

MBA Dissertation

**Promoting Readiness For Change in a
Higher Education, Academic (Engineering)
Department**

Author: Paul Filmore
Organisation: SECEE, University of
Plymouth
Supervisor: Dr. Penny Gardiner
Date: June 1998

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Business Administration with the Plymouth Business School, University of Plymouth

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Business Administration with the Plymouth Business School, University of Plymouth.

Abstract

A six stage programme to promote readiness for change has been designed and implemented in an academic (engineering) department of a university. A survey has been developed to measure readiness for change. The survey has been used through the programme to benchmark attitudinal change. Various survey delivery methods have been explored, and a web based version concluded to have greatest potential. A comparison of the results against qualitative data collected from focus groups, shows close agreement. The survey has also been run at another university to validate its effectiveness. The results from this give confidence in its operation.

The programme ran against a backdrop of great uncertainty and resistance to change. Details of the change programme are given, including recommendations for developing and running change programmes. The final survey result showed that the process had been a great success at promoting readiness to change. The department's manager has been very satisfied with the real, tangible outcomes from the process.

Acknowledgements

My acknowledgements and thanks are extended to the following people and organisations who made this project and dissertation possible:

Emmanuel Ifeachor (Manager, SECEE) for his trust in me to deliver this programme;

Phil Culverhouse (SECEE) for a listening ear and for invaluable support in the practical side of web survey implementation;

Staff at SECEE for trusting me at the Awaydays and for their support day to day;

Penny Gardiner (PBS) for keeping me going and answering even the simplest question;

Staff at PBS in particular, Beryl, Peter, Eugene, Tony to name but a few, with whom I have developed a friendship which I hope will continue for a long time;

Mark Atherton(South Bank University) who made the ‘external’ survey possible;

and of course

My wife Catherine, for her patience and understanding over the last few years, and my children Hannah and Geoffrey with whom I can now play more regularly!

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 The Changing Environment	2
1.4 Aims	3
1.5 Methodology	3
2. Background to Study	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Management of Change	5
2.2.1 Types of change	6
2.2.2 Assessing change	8
2.2.3 Dynamics of change	9
2.2.4 Motivation	10
2.2.5 Power	12
2.2.6 Resistance to change	13
2.2.6.1 Overcoming resistance to change	13
2.2.7 Organisational Change and Learning	14
2.3 University Context	17
2.3.1 Environment	18
2.3.2 Pace of Change	19
2.3.3 Implementing Change in HE	20
2.3.4 The Learning University	21
3. Further Investigations	23
3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 The 'Readiness for Change' Model	23
3.3 Further Developments	25
3.4 Further thoughts on influencing Strategy	26
3.4.1 MIT's 90 Project	27
3.4.2 MIT's Model applied to HE	28
3.4.3 The NCET Project	29
3.5 Summary	32
4. Research Methods	33
4.1 Introduction	33
4.2 Foundation Professional Development Scheme	33
4.3 The Change Programme	34
4.4 The Survey	36
4.4.1 Political Sensitivity of Questionnaire	38
4.4.2 The Questionnaire	39
4.4.3 The Analysis Method	40
4.4.4 Reliability and Validity of Survey	41
4.5 January Awayday	42
4.6 Development of Change Readiness	44
4.6.1 Customising the MIT/NCET Model	44
4.7 Focus Groups	44
4.7.1 General Approach	45

4.7.2 Procedures	45
4.7.3 Results and Further Analysis	46
4.8 May Awayday	46
4.9 May Awayday Questionnaire	47
4.10 Summary	48
5. Results	49
5.1 Survey Validity	49
5.2 Survey Results	50
5.2.1 Comparison of Questionnaire with International Engineering	51
5.3 Readiness Analysis and Development	54
5.3.1 Conclusion from analysis	56
5.4 Focus Groups	57
5.5 Comparison of Survey and Focus Group Results	58
5.6 May Awayday Survey	59
5.7 Comments on Results	60
6. Conclusions	62
6.1 Background	62
6.2 Conclusions on Promoting Readiness to Change	63
6.3 Recommendations for the Organisation	65
7. References	67
8. Appendix	79
HEQC: Stages in Managing Change in HE	A1
Comments on the Dearing Report on UK Higher Education	A2
The Foundation Professional Development (FPD) Scheme: Proposal	A3
Carnall's (1990) Organisational Diagnosis Questionnaire	A4
January Awayday Questionnaire Results for PMC	A5
Full Questionnaire (attached to outcomes sheets)	A6
Condensed Questionnaire (email version)	A7
Raw Questionnaire data (exported from Question Mark)	A8
Questionnaire Results Sheets (modified)	A9
Question Analysis Report (from Question Mark)	A10
South Bank Questionnaire (adapted)	A11
The January Awayday	A12
The MITs90/ NCET handout (indicative data)	A13
Focus Group Meetings: Notes and Feedback	A14
The May Awayday	A15
Memo to staff	A16
May Questionnaire (Paper Based)	A17
May Questionnaire (Web Based)	A18
May Questionnaire Results	A19

Role Counselling (draft)	
A20	
Academic Staff Roles (from Ford et al, 1996)	A21

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 The Business Excellence Model	6
Figure 2.2 Motivation of knowledge workers (source: Tampoe, 1994)	11
Figure 2.3: The Kolb Learning Cycle	14
Figure 2.4: Kim's Integrated Model of Organisational Learning: Source Kim, 1993	15
Figure 2.5: Some of the external relationships associated with HEIs (Source: Ford et al, 1996)	19
Figure 3.1: Factors relevant in creating readiness for change (source: Armenakis, Harris, Mossholder, 1993).	24
Figure 3.2 Business transformation levels (Source: Ford et al 1996; based on MIT/ Sloan 1990: 107)	28
Figure 3.3: The NCET Transformation Model (Source: NCET, 1995).	32
Figure 4.1: Force field analysis of the department.	35
Figure 4.2: The computer questionnaire showing a question with an option chosen on the computer screen. NB The respondent 'clicks' the 'OK' button to continue to the next question.	39

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Shows the use of the MITs90 model by Ford et al (1996) for application to learning environments (source: adapted from Ford). The NCET equivalent levels are also shown for comparison.	30/31
Table 4.1: The attitude scale used in the department	40
Table 4.2: Respondent groups for the January survey.	40
Table 5.1: Comparison of South Bank data (scale: +2=very positive to -2= very negative) with the managers assessment (data in brackets is that unmodified by altering the contributory questions - see text).	50
Table 5.2: Comparison of data (scale: +2=very positive to -2= very negative) between South Bank and the department (all post Awayday replies).	51
Table 5.3: Showing the percentage positive improvement over the pre Awayday (Group 1) respondents, the actual data (all post Awayday replies), and the average standard deviation of the data.	52
Table 5.4: Respondent data from all post Awayday replies (sorted by motivation), showing the variation in individuals attitudes.	53
Table 5.5: Comparing Personal Motivation and Personal Readiness for Change factors for all Awayday replies (Scale:- motivation: high > 0.5, low < -0.6; readiness: high ≥ 1.0, low ≤ 0.5).	53
Table 5.6: A comparison of the Department and Carnall Attitude Scales.	54
Table 5.7 Comparing the average scores between International Engineering and the Department (using the Department Scale).	55
Table 5.8: An audit of current (mid April) readiness for change using Armenakis et al model(1993). NB The contextual factor of Faculty developments, has been included as it has such a strong impact.	56
Table 5.9: The Focus Group analysis: summarising issues relating to concerns, by frequency.	58
Table 5.10: Comparison of results of January and May surveys (scale: +2=very positive to -2= very negative).	59
Table 5.11: Showing results from the May survey (scale: +2=very positive to -2= very negative)	60

