threat of job loss outweighs the influence of an immediate supervisor.

The leader-member exchange relationship can be associated with employee performance, job satisfaction organizational commitment and turnover. In addition, high quality leader-member exchange relationships can lead to a positive climate of change and successful organizational change (van Dam, Oreg, & Schyns, 2007). Casey Family Services, which is the branch of the Annie E. Casey Foundation that provides multi-services in the area of child welfare, developed several strategies for implementing organizational change in human service organizations. The importance of middle managers and supervisors facilitating change was highlighted. Supervisors should have the ability to convey the rationale and goals of organizational change along with manage employee resistance to change (Kerman, Freundlich, Lee, & Brenner, 2012).

Components of Organizational Change

In a review of major themes in organizational change literature, Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) found that change context, change process, and change criterion are core dimensions of organizational change. Contextual factors are primarily focused on conditions present in the organization’s external and internal environments; process factors are concerned with actions undertaken during the creation of an intended change, and criterion factors deal with outcomes usually examined in organizational change.
Resistance to change is reduced when employee readiness for change is present. The central circumstances under which change occurs and the process of how change is managed determine the level of readiness for change. The following is a review of the role that the readiness for change (i.e., change criterion), the climate of change (i.e., change context), and the process of change (i.e., change process) has on the implementation of organizational change (Bourkenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).

**Readiness for Change**

Organizational commitment focuses on employees' alignment to an organization's values and dedication to a mission, whereas commitment to change reflects employees' behavioral intention to implement successful organizational change. Employees that have high levels of commitment to change as well as a strong commitment to their organization tend to have a positive response to organizational change (Fedor, Caldwell, & Herold, 2006). Cook and Wall (1980) measure organizational commitment across three components. These elements include, identification, involvement and loyalty. Identification focuses on the pride an employee has for an organization; involvement entails an employee's willingness to devote additional time and effort to an organization, and loyalty examines an employee's attachment and sense of belongingness to an organization.

Typically, employees with a strong commitment to their organization accept the organization's goals, demonstrate willingness to work diligently on behalf of the organization and possess a strong desire to maintain employment with the organization.
Organizational readiness, which influences organizational commitment, reflects an organization’s previous involvement with and application of change initiatives. Organizational readiness has been shown to be a strong predictor of organizational commitment (Ingersoll et al., 2000). Employees that are committed to change and identify with their organization are prone to display high levels of change readiness and acceptance. Moreover, individuals with a strong sense of organizational commitment are less likely to experience change related stress, job dissatisfaction and work-related irritation (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011).

Readiness for change pertains to the degree to which an individual believes change is needed and whether they have the capacity to change. In the context of organizational change, readiness for change includes an employee’s perceptions of the organization’s potential to implement successful change, the extent to which change is needed in the organization and the advantages the change will bring to both the organization and employees. Moreover, research shows that trust in leaders and peers, participation at work, organizational commitment and job satisfaction increases individual readiness for change (Choi, 2011).

Cunningham et al. (2002) identify self-efficacy as an individual contributor to readiness for organizational change. The opportunity for employees to engage in active jobs was also identified as a workplace contributor that influences readiness for organizational change. Self-efficacy, which is the confidence one has in their ability to manage change, promotes readiness for change. Employees that exhibit self-confidence are prone to support and be actively engaged in organizational change. Accordingly, positions that provide skills and opportunities to employees that help them manage
change increases work-related self-efficacy. Active jobs, which can be characterized as psychologically demanding positions, give employees the freedom to make key decisions. As a result, employees in active jobs are better prepared to participate in organizational change.

Readiness for change entails how employees feel about the change (i.e., emotional reaction), what they think about the change (i.e., cognitive reaction), and what they intend to do in response to the change (i.e., intentional reaction). Affective reactions are both positive and negative; these responses range from change-related satisfaction to psychological distress. Cognitive reactions that change recipients may report include support of the business strategy, openness to change and perceived fairness. Moreover, behavioral reactions exhibited by change recipients include withdrawal, opposition or active involvement (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011).

Change readiness is the antecedent for either resistance or support for a change initiative. Creating readiness for organizational change may reduce the risk of resistance to change and in turn, increase the likelihood for effective change efforts. To create readiness for change, change agents utilize enterprising strategies that influence employees' beliefs, attitudes and behaviors regarding the proposed changes (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993). Studies show that numerous variables correlate with readiness for change. These constructs include: individual contribution to the change effort, active-passive jobs, self-efficacy, job demands, decision latitude, job satisfaction, job knowledge and skills, social relations in the workplace, organizational culture and management-leadership relationships (Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005).
Bouckenooghe, Devos, and Van Den Broeck (2009) point out that although several factors shape employees' readiness for change, the climate of change and the process of change are the most significant components that impact employee readiness for change. Readiness for change is a multifaceted concept that reflects the beliefs, feelings and intentions employees possess regarding their perceptions of an organization's capacity to implement successful organizational change. Choi and Ruona (2011) created a conceptual model, which demonstrates the relationship between employee readiness for change, organizational culture (climate of change), and change strategies (process of change). Methods used for change implementation that utilize the normative reeducative change strategy (i.e., process of change) and an organization's continuous effort to strengthen organizational health and cultivate a learning culture (i.e., climate of change) foster employees' readiness for organizational change.

Climate of Change

The climate and culture of organizations address the ways in which employees understand their environment. Organizational culture deals with the way work are conducted in an organization and organizational climate represents the way people view the characteristics of their environment (Allen, 2003). Organizational culture reflects the values and beliefs of organizational members. Additionally, employees' values and beliefs affect employee's interpretations of organization policies, practices and procedures. Therefore, organizational change can only occur once there are changes in the attitudes of the people that make up the organization (Schneider, Brief, & Guzzo, 1996).
Although organizational climate and culture are interrelated, the two concepts are distinct. Organizational culture reflects the deep-seated customs and principles within an organization; whereas, organizational climate encompasses the rules and regulations, practices and procedures and communication models within an organization. Up to 80% of organizational climate is influenced by deeply rooted organizational culture (Sopow, 2006). According to Schein (1990), organizational culture consists of observable artifacts, values and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts include the visible language, behaviors and material symbols such as the dress code, the way in which employees speak to one another, company records and annual reports, products and mission statements. Values are the shared beliefs and norms that guide the attitudes and behaviors of employees, whereas; assumptions are the deep-seated beliefs about human nature and the organizational environment.

Cameron and Quinn (1999) presented four types of organizational culture. The clan culture operates as an extended family where leaders are viewed as parental figures. This type of culture, which is mostly seen in community-based agencies, places emphasis on personal bonds, morale and teamwork. The adhocracy culture, which can be found in industries such as aerospace, software development, consulting and filmmaking, offers an entrepreneurial environment to organization members. Leaders are risk takers committed to innovation. The market culture is usually in results-oriented organizations. The long-term focus is on reaching measurable goals and targets. Lastly, the hierarchy culture is a structured work environment in which employees are governed by procedures.
Organizational culture is the most important factor that influences employees’ view and approach to change because in order to understand the components of change, the context in which change occurs must be understood first. Oftentimes, the deeply embedded assumptions are at the center of organizational culture. These assumptions can shape how decisions are made, how employees respond to clients and how employees interact with one another (Proehl, 2001).

Particularly in human service organizations, organizational culture usually determines how employees will perceive and assist their clients. Additionally, organizational culture impacts an organization’s effectiveness. The culture of an organization shapes the procedures and outcomes of service delivery to clients (Galambos, Dulmus, & Wodarski, 2005).

Within human services organizations, the visible artifacts are transformed, while the underlying assumptions are not addressed. However, during organizational change, to cultivate employee readiness for change, the underlying assumptions that are entrenched in an organization must be included in the change process (Proehl, 2001). Organizational climate can impact employees’ perception of organizational change. Accordingly, employees who believe they work in a positive work environment are more likely to have a favorable adjustment to organizational change. Employees that have poor adjustment to organizational change are more likely to experience uncertainty frustration, alienation and anxiety as it relates to job security, work relationships and work tasks (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2005).

Employees’ perceptions of organizational change climate are important in the change process because organizational climate shapes employees’ actions. An
organization is comprised of multiple climates. Although numerous climates exist in an organization, there are five critical features that an organization should possess to foster a change-conducive climate. These preconditions include an overall willingness of employees to shift away from the status quo, a high level of trust among employees, the freedom for employees to make key decisions about their work, a system of open communication, and opportunities for professional development for employees (Tierny, 1999).

Oreg, Vakola, and Armenakis (2011) found that organizational culture and climate were factors that determined employees' reaction to organizational change. For instance, positive employee perceptions on work environments correlate to employee readiness for change, openness to change, and adjustment to change. Along with this, the presence of an information-sharing environment was linked to employees' readiness for change. The psychological climate, which is a set of universal perceptions held by organizational members regarding the organization's internal environment, is an important factor that influences readiness for change. The key climate dimensions that impact employees' readiness for change include the level of employee participation in decision making, the level of change communication between management and employees, the amount of trust employees have in top management and the history of organizational change within the organization (Bouckenooghe & Devos, 2008).

**Process of Change**

Change process pertains to the adoption and implementation of change. Accordingly, the process of change is comprised of how change is formulated, initiated,
accomplished and sustained (Burke, 2008). Organizational change processes include activities that motivate employees, create a vision, develop political support, manage the transformation and sustain the momentum. The key aspects of organizational change process are the incorporation of group and individual change processes. Thus, substantial organizational change can only occur if specific groups and individual change within the organization. It is essential for teams and individuals to accept new work routines, models, frameworks and values to guide their actions (Whelan-Berry, Gordon, & Hinings, 2003).

Whelan-Berry and Somerville (2010) summarized the steps that are frequently included in the organizational change process. The first common step in the organizational change process is establishing a clear compelling vision that describes how specific features and outcomes of the organization will look after the change is implemented. Most change processes also include the integration of change throughout the organization. The change vision moves to group and individual levels. Individuals and groups will then determine how specific departments, teams or locations of the organization will function as a result of the change initiative. The execution of the change vision ultimately occurs at the individual employee level.

Prochaska, DiClemente, and Norcross (as cited in Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010) developed a spiral model of individual stages of change that are used in change management literature. The five stages in the individual change process include, precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance. Precontemplation occurs when an individual fails to acknowledge that problems exist and does not engage in any change process activities. Contemplation occurs when the individual raises
awareness of the presenting issues. Preparation occurs when the individual is ready to change their behavior and makes plans to change. The action stage follows shortly after the preparation stage and is characterized by an increase in coping with behavioral change. The individual then begins to engage in change activities. In the final stage, maintenance, actions to reinforce the change are taken in combination with establishing the new behavioral change to the individual’s norms.

Process includes the specific methods utilized to implement change and it contains the phases of organizational change progression. Several strategies exist that help execute core steps before, during and after the implementation of change. These tactics include persuasive communication through executive briefings and newsletters and active participation through activities that capitalize on self-discovery (Self, Armenakis, & Schraeder, 2007). Employee participation in change efforts can lead to favorable outcomes for organizations. Employee participation in decision making related to organizational change is positively correlated to employee openness and commitment to change. In addition, information sharing about change initiatives and the quality of the information that is shared impacts employees’ commitment and willingness to change (Choi, 2011).

Providing information to employees that keeps them aware of anticipated changes reduces uncertainty and apprehensiveness. If information is shared with them on a continuous basis, employees are more aware of specific changes that will occur, the impact of the change and new work roles as a result of the change. Contrarily, poor quality of change communication can result in increased skepticism and resistance to change (van Dam, Oreg, & Schyns, 2007). Communication is a crucial part of the
change process that helps employees prepare and develop support for organizational change. When formulating a communication plan, change leaders should take into consideration various types of employees that will fit into the change process. The employees that will help to achieve effective communication include the innovators who will drive change in the organization, the new arrivals who will try new concepts, the early majority who accept change quicker than the majority of employees and the late majority who accept change when the majority of employees accept change (Petrescu, 2011).

A variety of techniques can be utilized within human service organizations to communicate change initiatives. One example is knowledge diffusion. This approach emphasizes the distribution of information within human service organizations and refers to the process by which new concepts are communicated and adopted. The personal compact technique can also be used within human service organizations. Personal compacts, which are agreements between employees and organizations as it relates to mutual responsibilities, can reduce issues with employee/management communication. These types of agreements help employees gain a clear understanding of their job requirements and create mutual expectations and commitments between employees and management.

Lastly, a change booklet is a straightforward approach to communicating change efforts. A change booklet presents a brief synopsis of changes and the expected impact the changes will have on employees and clients. Basic facts are outlined for supervisors who will in turn present the information to their staff. Once front line employees receives the information from their supervisors, they are encouraged to provide feedback and
recommendations that will be submitted to upper management for consideration (Galambos et al., 2005).

Packard, Patti, Daly, and Tucker-Tatlow (2012) examined organizational change tactics that are used by change agents and are instrumental in the success of organizational change in public human service organizations. For instance, key approaches by leaders to communicate the need for change include highlighting the need for improved services to clients, sharing the guiding principles of the change and reporting regularly the benefits, costs and progress of the change. Organizational leaders should also provide a plan, in which mid-level and lower-level employees are involved in developing. To ensure that internal support is built and resistance is minimized, key stakeholders should be involved in the planning and implementation phases through work groups and task forces. In addition, continuous communication by leaders that express concern for employees and an understanding of the increased job responsibilities should be conveyed through staff meetings, newsletters and other similar forums.

Adequate resources must be provided that support the change process. Aspects of support include managing change gradually to prevent overloading staff with excessive duties, and providing training on change management and implementation. To ensure top management support and commitment, executives should be willing to invest personal energy and professional capital in achieving the change. Trust should also be built within departments and among executive team members. To increase external support, change goals should be aligned with the goals of political overseers and community constituents.

After organizational change is implemented, changes should be institutionalized. The institutionalization of change can occur by restructuring organization charts, policies
and procedures, and monitoring implementation through action plans and review meetings. Furthermore, to pursue extensive change, the interconnectedness across all organizational subsystems should be addressed during the design and planning stages of change (Packard, Patti, Daly, & Tucker-Tatlow, 2012).

Three types of change strategies exist. These strategies include empirical-rational strategies, normative-reeducative strategies and power-coercive strategies. Empirical-rational strategies are based on the underlying assumptions that people are logical and will follow their rational self-interest; therefore, employees will accept changes that can be rationally justified and prove to be advantageous for them. Through this method, scientific investigation, research, and educational tools are used to foster change.

Normative-reeducative strategies are based on the assumptions that at the core of behavior are norms and change occurs by abandoning old norms and acquiring new norms. Normative-reeducative strategies involve employees’ strengthening problem-solving skills and management promoting overall growth in employees. The underlying assumption of power-coercive strategies is that change occurs when individuals who have more power require compliance from individuals with less power. Methods utilized under this strategy range from subtle manipulation to direct physical force (Choi & Ruona, 2011).

Although organizational change incorporates elements of each of these strategies, normative-reeducative strategies are the most effective in fostering readiness for change. Empirical-coercive strategies may be ineffective in the implementation of organizational change because new practices depend primarily on employees’ beliefs in the benefits of
the changes and not necessarily on the actual benefits. Normative-reeducative strategies may be more beneficial than empirical-coercive strategies because employees are able to examine and reshape their beliefs and values (Choi & Ruona, 2011).

To enhance change implementation, employees should have some level of commitment to the proposed change and have the ability to provide feedback regarding the change. However, under power-coercive strategies, employees are forced to comply with change efforts without considering their own values and beliefs. Alternatively, normative-reeducation strategies give employees an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and employees are given the choice to provide their viewpoint on the change (Choi & Ruona, 2011).

Measurement of Organizational Change Instruments

Several instruments that measure readiness of organizational change exist. As a result, three instruments were taken into consideration for this study. These instruments included the following: (1) Organizational Readiness for Change Assessment (ORCA); (2) The Texas Christian University Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC); and (3) Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes, and Readiness (OCQ-C,P,R).

Organizational Readiness for Change Assessment

The Organizational Readiness to Change Assessment (ORCA) was developed by researchers from the Veterans Affairs Ischemic Heart Disease Quality Enhancement Research Initiative. This 77-item survey was based on the Promoting Action on Research on Research Implementation in Health Services (PARIHS) framework, which guides the
implementation of evidence-based clinical practice. The PARIHS framework consist of three core elements: (1) the strength and nature of evidence as perceived by stakeholders; (2) the quality of the context in which the research is implemented; and (3) the processes utilized to facilitate implementation (Helfrich, Li, Sharp, & Sales, 2009).

The ORCA was designed to provide the baseline for the likelihood of successfully implementation of a specific evidence-based clinical practice and assess change over time. The survey has three scales, which include evidence, context and facilitation. Each scale contains various subscales. The subscales for evidence include: (1) research evidence; (2) practice experience; (3) patient needs; and (4) staff discord over evidence. The subscales for context include: (1) leadership culture; (2) staff culture; (3) opinion leader culture; (4) leadership practice; (5) evaluation/accountability; and (6) stack resources. The subscales for facilitation include: (1) leadership roles in planning; (2) project champion roles; (3) leadership roles in support; (4) implementation team roles; (5) assessment; (6) evaluation; (7) implementation plan; (8) communication; and (9) project resources (Helfrich et al., 2011).

Texas Christian University Organizational Readiness for Change

The Texas Christian Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC) instrument was initially developed to study the transference of technology in substance abuse treatment programs. The instrument examines changes in organizational readiness over time, test the effectiveness of strategies that focus on varying levels of change readiness, and identifies reasons why change initiatives fail. The ORC consists of 115 items measured
on a 5-point Likert scale. Rating scales range from agree to disagree (Lehman, Greener, & Simpson, 2002).

The ORC includes measures in four major areas (i.e., motivation to change, institutional resource of the program, personality attributes of the staff and organizational climate of the program). The content domains that encompass motivational readiness include: (1) program need for improvement; (2) training needs; and (3) pressure for change. The content domains included in institutional resources are: (1) offices; (2) staffing; (3) training resources; (4) computer access; and (5) E-communications. Staff attributes are assessed through the following areas: (1) professional growth; (2) staff efficacy; (3) coworker influence; and (4) staff adaptability. Organizational climate is measured on the following scales: (1) clarity of mission and goals; (2) staff cohesiveness; (3) staff autonomy; (4) openness of communication; (5) staff stress; and (6) openness to change (Lehman, Greener, & Simpson, 2002).

**Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes, and Readiness**

The Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes, and Readiness (OCQ-CPR) was selected in measuring employees' perceptions on readiness, climate and process of change. The OCQ-CPR was designed to be administered in both public and private organizations. This 39-item instrument measures the internal conditions of change (climate of change), the process of how change is addressed and the organization's level of readiness to implement successful change. The OCQ-CPR was selected due to its scope and relevance to the current study (Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).
Theoretical Framework

Theories of organizational change, which can be called "theories of changing" typically address the ways in which change is implemented in organizations. These frameworks address the actions that should occur to ensure successful organizational change (Cummings & Worley, 2008). The models that describe the activities that support the initiation and application of successful organizational change are important to understand because the driving force of change, the stages of change, and the outcomes of change can be revealed.

An array of theories exist that provide insight into organizational change. However, due to the nature of the current study, the theoretical framework for this study will be based on three organizational theories, which include systems theory, Lewin's change model, and structural contingency theory. These theories explore the dynamics of organizations, the factors that influence organizational change and the approaches to organizational change (Kezar, 2001).

Systems Theory

The systems theory is one of the foundations of organization development and is one of the most influential conceptual tools for understanding the dynamics of organizational change and development. The systems approach seeks first to identify individual parts, then to understand the nature of their collective connection (French & Bell, 1999). Essentially, the systems theory is a collection of ideas and relationships that describe the characteristics and behaviors of systems, such as, organizations, groups and people. A system is viewed as one whole composed of interconnected parts that function
together (Cummings & Worley, 2008). Because organizations continuously interact and receive feedback with the environment, they are considered to be an open system. The systems theory is a cyclical process that includes, input, throughputs, outputs and feedback (Burke, 2008).

Organizations exchange information and resources with their environment and are impacted greatly by their external environment. This interchange of resources and information occurs through an input-transformation-output method. Organizational systems are comprised of inputs, transformations or throughputs and outputs. Inputs are human resources and additional resources that, such as information, energy and materials, that enter into the system. Throughputs are mechanisms composed of social and technological components that convert inputs into outputs. Outputs are the products of what was altered by the system and was sent to the environment. A feedback loop connects output to input, in which information is transmitted regarding the performance results of the system. Feedback is an important piece in this process because it can be used to keep the system in a fixed state or it can be used to help the organization adjust to changing conditions (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

In order for a system to be completely effective, subsystems within the organization must be aligned. Namely, alignment involves the link between organizations and its environment, the link between inputs and transformations and the link between transformations outputs. Alignment represents the extent to which one system’s features support the effectiveness of another system. Therefore, systems perspective is important when considering organizational change because the change of one part will eventually affect all parts (Burke, 2008).
Structural Contingency Theory

The structural contingency theory asserts that in order for an organization to survive, it adapts to its environment. The premise for the contingency theory is that the structural components of an organization must be integrated in order for an organization to progress and remain relevant (Donaldson, 1995). A change in one segment must be followed by changes in other segments to maintain cohesion. The structural contingency theory maintains that organizational structure needs to be congruent with the environment in which the organization operates, the size of the organization and the corporate strategy of the organization (Donaldson, 2001).

Organizational change is a slow and reoccurring process that is needed to achieve equilibrium between contingency features such as technology, environment and size. Additional components include structural features such as bureaucratic, functional, divisional and matrix structures. The contingency approach posits that organizational structural components must be unified in order for the organization to survive. To maintain coherence within an organization, when one element changes within an organization all other elements must change (Demers, 2007).

The central paradigm of the structural contingency theory is constructed of three key elements. The first element is that there is a connection between contingency, which is any factor that weakens the effect of an organizational characteristic on organizational performance, and organizational structure. Studies show that there are correlations between contingencies and organizational structures (Donaldson, 2001).

The size of an organization affects the bureaucratic structure of an organization. Large organizations tend to thrive on bureaucratic structures because the operations and
administration are routine. This leads to a decision-making process that is based on rules, which produces efficiency and cost effectiveness (Donaldson, 2001). The stability of the environment impacts the mechanistic structure of an organization. A stable environment supports the mechanistic structure because hierarchies are better equipped for routine operations. In organizations with a mechanistic structure, the knowledge and information needed to make decisions remains at the upper levels of the organization’s hierarchy. In contrast, organic structures are more suitable for unstable environments because the knowledge and information that is needed for innovation comes from lower levels of the organization’s hierarchy (Donaldson, 2001).

The corporate strategy of an organization can determine whether an organization will have a functional structure or a divisional structure. An undiversified strategy is compatible with a functional structure because the organization can focus on one product or service. Whereas, a diversified strategy is well suited for a divisional structure in which each division of the organization is responsible for one product or service (Donaldson, 2001).

The second component of the contingency theory is that contingency change generates structural change within an organization. For example, the rate of technological and market change in an organization’s environment impacts an organization’s structure. Increasing technological and market changes can move the organizational structure from hierarchal to participatory (Donaldson, 2001).

The third feature of the contingency theory is that the fit between contingency and organizational structure has a positive effect on organizational performance. The contingency theory explains the trivariate relationship between contingency, structure
and performance by demonstrating that the fit between structure and contingency produces high performance and conversely, that the misfit between structure and contingency produces low performance (Donaldson, 2001).

When an undiversified organization with a functional structure diversifies through strategic change and retains its initial structure, it moves from fit to misfit and experiences low performance. The organization will move from misfit to fit once it adopts a divisional structure (Donaldson, 2001).

**Lewin's Change Model**

Kurt Lewin (Cummings & Worley, 2008) developed the forced-field analysis technique that helps organizations identify obstacles to change. Two groups of forces that encompass a set of specific behaviors are present during change: a set of behaviors that try to maintain the status quo and a set of behaviors that encourage change. The status quo is maintained when both sets of behaviors are equal. On the other hand, change will occur only when the forces that drive change are increased and the forces holding on to the status quo are decreased (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

Lewin (as cited in Burke, 2008) developed a classic model of systems change that depicted this process of moving away from the status quo into a new state. A substantial amount of studies identify the Lewin's change management model as the foundation of organizational change research. This model targets group behavioral change and includes actions initiated over a period of time (Erwin, 2009).

The three-step model, which involves unfreezing the old behavior, moving to a new behavior and refreezing the new behavior at a new level, shows that change
progresses in a developmental process. Furthermore, the model demonstrates that change requires an organization to move from one equilibrium point to another point (French & Bell, 1999). In the first stage, unfreezing, employees are motivated to change because they feel dissatisfied with the status quo. During this stage, employees may gather evidence that will guide them in realizing that problems exist that need to be addressed. Once the data is gathered, some employees will determine that the only way to solve the dilemma is organizational change. There is also a tendency for some employees to hold on to the status quo and they may be drawn to the security of past experiences (Proehl, 2001).

Stage two, moving or changing, involves the organization creating a better method of operating. Employees realize during this phase, that change is possible. New goals, frameworks, processes and values that are achievable are introduced. Employees need support and training to develop the required skills to manage the new system and internalize the changes. This transitional phase can also be marked by uncertainty, hostility, anxiety and blame. Once employees become aware of the benefits of letting go of the status quo, these feelings will lessen (Proehl, 2001).

In stage three, refreezing, stabilization to the new equilibrium is desired. Employees integrate the changes into the system and actions are taken to ensure that the changes are maintained. In order for change to be implemented successfully, transformation in group norms, organizational culture and business policies must be transformed (Burnes, 2004).

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (as cited in French & Bell, 1999) modified Lewin’s model and expanded it into a seven-stage model which is often utilized by OD
consultants. The model includes the following: (1) developing a need for change; (2) creating a change relationship between the outside change agent (consultant) and the change recipient (organization); (3) diagnosing the organization’s problem; (4) analyzing and establishing alternate goals and plans of action; (5) converting plans into actual change efforts; (6) stabilizing change; and (7) terminating the client-consultant relationship.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions on the readiness, climate and process of organizational change. In this chapter, the research design will be presented, which will describe the type of research being conducted. The second section will describe the sample and population. The third section discusses the instrument used for the study as well as the procedure used for collecting the data. The fourth section identifies the methods that will be utilized to analyze the collected data. The final section explains the limitations of the study.

Research Design

An explanatory research design was used for this study. Explanatory research explains causal relationships and provides explanations regarding the sources of certain phenomena. This design will assist with interpreting the statistical relationship between employees’ perceptions of the readiness, climate and process of organizational change and employee status (Collis & Hussey, 2009).
Sample and Population

Respondents were selected using the convenience sampling method. The organization used to examine the research questions proposed in this study was determined by targeting public housing agencies that experienced recent organizational change. Public housing agencies were chosen because of the major transformation of public housing across the United States. A request for participation in the study was sent to the executive directors of PHAs in five cities. Only one executive director agreed to participate in the study on the condition that the agency remains anonymous.

The particular agency that was selected has been impacted by both HOPE VI program and the MTW demonstration. The agency is one of the largest PHAs in the United States, serves approximately 20,000 residents and employs over 1,000 professionals. The target population for this study was current employees (permanent staff, temporary staff, and consultants) of this PHA. These employees are direct and/or indirect participants of the planned organizational change taking place.

Instrumentation

The Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes, and Readiness (Appendix C), which was derived from the works of Bouckenooghe, Devos, and Van Den Broeck (2009), was the instrument selected for this study. Researchers tested content validity, construct validity, criterion-related validity and reliability of survey and found that the instrument meets the American Psychological Associations standards for scientific validity. The instrument measures the context or climate of change, process of change and readiness of change across 10 dimensions.
The reaction of change is comprised of employees’ emotional, cognitive and intentional readiness for change. The internal context of change includes the trust employees have in executive management, the extent to which politics plays in the organization and the level of solidarity within the organization. Lastly, the elements of the process of change include the quality of communication between employees and management, employee participation, the overall attitude that management has towards change, and the support employees receive from the department supervisors (Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).

The questionnaire consists of three sections and is comprised of forty-seven (47) questions. Section I asks respondents to share demographic information. Section II asks employees general questions about change, while Section III asks specific questions about the organizational change that their company is currently implementing. Section I consists of eight questions. The questions examine characteristics of the respondents, such as the number of years employed with the agency, the employee status, the employee type, age, gender, ethnicity, education level and degree type. Specific items in this section were used as independent variables.

Section II consists of twenty-two (21) questions. This section utilizes the Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes and Readiness (OCQ-C,P,R). This section measures employees’ general attitudes towards change as it relates to the climate of change (support by supervision, trust in leadership, cohesion, politicking) and cognitive readiness for change. Section III, which consists of eighteen (18) items, also employs the OCQ-C,P,R and measures employee’s attitudes about the specific change that is occurring in their company.
Specific factors that were examined include the process of change (involvement in the change process, ability of management to lead the change, and attitude of top management toward the change), and the readiness of change (intentional and emotional). The survey participants responded to the items on the OCQ-C,P,R using a four point continuum Likert Scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, and 4=Strongly Agree. The survey is designed to determine whether or not certain context factors and process factors that promote employees' readiness for organizational change are present within an organization.

The survey was developed by identifying the domains (i.e. climate of change, process of change and readiness for change), generating the items that assess the domains and calculating the extent to which each item measures the specified domain. Furthermore, factor analyses were conducted on the items to determine the correlation of each item across each domain. The climate of change consisted of eighteen survey items, process of change consisted of thirteen survey items and readiness for change consisted of eight survey items. Table 1 illustrates the survey items that comprise each domain (Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van Den Broeck, 2009).
Table 1

Classification of Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that most changes will have a negative effect on the clients we serve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for future improvement will not come to much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most change projects that are supposed to solve problems around here will not do much good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to devote myself to the process of change.</td>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to make a significant contribution to the change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put energy into the process of change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good feeling about the change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experience the change as a positive process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager does not seem very keen to help me find a solution if I have a problem.</td>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I experience any problems I can always turn to my manager for help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager can place herself or himself in my position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager encourages me to do things that I have never done before.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management team consistently implements policy in all departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management fulfills its promises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management team keeps all departments informed about its decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two way communication between executive management team and departments is very good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a strong rivalry between colleagues in my department.</td>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt whether all of my colleagues are sufficiently competent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department is very open.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes are always discussed with all people concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions concerning work are taken in consultation with the staff who are affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front line staff and office workers can raise topics for discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within our organization power games between departments play an important role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are sometimes taken advantage of in our organization.</td>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our organization favoritism is an important way to achieve something.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am regularly informed on how the change is going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between project leaders and staff members about the organization’s policy toward changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided on change is clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are sufficiently informed on the progress of change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s senior managers pay sufficient attention to the personal experiences that the changes could have for their staff members.</td>
<td>Process of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s executives speak up for us during the change process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s senior management coaches us very well about implementing change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s senior managers have trouble adapting their leadership styles to the changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s executives focus too much on current problems and too little on their possible remedies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our department’s executives are perfectly capable of fulfilling their new function.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management team has a positive vision of the future.</td>
<td>Process of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management team is actively involved with the changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management team supports the change process unconditionally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire was administered online through Qualtrics Online Survey Software. Via company electronic mail, employees were asked to complete the online survey. The link to the survey was included in the electronic mail. The researcher allowed a two-week response time. Potential participants were prompted to read the Informed Consent (Appendix A) and asked to continue to the survey if they agree with information disclosed. Participation in this study was both voluntary and anonymous.

Treatment of Data

Descriptive statistics, such as measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, and cross tabulation were used for statistical treatment of the data. Chi Square was the statistical test utilized in this study. Measures of central tendencies
describe where the values of the variables are centered. Frequency distribution shows how the research sample values are distributed by detailing the rate of occurrence for a particular value. Frequency distribution was used to summarize the data in the demographic section of the questionnaire (Abu-Bader, 2006).

The Chi-Square test is used to determine the statistically significant relationship between variables. To compute chi-square, cross-tabulation must be conducted (Royse, 2004). Cross-tabulations, or chi-square tables represent nominal values and are used to show the variables that are interrelated. Cross-tabulations were performed on the readiness for change, climate of change, process of change, and employee status (Abu-Bader, 2006).

Limitations of the Study

Limitations exist in the current study. The first limitation lies in the administration for the survey instrument. To test the reliability and validity of the instrument, Bouckenooghe, Devos, and Broeck (2009) tested the items in organizations before and during the implementation for change. The instrument was only administered during the implementation of change. Another limitation of the proposed study was the type of sampling being utilized. Convenience sampling has the potential not be representative of the entire population. The results from this study should not be generalized (Royse, 2004).

The low response rate presented an additional limitation to the study. Fricker and Schonlau (2002) concluded that respondents are more likely to choose to respond to surveys through mail if they are given the option to respond by mail or via the Internet.
Web-based surveys can also encounter technical glitches such as computer freezes or server crashes which can account for a low return rate.

Additionally, employee resistance to organizational change can give an explanation for the low response rate. Studies show that employees may develop negative attitudes towards organizational change. These attitudes can be manifested through behavioral responses, such as, verbal complaints, low work productivity and sabotage. Resistance to change may be present in the sample population; therefore, employees may have lacked the motivation to participate in the current study (van Dam, Oreg, & Schyns, 2007).
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the current study. These findings will be used to explain relationship between employee status and the perceptions of the readiness, climate and process of organizational change of public housing employees who participated in a business transformation. The findings will be shown through demographic data, research questions and hypotheses.

Demographic Data

A description of the study's respondents is provided in this section. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the following: the number of years respondents were employed with the agency, the respondents employee status, the respondents employee type, age, gender, ethnicity, and education level. The target population for this study consisted of current employees of a large metropolitan public housing authority. Sixty-six current employees were selected employing convenience sampling.
Table 2
Demographic Profile of Study Respondents (N=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and Under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and Older</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Not Completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/GED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The typical respondent was employed with the agency from one to five years and was in a permanent non-supervisory position. The typical respondent in this study was also an African American female between the age of forty-six and fifty-five that graduated from college. Respondents were also asked to identify the field area in which they held the highest degree. This was an open-ended question and the majority of respondents either held a degree in business management or human services. Other fields that were identified included the following: law, political science, accounting, education, public administration, history, sociology and architecture.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Three research questions and three null hypotheses were presented in this study. This section provides analysis of the results from the three null hypotheses that were tested. Readiness for change was defined as employees’ beliefs regarding an organization’s capacity to implement successful organizational change and the degree to which employees are committed to organizational change. Table 3 is a frequency
distribution of the sub-facets of readiness for change among 66 public housing authority employees. Table 3 indicates whether or not the respondents agreed or disagreed that components of employee readiness for organizational change was present within their organization.

Table 3
Readiness of change sub-facets among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 1: I think that most changes will have a negative effect on the clients we serve.</td>
<td>47 71.2</td>
<td>18 27.3</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 2: Plans for future improvement will not come to much.</td>
<td>32 48.5</td>
<td>33 50.0</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 3: Most change projects that are supposed to solve problems around here will not do much good.</td>
<td>28 42.4</td>
<td>35 53.0</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 4: I want to devote myself to the process of change.</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>54 81.8</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 5: I am willing to make a significant contribution to the change.</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>54 81.8</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 6: I am willing to put energy into the process of change.</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>55 83.3</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 7: I have a good feeling about the change.</td>
<td>29 43.9</td>
<td>25 37.9</td>
<td>12 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 8: I experience the change as a positive process.</td>
<td>21 31.8</td>
<td>32 48.5</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 is a frequency distribution for the computed variable of readiness for change. Table 4 indicated whether or not employees believed there was an overall presence of readiness for change within their organization. To calculate the true value of the computed variable, the values from the measurement scale (1 through 4) of the 8 sub-facets were calculated by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the number of figures. An example of the calculation can be presented by the following:
\[(2+4+3+1+1+2+3+4)/8=2.5.\]

Table 4

Readiness for change among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Climate of change was defined as employees’ universal perception regarding an organization’s internal environment that is undergoing organizational change. Table 5 is a frequency distribution of the sub-facets of how 66 public housing authority employees view their organization’s climate of change. Table 5 shows whether or not the respondents either agreed or disagreed that context factors that promote employees’ readiness for organizational change were present within their organization.
Table 5
Climate of change sub-facets among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 1: My manager does not seem very keen to help me find a solution if I have a problem.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 2: If I experience any problems I can always turn on my manager for help.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 3: My manager can place herself or himself in my position.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 4: My manager encourages me to do things that I have never done before.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 5: Executive management team consistently implements policy in all departments.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 6: Executive management fulfills its promises.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 7: Executive management team keeps all departments informed about its decisions.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 8: Two way communication between executive management team and departments is very good.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 9: There is a strong rivalry between colleagues in my department.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 10: I doubt whether all of my colleagues are sufficiently competent.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate 11: I have confidence in my colleagues.</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Missing #</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 12: My department is very open.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 13: Changes are always discussed with all people concerned.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 14: Decisions concerning work are taken in consultation with the staff who are affected.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 15: Front line staff and office workers can raise topics for discussion.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 16: Within our organization power games between departments play an important role.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 17: Staff members are sometimes taken advantage of in our organization.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 18: In our organization favoritism is an important way to achieve something.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 is a frequency distribution for the computed variable of climate of change. Table 6 indicated whether or not employees believed there was an overall presence of positive climate of change within their organization. To calculate the true value of the computed variable, the values from the measurement scale (1 through 4) of the 18 sub-facets were calculated by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the
number of figures. An example of the calculation can be presented by the following:

\[(2+4+3+1+1+2+3+4+4+2+3+1+3+4+1+1+3)/18=2.39\]

Table 6

Climate of change among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process of change was defined as the way in which change is developed, implemented and maintained. Table 7 is a frequency distribution of the sub-facets of how 66 public housing authority employees view their organization’s process of change. Table 7 shows whether or not the respondents either agreed or disagreed that process factors that promote employees’ readiness for organizational change were present within their organization.
Table 7

Process of change sub-facets among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process 1: I am regularly informed on how the change is going.</td>
<td>37 56.1</td>
<td>18 27.3</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 2: There is good communication between project leaders and staff members about the organization’s policy toward changes.</td>
<td>36 54.5</td>
<td>19 28.8</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 3: Information provided on change is clear.</td>
<td>39 59.1</td>
<td>16 24.2</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 4: We are sufficiently informed on the progress of change.</td>
<td>37 56.1</td>
<td>18 27.3</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 5: Our department’s senior managers pay sufficient attention to the personal experiences that the changes could have for their staff members.</td>
<td>27 40.9</td>
<td>26 39.4</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 6: Our department’s executives speak up for us during the change process.</td>
<td>28 42.4</td>
<td>26 39.4</td>
<td>12 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 7: Our department’s senior management coach us very well about implementing change.</td>
<td>31 47.0</td>
<td>23 34.8</td>
<td>12 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 8: Our department’s senior managers have trouble adapting their leadership styles to the changes.</td>
<td>24 36.4</td>
<td>29 43.9</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 9: Our department’s executives focus too much on current problems and too little on their possible remedies.</td>
<td>27 40.9</td>
<td>25 37.9</td>
<td>14 21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 10: Our department’s executives are perfectly capable of fulfilling their new function.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 11: Executive management team has a positive vision of the future.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 12: Executive management team is actively involved with the changes.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process 13: Executive management team supports the change process unconditionally.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 is a frequency distribution for the computed variable of process of change. Table 8 indicates whether or not employees believed there was an overall presence of process factors that facilitate change within their organization. To calculate the true value of the computed variable, the values from the measurement scale (1 through 4) of the 13 sub-facets were calculated by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the number of figures. An example of the calculation can be presented by the following: \((2+4+3+1+1+2+3+4+4+2+3+1+3)/13=2.54\)
Table 8

Process of change among public housing authority employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the readiness for organizational change within human service organizations?

Hypothesis 1: There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the readiness for organizational change within human service organizations.

Table 9 is a cross-tabulation of employees’ perceptions on the readiness for organizational change and employee status. It shows whether or not there is a statistically significant association between employee status and employees’ perceptions on the readiness for change.
Table 9

Public housing authority employees' perceptions on readiness for change by employee status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness for Change</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Status</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by Table 9, of the 66 respondents, 28.8% indicated that they held supervisory roles and disagreed that their organization exhibited a readiness for change. Approximately 20% agreed that their organization demonstrated a readiness for change and held non-supervisory positions. The majority (38.5%) held non-supervisory roles and indicated that they did not believe that their organization exhibited a readiness for change. When the chi square statistical test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted (p=.602). Table 9 shows that while there is a relationship between the variables, it is not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the climate of organizational change within human service organizations?
Hypothesis 2: There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees’ perception of the climate of organizational change within human service organizations.

Table 10 is a cross-tabulation of employees’ perceptions on the climate of organizational change and employee status. It shows the whether or not there is a statistically significant association between employee status and employees’ perceptions on the climate of change.

Table 10
Public housing authority employees’ perceptions on climate of change by employee status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate of Change</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=1  p=.650

As shown in Table 10, of the 66 respondents, 33.9% held supervisory roles and indicated that they disagreed that their organization possessed contextual factors. Approximately, 4% held non-supervisory positions and agreed that their organization
demonstrated a positive climate of change. The majority (59.7) held non-supervisory roles and indicated that they did not believe that their organization exhibited a positive climate of change. When the chi square statistical test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted ($p = .650$). Table 10 shows that while there is a relationship between the variables, it is not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees' perception of the process of organizational change within human service organizations?

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant relationship between employee status and employees' perceptions of the process of organizational change within human service organizations.

Table 11 is a cross-tabulation of employees’ perceptions on the process of organizational change and employee status. It shows the whether or not there is a statistically significant association between employee status and employees’ perceptions on the process of change.
Table 11

Public housing authority employees’ perceptions on process of change by employee status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process of Change</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As revealed in Table 11, of the 66 respondents, 36.7% held supervisory roles and indicated that they disagreed that their organization possessed positive process factors. Approximately 6% held non-supervisory positions and agreed that their organization demonstrated a positive process factors. The majority (53.1%) held non-supervisory roles and indicated that they did not believe that their organization exhibited a process conducive for organizational change. When the chi square statistical test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted (p=.969).

Table 11 shows that while there is a relationship between the variables, it is not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Summarily, public housing authority employees responded by indicating that the readiness for change, climate of change and process of change components were not present while organizational change
was being implemented. However, there was no statistically significant relationship between employees’ perceptions on readiness, climate and process of change, and employee status.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research study was designed to answer three questions regarding public housing authority employees' perceptions on the relationship between the readiness, climate and process of organizational change and employee status. The participants in this study underwent various elements of organizational change. The conclusion, recommendations, and implications of the research findings are presented in this chapter. Each research question is presented in order to summarize the findings.

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the readiness for organizational change within human service organizations?

To determine the relationship between employees’ perceptions of the readiness for organizational change and employee status within human service organizations, eight facets of readiness for change were analyzed. The eight dimensions were developed to determine whether or not there was a presence of readiness for change within the organization. Readiness for change was computed based on a calculation of these eight facets and to determine the true value of the variable, the values (1 through 4) from the measurement scale of the eight dimensions for readiness for change were computed by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the number of figures. To determine the
status of each employee, respondents were asked in the demographic section of the
survey whether they held a supervisory position or a non-supervisory position. Of the 66
public housing authority employees who responded to the survey, the minority (25.8%)
agreed that their organization displayed a readiness for change; whereas, the majority
(53%) disagreed that their organization displayed an overall readiness for change (see
Table 4). Additionally, the majority of respondents (63.6%) held non-supervisory
positions, and the minority of respondents (36.4%) held supervisory positions.

When public housing authority employees’ perceptions of readiness for change
were cross-tabulated with employee status, the minority (11.5%) of the survey
participants indicated that they were in supervisory roles and believed that their
organization demonstrated a readiness for organizational change. Contrarily, the majority
of the respondents (38.5%) held non-supervisory positions and believed that the
organization did not possess a readiness for organizational change. When the statistical
test for significance chi-square was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted (p=.602).
This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between the two
variables at the .05 level of probability (see Table 9).

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees’
perceptions of the climate of organizational change within human
service organizations?

To determine the relationship between employees’ perceptions of the climate of
organizational change and employee status within human service organizations, 18 facets
of climate of change were analyzed. The 18 components were developed to determine
whether or not there was a presence of a positive climate of change within the
organization. Climate of change was computed based on a calculation of these 18 facets and to determine the true value of the variable, the values (1 through 4) from the measurement scale of the 18 dimensions for climate of change were computed by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the number of figures. To determine the status of each employee, respondents were asked in the demographic section of the survey whether they held a supervisory position or a non-supervisory position. Of the 66 public housing authority employees who responded to the survey, the minority (6.1%) agreed that their organization had a positive climate of change; whereas, the majority (87.9%), disagreed that their organization had a positive climate of change (see Table 6). Additionally, the majority of the respondents (63.6%) held non-supervisory positions, and the minority of the respondents (36.4%) held supervisory positions.

When public housing authority employees’ perceptions of climate of change were cross-tabulated with employee status, the minority (1.6%) of the survey participants indicated that they were in supervisory roles and agreed that their organization had a positive climate of change. The majority of the respondents (59.7%) held non-supervisory positions and believed that the organization did not possess a positive climate of change. When the statistical test for significance chi-square was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted (p=0.650). This indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability (see Table 10).

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between employee status and employees’ perceptions of the process of organizational change within human service organizations?
To determine the relationship between employees’ perception of the process of organizational change and employee status within human service organizations, 13 facets of readiness for change were analyzed. The 13 dimensions were developed to determine whether or not the organization had a process in place that facilitated organizational change. Process of change was computed based on a calculation of these 13 factors and to determine the true value of the variable, the values (1 through 4) from the measurement scale of the 13 dimensions for process of change were computed by dividing the sum total of the set of figures by the number of figures. To determine the status of each employee, respondents were asked in the demographic section of the survey whether they held a supervisory position or a non-supervisory position. Of the 66 public housing authority employees who responded to the survey, the minority (7.6%) agreed that their organization had an established process that promoted organizational change; whereas, the majority (66.7%) disagreed that their organization had a process in place that facilitated organizational change (see Table 8). Additionally, the majority of respondents (63.6%) held non-supervisory positions, and the minority of respondents (36.4%) held supervisory positions.

When public housing authority employees’ perceptions of process of change were cross-tabulated with employee status, 4.1% of the survey participants indicated that they were in supervisory roles and agreed that their organization had a process in place that facilitated organizational change. Contrarily, the majority of the respondents (53.1%) held non-supervisory positions and believed that the organization did not have an established process that facilitated organizational change. When the statistical test for significance chi-square was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted (p=.969). This
indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability (see Table 11).

Recommendations

The findings in this study can be used to contribute to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to organizational change within human service organizations. Additional empirical research should be conducted to determine the correlation between the variables presented in this study. The following are four specific recommendations for future research.

Recommendation 1: More research should be conducted to determine the differences in adjustment and reaction to change among employees. Discovering how employees respond to organizational change based on employee rank can assist organization development consultants and human service organizations with developing various strategies for promoting employee involvement and acceptance in organizational change efforts.

Most organizational change initiatives fail due to employee responses, attitudes and behaviors towards change. Although group status is an important factor that can be evaluated to identify variations in employee cognition, affect and actions, most studies on organizational change fail to differentiate employee status and instead consider employees to be a single entity. Furthermore, group identity has a tendency to be more significant during organizational change (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2006).

Recommendation 2: Further research should be conducted to assist in determining what leads to successful change within human service organizations.
Organizational change within human service organizations is prevalent. It becomes important for human service administrators to understand that employee participation in organizational change can lead to healthy work relationships and healthy organizations as a whole. Moreover, public employees gain trust in the organization in which they work if they are included in the decision-making process and are given a sense of empowerment by leaders. Essentially, employee involvement and participation promotes better decisions and more effective organizational change (Bruhn, Zajac & Al-Kazemi, 2001).

Recommendation 3: Further research should focus on how human service organizations can promote readiness for organizational change.

Change readiness is critical for successful management of change. Change agents can strengthen change readiness through various approaches such as explaining the need and expected effects of change, encouraging collective support for change throughout the organization, and emphasizing active employee participation in the change efforts. However, research suggests that, due to the consistent flux of the environment that impacts organizations, change agents must go beyond enhancing change readiness. Alternatively, organizations must build change capacity, which is an organization’s ability to continuously change in response to internal and external shifts (Buono & Kerber, 2010).

Recommendation 4: Further research should be conducted on the development of strategies that create positive change climates and change processes.

Employees’ reactions to organizational change are key components of successful change efforts. A link exists between employees’ reactions to change, characteristics of
the change process, and organizational climate. For instance, employee acceptance of change can be improved when certain change process characteristics are present. The elements of change process that reduce resistance to change include, keeping employees informed about specific details regarding change initiatives, creating opportunities for employee participation and developing trust in management. Employees that work for an organization that has a change climate that fosters continuous employee development through job rotation, special project assignment, training and on-the-job learning tend to be less likely to experience resistance to change. Furthermore, employees who work in a setting where change climates promote development are likely to receive constant information regarding change efforts, have opportunities for participation in organizational change, and trust individuals in management positions (van Dam, Oreg, & Schyns, 2007).

Implications

The results of this study revealed implications that can impact human service organization administrators and the field of organization change and development. As human service organizations continue to be influenced by their internal and external environment, administrators must appropriately implement change initiatives.

This research on employees’ perspectives on organizational change fosters the notion that employee involvement is a pivotal component in organizational change. Human service organization administrators must abandon beliefs that new practices and policies should be incorporated into the fabric of their organizations without seeking
input from front line employees. Instead, administrators should recognize and understand the value employees can add to organizational change.

Lastly, this research will encourage organization change and development professionals to create strategies specific to human service organizations. These strategies should ensure that human service employees are willing to accept, implement and sustain organizational change.
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I am a doctoral student in at Whitney M. Young Jr. School of Social Work at Clark Atlanta University. I invite you to participate in a study that examines employee involvement in organizational change within a human service agency. The study is entitled *Planned Organizational Change Within the Human Service: The Relationship Between the Climate, Process and Readiness of Change*. The purpose of this study is to explore employee perspectives on participation in organizational change in the human service. The findings will be used in an analysis for my dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, I ask that you click the “Proceed to Survey” button at the bottom of the screen. Choose only one answer for each question. After selecting an answer, click the “Next” button at the bottom of the screen. After you have recorded all of your answers, press the “Submit” button.

The survey will take no more than twenty (20) minutes to complete. All responses will remain anonymous. There are no known risks or personal benefits to participants who agree to take part in this study. This study is intended to advance research in the fields of social work and organization development. Participation is voluntary.
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SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Organizational Change Questionnaire-Climate of Change, Processes, and Readiness
(Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van De Broeck, 2009)

Part I: Demographic

This section asks some basic questions about you. Place a mark (X) next to the appropriate item. Choose only one answer for each statement.

1. Number of years employed by your agency
   1) ___ 1-5
   2) ___ 6-10
   3) ___ 11-15
   4) ___ 16-20
   5) ___ 21+

2. Employee status
   1) ___ Supervisory
   2) ___ Nonsupervisory

3. Type of employee
   1) ___ Consultant
   2) ___ Permanent
   3) ___ Temporary

4. Age
   1) ___ 25 and under
   2) ___ 26-35
   3) ___ 36-45
   4) ___ 46-55
   5) ___ 56 and older
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5. Gender

1) ___ Male
2) ___ Female

6. Ethnicity:

1) ___ African American/Black
2) ___ Asian
3) ___ Caucasian/White
4) ___ Latino/Hispanic
5) ___ Native American
6) ___ Other

7. Highest Education Level

1) ___ High School not completed
2) ___ High School Graduate/GED
3) ___ Some college
4) ___ College graduate
5) ___ Postgraduate
6) ___ Other

8. In what field is your highest degree? ___________________________

Part II: General

This survey presents you with a set of questions about the enhancement of operational effectiveness through the realignment of organizational structure, business processes, personnel, and technology systems. Indicate your level of agreement regarding the following statements on change. For each question, please write the appropriate rating in the blank next to each statement.

1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Agree  4=Strongly Agree

_____ 9. My manager does not seem very keen to help me find a solution if I have a problem.

_____ 10. If I experience any problems, I can always turn on my manager for help.

_____ 11. My manager can place herself or himself in my position.

_____ 12. My manager encourages me to do things that I have never done before.
13. Executive management team consistently implements policy in all departments.

14. Executive management fulfills its promises.

15. Executive management team keeps all departments informed about its decisions.

16. Two-way communication between executive management team and departments is very good.

17. There is a strong rivalry between colleagues in my department.

18. I doubt whether all of my colleagues are sufficiently competent.

19. I have confidence in my colleagues.

20. My department is very open.

21. Changes are always discussed with all people concerned.

22. Decisions concerning work are taken in consultation with the staff who are affected.

23. Front line staff and office workers can raise topics for discussion.

24. Within our organization, power games between the departments play an important role.

25. Staff members are sometimes taken advantage of in our organization.

26. In our organization, favoritism is an important way to achieve something.

27. I think that most changes will have a negative effect on the clients we serve.

28. Plans for future improvement will not come to much.

29. Most change projects that are supposed to solve problems around here will not do much good.
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Part III: Specific

The final section of this questionnaire contains statements about specific change within (organization's name). For each question, please write the appropriate number in the blank next to each statement. As you rate each statement, please have the business transformation in mind. Focus primarily on those things that particularly have/will affect you and your immediate colleagues.

1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Agree  4=Strongly Agree

30. I am regularly informed on how the change is going.

31. There is good communication between project leaders and staff members about the organization’s policy toward changes.

32. Information provided on change is clear.

33. Staff members were consulted about the reasons for change.

34. Our department’s senior managers pay sufficient attention to the personal consequences that changes could have for their staff members.

35. Our department’s executives speak up for us during the change process.

36. Our department’s senior managers coach us very well about implementing change.

37. Our department’s senior managers have trouble adapting their leadership styles to the changes.

38. Our department’s executives focus too much on current problems and too little on their possible remedies.

39. Our department’s executives are perfectly capable of fulfilling their new function.

40. Executive management team has a positive vision of the future.

41. Executive management team is active involved with the changes.

42. Executive management team supports the change process unconditionally.

43. I want to devote myself to the process of change.
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44. I am willing to make a significant contribution to the change.

45. I am willing to put energy into the process of change.

46. I have a good feeling about the change project.

47. I experience the change as a positive process.
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SPSS PROGRAM ANALYSIS

TITLE 'PHA ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE'.
SUBTITLE 'Angela Bullock, LMSW'.

DATA LIST FIXED/
   ID       1-3
   YEARS    4
   STATUS   5
   TYPE     6
   AGEGRP   7
   GENDER   8
   ETHNCTY  9
   EDUCATE  10
   SOLUTION 11
   PROBLEMS 12
   POSITION 13
   ENCOURGE 14
   POLICY   15
   PROMISE  16
   INFORMED 17
   COMUNCTE 18
   RIVALRY  19
   DOUBT    20
   CONFIDEN 21
   OPEN     22
   CHANGES  23
   DECISION 24
   FRONT    25
   POWER    26
   ADVANTGE 27
   FAVORTSM 28
   NEGATIVE 29
   PLANS    30
   PROJECTS 31
   REGULAR  32
   GOOD     33
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CLEAR  34
SUFFIC 35
MANAGERS 36
SPEAK  37
COACH  38
TROUBLE 39
FOCUS  40
CAPABLE 41
VISION  42
ACTIVE  43
SUPPORTS 44
DEVOTE 45
MAKE 46
ENERGY 47
FEEL  48
PROCESS 49.

COMPUTE READ1 =
(NEGATIVE+PLANS+PROJECTS+DEVOTE+MAKE+ENERGY+FEEL+PROCESS)/8.

COMPUTE CLIMATE=
(SOLUTION+PROBLEMS+POSITION+ENCOURGE+POLICY+PROMISE+INFORMED+COMUNCTE+RIVALRY+DOUBT+CONFIDEN+OPEN+CHANGES+DECISION+FRONT+POWER+ADVANTGE+FAVORTSM)/18.

COMPUTE PROCESS1 =
(REGULAR+GOOD+CLEAR+SUFFIC+MANAGERS+SPEAK+COACH+TROUBLE+FOCUS+CAPABLE+VISION+ACTIVE+SUPPORTS)/13.

VARIABLE LABELS
ID 'Questionnaire number'
YEARS 'Number of years employed by agency'
STATUS 'Employee status'
TYPE 'Type of employee'
AGEGRP 'Age'
GENDER 'Gender'
ETHNCTY 'Ethnicity'
EDUCATE 'Highest education level'
SOLUTION 'My manager does not seem very keen to help me find a solution if I have a problem'
PROBLEMS 'If I experience any problems I can always turn on my manager for help'
POSITION 'My manager can place herself or himself in my position'
ENCOURGE 'My manager encourages me to do things that I have never done before'
| POLICY | 'Executive management team consistently implements policy in all departments' |
| PROMISE | 'Executive management fulfills its promises' |
| INFORMED | 'Executive management teams keeps all departments informed about its decisions' |
| COMUNCTE | 'Two way communication between executive management team and departments is very good' |
| RIVALRY | 'There is a strong rivalry between colleagues in my department' |
| DOUBT | 'I doubt whether all of my colleagues are sufficiently competent' |
| CONFIDEN | 'I have confidence in my colleagues' |
| OPEN | 'My department is very open' |
| CHANGES | 'Changes are always discussed with all people concerned' |
| DECISION | 'Decisions concerning work are taken in consultation with the staff who are affected' |
| FRONT | 'Front line staff and office workers can raise topics for discussion' |
| POWER | 'Within our organization power games between the departments plan an important role' |
| ADVANTAGE | 'Staff members are sometimes taken advantage of in our organization' |
| FAVORITSM | 'In our organization favoritism is an important way to achieve something' |
| NEGATIVE | 'I think that most changes will have a negative effect on the clients we serve' |
| PLANS | 'Plans for future improvement will not come to much' |
| PROJECTS | 'Most change projects that are supposed to solve problems around here will not do much good' |
| REGULAR | 'I am regularly informed on how the change is going' |
| GOOD | 'There is good communication between project leaders & staff members about the organizations policy toward changes' |
| CLEAR | 'Information provided on change is clear' |
| SUFFIC | 'We are sufficiently informed of the progress of change' |
| MANAGERS | 'Our departments senior managers pay sufficient attention to the personal experiences that the changes could have for their staff members' |
| SPEAK | 'Our departments executives speak up for us during the change process' |
| COACH | 'Our departments senior management coach us very well about implementing change' |
| TROUBLE | 'Our departments senior managers have trouble adapting their leadership styles to the changes' |
| FOCUS | 'Our departments executives focus too much on current problems and too little on their possible remedies' |
| CAPABLE | 'Our departments executives are perfectly capable of fulfilling their new function' |
| VISION | 'Executive management team has a positive vision of the future' |
| ACTIVE | 'Executive management team is actively involved with the changes' |
| SUPPORTS | 'Executive management team supports the change process unconditionally' |
DEVOTE 'I want to devote myself to the process of change'
MAKE 'I am willing to make a significant contribution to the change'
ENERGY 'I am willing to put energy into the process of change'
FEEL 'I have a good feeling about the change project'
PROCESS 'I experience the change as a positive process'.

VALUE LABELS
YEARS
1 '1-5'
2 '7-10'
3 '11-15'
4 '16-20'
5 '20+

STATUS
1 'Supervisory'
2 'Non-supervisory'

TYPE
1 'Consultant'
2 'Permanent'
3 'Temporary'

AGEGRP
1 '25 and under'
2 '26-35'
3 '36-45'
4 '46-55'
5 '56 and older'

GENDER
1 'Male'
2 'Female'

ETHNCTY
1 'African American'
2 'Asian'
3 'Caucasian'
4 'Latino'
5 'Native American'
6 'Other'

EDUCATE
1 'High school not completed'
2 'High school graduate'
3 'Some college'
4 'College graduate'
5 'Postgraduate'
6 'Other'
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SOLUTION
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

PROBLEMS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

POSITION
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

ENCOURGE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

POLICY
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

PROMISE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

INFORMED
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

COMUNCTE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIVALRY</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOUBT</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENCE</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGES</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRONT</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>1 'Strongly Disagree'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 'Disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 'Agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 'Strongly Agree'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ADVANTAGE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

FAVORTSM
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

NEGATIVE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

PLANS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

PROJECTS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

REGULAR
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

GOOD
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

CLEAR
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
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SUFFIC
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

MANAGERS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

SPEAK
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

COACH
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

TROUBLE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

FOCUS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

CAPABLE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

VISION
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
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ACTIVE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

SUPPORTS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

DEVOTE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

MAKE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

ENERGY
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

FEEL
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

PROCESS
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

READI
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/
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CLIMATE
   1 'Strongly Disagree'
   2 'Disagree'
   3 'Agree'
   4 'Strongly Agree'/

PROCESS1
   1 'Strongly Disagree'
   2 'Disagree'
   3 'Agree'
   4 'Strongly Agree'/

RECODE SOLUTION PROBLEMS POSITION ENCOURGE (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE POLICY PROMISE INFORMED COMUNCTE (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE RIVALRY DOUBT CONFIDEN OPEN CHANGES (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE DECISION FRONT POWER ADVANTGE FAVORTSM (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE NEGATIVE PLANS PROJECTS REGULAR GOOD (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE CLEAR SUFFIC MANAGERS SPEAK COACH (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE TROUBLE FOCUS CAPABLE VISION ACTIVE (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE SUPPORTS DEVOTE MAKE ENERGY FEEL PROCESS (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE READI (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE CLIMATE (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).
RECODE PROCESS1 (1 THRU 2.99 = 2) (3 THRU 4.99 = 3).

MISSING VALUES
   YEARS STATUS TYPE AGEGRP GENDER ETHNCTY EDUCATE SOLUTION PROBLEMS POSITION ENCOURGE POLICY PROMISE INFORMED COMUNCTE RIVALRY DOUBT CONFIDEN OPEN CHANGES DECISION FRONT POWER ADVANTGE FAVORTSM NEGATIVE PLANS PROJECTS REGULAR GOOD CLEAR SUFFIC MANAGERS SPEAK COACH TROUBLE FOCUS CAPABLE VISION ACTIVE SUPPORTS DEVOTE MAKE ENERGY FEEL PROCESS (0).
APPENDIX D (continued)

BEGIN DATA
001125235144412111433333341222232233332232233333
002512513413334121233333323231221113421333331
00311224134322233223332214243244221122223223133333
004512521414444221111411114333332232233333322
005112323521313123332312431232122234222333333
006512423423331111342222343413311111322232223333
0071223135144311112233122333333111223422311233311
008211221423331112321114333332232233322333333
009122423500121111432111343403121111230232233320
0101122114323422332233221112222322322333333
011122211342231111223311444144222111441114423
012122321433121113211134433441111224322333311
013522423211112124212134434422232223233332
01421242151444334332444122122333333344444
01512221242231311242221111343332111112432134422
01611231524332333332322123322333333333
017222411243333333311132233233333333333333
01812241151433333323143223221333333322333333
019222500311321113311124443441111114311443311
0205224212444433233133344414421114222432223332
021122313444441111111113413424223223323332
02251252331333333123233141422333343324443333
02352252151233222322232233322223223223332
024122221414421131213311444242233112123113333
02512221151433111213231134442422331112132113333
026522521214331211132222324241220232211144414
0271122124323332333222323322223233334444
02821251352212223221233223322222222222233332
0292223121334212221343431441413433334124443333
0305134135142433311144441111111333334411333333
03112252151433232322223333222223222233332
032512413314423433223323333333333333333
03322523432141111244141411111112111133324
034122421323232223333223323222233333333
035122323423422233223422301111414230333333
036222424121441112123133334222323332333322
0371224113232422322322322322222222233332
03821232143233334322332344333333322222223333
0395125152222113411112324244111111414214424
040123321323231123233112323222222323333332
0412231423222222322322223222222222333332
04222421223212143222134442232222223333333
APPENDIX D (continued)

04312122341414221112443114343231233323322211144424
044512421513232111143232231342333223322323244433
045522511414332232133423324232322222333223244443
04651242161434332314432313111333332311444323433
04712242354223221133211123333311111313412223322
04841241122333332223333241333222233222233333
049522421323344343113333323132233334322334344422
050312513423233222233322200000000000000000000
051422521423212112332223242220000000000000000000
05211232121342233424333232220000000000000000000
053123223613432332422233244223000000000000000000
05412322313444444411444321114100000000000000000
055121413533332302200330022220000000000000000000
056123221523222223332223323132000000000000000000
057122221422333233132324422223000000000000000000
05801251341444333324333222022200000000000000000
059522511422231221143123333222000000000000000000
0602223235143323212214332322222000000000000000000
06112321533322211423123232211110200000044400
062112311323333222223333222222233333333
063112311424332122333333222222222222333333
064222411323222123232233223222223333333
06551232031444300330033300222333330033304444
066123221323444443114443222242333332243433333

END DATA.

FREQUENCIES
/VARIABLES YEARS STATUS TYPE AGEGRP GENDER ETHNCTY EDUCATE
SOLUTION PROBLEMS POSITION ENCOURGE
POLICY PROMISE INFORMED COMMUNTE RIVALRY DOUBT CONFIDEN
OPEN CHANGES DECISION FRONT POWER ADVANTAGE
FAVORTSM NEGATIVE PLANS PROJECTS REGULAR GOOD CLEAR SUFFIC
MANAGERS SPEAK
COACH TROUBLE FOCUS CAPABLE VISION ACTIVE SUPPORTS DEVOTE
MAKE ENERGY FEEL PROCESS READI CLIMATE PROCESS
/STATISTICS=.
REFERENCES


