THESIS
3
2001

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

GETTING TO "GO":
HOW ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS APPROACH PLANNING FOR SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS IN STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SYSTEMS

presented by

William Scott Rizzo

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Resource Development

Major professor

Date 8/8/01

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

O-12771

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
OCT 2 5 2004		
05 02 05		

6/01 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.15

GETTING TO "GO":
HOW ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS APPROACH PLANNING FOR SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS IN STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SYSTEMS

By

William Scott Rizzo

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION
Submitted to
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
Department of Resource Development
2001

Professor Frank A. Fear

ABSTRACT

GETTING TO "GO":
HOW ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS APPROACH PLANNING FOR SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS IN STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SYSTEMS

By

William Scott Rizzo

Public education institutions are under increasing pressure to operate more efficiently, effectively, and with impact. State Cooperative Extension Systems, which include campus- and field-based operations, are experimenting with administrative innovations. An innovation receiving contemporary attention in Extension systems, the self-directed work team (SDWT), holds promise for better connecting campus and field, and making it possible to provide end-users with better quality information and educational programs.

The purpose of this research, which was undertaken in the constructivist tradition, is to explore organizational dynamics associated with getting to the decision point of adopting SDWTs in three statewide Extension organizations. Data were collected through personal interviews conducted with administrators (and others) who were involved actively in the decision to adopt SDWTs in their respective statewide organization.

Findings suggest that administrators were attracted to SDWTs for common reasons (e.g., serving clientele). Change managers considered SDWTs to be an effective venue through which collegiality among Extension

professionals could be improved, and through which better Extension education programs could be produced. Change managers also believed that SDWTs represented a good 'fit' with the values they associated with their organizations.

Each organization's adoption process reflected unique and sometimes multiple theoretical models of organizational change. However, administrators' theories-in-use about change, leadership, organizations and Extension, which differed across study sites, tended to be more useful in explaining change processes and outcomes than did change models gleaned from the literature. A participatory approach to the change process was observed across all organizations studied. However, each organization differed markedly in how that approach was operationalized.

The processes used to introduce teams reflected the unique cultural attributes of each Extension organization. For one organization, the adoption of self-directed teams reflected a preference for organization-wide dialogue and reflection as the primary means through which change might emerge. For another, the adoption process reflected strong organizational values around shared leadership. And for another organization, the adoption of teams unfolded as planned change. In each case, change managers understood the difficulty of making changes to their organization's culture and chose to concentrate change strategy on changing systems rather than culture. In each case, the decision entertained was how to adopt teams rather than whether or not to adopt teams.

Copyright by
WILLIAM SCOTT RIZZO
2001

Dedicated With Love
To

My Parents

Barth and Jean Rizzo

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several individuals have been instrumental in helping me to complete my Ph.D. program.

Frank Fear, my advisor, believed in me when, at times, I did not believe in myself. He taught me many things, the most lasting of which is the importance of living according to one's convictions. His courage in doing so himself continues to inspire me as a scholar and as a practitioner. His friendship has been genuine, his counsel wise, and his curiosity contagious.

Arlen Leholm helped to open doors to the world of Extension for me that I would not have been able to open alone. His support of my research, my academic pursuits, and my career has been unwavering.

Mary Andrews and Murari Suvedi, through their support and advice, have helped me to strengthen this research by adding significantly to my understanding of the Extension culture.

I am grateful to Dean Carl O'Connor of the University of Wisconsin-Extension/COOP Extension who provided me with sorely needed time with which to conduct this research.

I am deeply grateful to my wife, Kirsten Norslien, without whose love and support this dissertation could not have been completed.

Finally, I am grateful to my God and Savior, Jesus Christ, whose love and guidance brought me to, and sustained me through, my entire degree program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE
ADOPTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND INNOVATION

BACKGROUND

This research focuses on the readiness of public organizations to adopt an administrative innovation. The growing trend toward smaller government has public organizations at all levels facing an external environment characterized by shrinking public funding and rising performance expectations (Bryson, 1995). For example, Federal dollars--traditionally available to states as base budget appropriations--are increasingly taking the form of competitive grants made available to state executive departments on a competitive basis.

In response to the challenge of being expected to do more with less, public organizations are searching for innovative strategies to enhance effectiveness and efficiency (Bryson, 1995). Many public organizations have responded by employing a range of administrative innovations including strategic planning, reengineering, various forms of teams, total quality management, organizational flattening, visioning, and functional audits.

Introducing organizational innovations is invariably accompanied by structural, cognitive and cultural barriers that inhibit innovation or significantly reduce impact (Light, 1998). The term readiness is used to describe the degree to which barriers to organizational innovation have been anticipated and addressed (Harrison, 1987).

The adoption of organizational change and innovation may be problematic if organizations aren't 'ready' for the changes and innovation they plan to employ. Dimensions of readiness include:

- Knowing what is required to adopt change and innovation successfully
- Understanding the consequences associated with introducing organizational change and innovation in multiple environment
- Being consistent in the introduction and deployment of change and innovation
- Fitting change and innovation with existing ways of doing business
- Determining how change and innovation can be sustained
- Gaining commitment to change and innovation at all levels of an organization, and
- Determining if an organization is entrenched in a certain way of doing business, and deciding what might be required to enable the organization to think and act 'outside the box.'

All organizations have an interest in change and innovation when doing so results in significant operational improvements. However, while private sector organizations are rewarded with increased profitability, public organizations are often rewarded with only the opportunity to operate through the next budget cycle or, in fewer and fewer cases, the opportunity to grow. Yet, organizational effectiveness and efficiency within the public sector are of significant interest to the general public. The reality is that public organizations are under increasing scrutiny. They are expected to operate more efficiently; to produce programs of higher relevance and quality; to demonstrate significant and measurable outcomes and impacts; to respond more quickly to emerging issues and needs; and to do a better job of connecting knowledge to public issues, needs and concerns. (Bryson, 1995)

Constantly changing political forces, public priorities and social needs combine to create a public/governmental operating environment requiring

increasing organizational dexterity to adapt to rapidly changing conditions. In cases where the output (products or services) of a public organization are widely recognized and understood, successful innovation may result in observable improvements in operating efficiency and/or product or service quality. Improvements may have positive budget implications during the next funding cycle. An example of this might be a state or county highway department in which the effectiveness and efficiency of an administrative or technological innovation (expressed as the cost per mile of highway built) may increase the quality of an output (e.g., shorter construction periods and better road quality). But when the output of a public organization is less observable, known or understood, successful innovation may constrain the ability to demonstrate fundamental organizational relevance or to justify continuing public investment. Should public investment decrease, innovation is often required to increase output quality in the face of constant or rising expectations.

When the work of a public organization serves an unusually broad set of interests or its work is done in cooperation with other public and private institutions, the task of demonstrating a quality return on a public investment becomes both challenging and mercurial. This is particularly true of one public organization, **the state Cooperative Extension organization**.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

The output of state Cooperative Extension organizations includes a diverse mix of educational programs. It includes initiatives and projects designed

and delivered through a diverse set of institutions including universities; federal, state, and/or local governments; citizen volunteers; not-for-profit organizations; and private sector organizations. These outputs are designed to address a correspondingly broad mix of citizen, community, government, private and not-for-profit needs, issues and concerns. The goals, and often the missions, of partner institutions and those whom they serve may differ. Consequently, it is no surprise that there can be differing perceptions about the quality, relevance or effectiveness of services offered.

Given this mix of interests and evaluative criteria, state Cooperative Extension organizations are particularly sensitive to how elected officials and voters value and evaluate Cooperative Extension programming. Many Extension administrators understand that easily understood and evaluated government services, such as highways maintenance, may be viewed as more worthy of scarce public dollars than are government-sponsored educational programs. In response to these conditions, some Cooperative Extension organizations are pursuing new organizational tools intended to improve output quality, organizational efficiency, and organizational effectiveness. Extension organizations in a number of U.S. states have begun to employ an organizational innovation called **the self-directed work team** (SDWT).

SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS

SDWTs are a form of work group characterized by high levels of autonomy and self-direction (Wellins, Byham and Wilson, 1991; Fisher, 1993).

Their function is to address and, in some cases to identify, specific tasks, problems, issues, and/or concerns associated with an organization's work. SDWTs are a form of administrative innovation that has taken hold primarily in the private sector. They are now found in the public sector with increasing frequency.

A relatively small number of state Cooperative Extension organizations have employed, or are in the process of employing, SDWTs as a means of improving the design and delivery of educational programs specifically, and improving organizational performance, generally. This innovation offers organizations a number of benefits when employed successfully.

SDWTs are heralded as for the valued outcomes they can produce. Wellins, Byham and Wilson (1991) identify "improved quality, productivity and service; greater (organizational) flexibility; reduced operating costs; faster response to technological change; fewer, simpler job classifications; better response to worker values; and the ability to attract and retain the best people" as operational advantages of SDWTs. Orsborn et al. (1990) assert that "productivity, streamlining flexibility, quality, commitment and customer satisfaction" as advantages of SDWTs. Quick (1992) identifies collaboration between team members as the main benefit of organizing work around teams. Marshall (1995, pp. 7-8), in writing on team-based organizations, assumes collaboration to be the primary concept around which organizations most effectively accomplish work. He lists a number of benefits of the "collaborative workplace"

1. Organizations collaborate internally to compete externally;
2. Decisions are faster, of higher quality, and customer driven ;
3. Decisions are made on the basis of principle rather than power;
4. or personality, resulting in greater buy-in and impact ;
5. The energy of the workforce is focused on the customer rather than on internal conflicts;
6. The productivity of the workforce increases;
7. Strategic alliances that might have failed not only succeed, but build trust and produce extraordinary results;
8. Return on investment increases dramatically;
9. Span of control increases substantially (for the employee);
10. The workforce takes on full responsibility and accountability for the success of the enterprise, to the point where some teams have downsized themselves;
11. Conflict is reduced as work relationships open up and build trust;
12. Collaborative mergers and alliances result in all members pulling in the same direction;
13. Fear is gone--change is seen as a positive opportunity, and;
14. The organization is self-sufficient in sustaining the ongoing development of the company.

Clearly, SDWTs have much to offer. They can be instruments for accomplishing high-performance goals, such as offering service and product quality, enhancing internal efficiency, harnessing the talents of employees, and offering flexibility in dealing with changing business environments. SDWTs are also associated frequently with enhancing organizational performance. Words and terms such as quality, productivity, efficiency, cost reduction, innovation, harnessing the talents of employees, and organizational responsiveness to change are found throughout the literature. When seen in this light, we can begin to understand the contributions made by SDWTs to organizational performance. Interestingly, though, this organizational innovation is not automatically compatible with the way many Extension organizations traditionally do business.

The literature provides some guidance as to what organizational conditions are necessary for SDWTs to succeed or be successfully introduced.

In his book, Transforming the Way We Work: The Power of the Collaborative Workplace, Marshall calls collaborative teams the "basic unit of the Collaborative Workplace - a structure that can fulfill the promise of empowerment with accountability." (p. 112). He offers highly relevant perspectives on organizational readiness for collaborative teams. First, his cluster of "seven core values of the collaborative work ethic" provides a guide for organizations interested in cultural transformation. These include respect for people; honor and integrity; ownership and alignment; consensus; trust-based relationships; full responsibility and accountability; and recognition and growth (pp. 29-36). Second, he offers four imperatives for creating an environment in which collaboration can thrive (pp. 38-41). The imperatives are: 1) a commitment to make principle-based agreements rather than power-based agreements; 2) an agreement to adopt 'an explicit governance process' that contains no unwritten rules and no surprises; 3) an agreement that all organizational members give up avoidance, accommodation, competition and compromise behaviors in favor of behaviors based upon the 'seven core values'; and 4) operating agreements that reflect members' values and beliefs.

Wellins et al. (1991) believe that empowerment is central to the development and operation of SDWTs. They assert that clarifying organizational values and developing a vision around them is a prerequisite for the emergence of an "empowered culture." (p. 89) Shaffer and Anundsen (1993:pp. 272-273) note that, in order to thrive, teams require an organizational environment characterized by "trust and respect." Fisher (1993) warns that a lack of

managerial support for a transition to SDWTs may surface as a reluctance to provide necessary levels of fiscal and human resources (p. 22).

Despite the apparent benefits associated with employing innovations such as SDWTs, many organizations fail to innovate or, if they do, do so unsuccessfully. Consequently, an important issue for advancing SDWT effectiveness is **understanding the role that readiness plays in the success or failure of an organization's attempt to change and innovate**.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research is to explore—in context—organizational thought and action associated with readiness to adopt change and innovation within three state Extension organizations. The adoption of a specific form of administrative innovation, the SDWT, is examined as the basis for considering how these three organizations framed and approached organizational change and innovation. In the context of this study, readiness is defined as a set of internal organizational conditions, norms, capacities, patterns of thought and action, and their degree of fit with the operational requirements of a SDWT.

RESEARCH APPROACH AND CONTEXT

The Research Approach

This is a qualitative/inductive study conducted within the constructivist paradigm. In addressing the ontological question of the nature of reality, this

researcher agrees with Creswell (1994:4) when he states that "...the only reality is that constructed by the individuals involved in the research situation."

A Multiple Case Design

Employing a multiple-case design, the researcher examined three state Cooperative Extension organizations that have recently adopted SDWTs. Yin (1994; p.44) observes that the multiple case study is an appropriate design for exploring independent innovations that occur at different sites. The organizations include **Michigan State University Extension, Ohio State University Extension,** and the **University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension**.

The Research Context

Ohio State University Extension has been employing SDWTs for approximately twelve years. The administrative/leadership structure and programming functions are organized around teams. Michigan State University Extension has been employing SDWTs for approximately seven years in the domains of program design and delivery. The University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension has been employing SDWTs for approximately three years, primarily in the Agriculture and Natural Resources Program area.

These three state Cooperative Extension organizations are similar in three fundamental ways. All three Extension organizations decided to innovate through

SDWTs. The states share compatible organizational missions, and program priorities are expressed in these areas--community and economic development, families and youth development, and agriculture and natural resources. This balance suggests similarities in the sets of issues and corresponding stakeholder interests associated with each state Extension organization. Finally, each state Extension organization's decision to employ SDWTs is linked to a desire to increase organizational effectiveness and efficiency in the face of internal and external environmental stimuli.

The similarities across the three organizations enabled the researcher to anticipate similar results across the three cases. Yin (1994) describes this as literal replication, and identifies it as an important decision criterion is selecting a multiple-case study approach. This study utilizes a comparative design to explore the innovation experiences of the three study sites. Comparing the innovation experience across three study sites facilitates data categorization and the subsequent emergence of theory (Merriam, S.B., 1988).

Because each study site is at a different time point relative to the adoption process, the potential for each site's experience to address all of the research questions varies. For example, because Ohio State University Extension has been employing SDWTs for twelve years, their experience may be more helpful than the other two sites' in understanding organizational change and innovation in cases where certain outcomes emerge only after a considerable period of time. Conversely, the experiences of all three sites are useful in increasing our understanding of the connection between the adoption of organizational change

and innovation, as well as for understanding internal conditions associated with the change organization's culture. Finally, the multiple experiences are useful in helping us understand how organizational change and innovation bring about specific internal changes.

To provide a consistent basis for comparing and analyzing across study sites, the researcher has chosen to describe and analyze the adoption process within two separate units of each of the three study sites selected. These include the Extension administrative and agriculture program area units of the three sites. The administrative units represent the source of the adoption of innovation process at each site. The agriculture program areas represent, by far, the adoption process in its most mature and observable form at each study site.

The process of adoption necessarily involves decisions, thoughts and actions by people throughout each Extension organization. This study focuses primarily on the early stages of adoption during which many individuals contributed to the momentum that resulted in a decision to adopt SDWTs. While these individuals represent multiple divisions within each Extension organization, their contributions will not be based on their place within each organization but, rather, as individual contributions to an organizational decision to adopt SDWTs.

Change vs. Innovation

As originally proposed, this study was designed to focus on the readiness of Extension organizations to innovate through the adoption of a specific administrative innovation, the self-directed work team. What emerged from the

research experience was an understanding that a broader process of organizational change was taking place at all three study sites, both by design and through evolution. To be able to accurately assign meaning to the findings, the researcher decided to focus on organizational readiness to adopt change as well as to innovate. Rather than address a more narrow focus only-- organizational readiness to innovate-- this study examines organizational change AND innovation as phenomena that occur simultaneously and together.

An extensive review of the literature on organizational change and innovation suggests that administrative innovations, such as the adoption of SDWTs, occur within a larger context of organizational change. At numerous points during data collection, and again during data analysis, the question of whether the organizations under study were changing or innovating was essentially unanswerable. As a practical matter, any attempt to analyze each study site by separating the process of innovation from the process of organizational change missed the mark of what was actually happening. The organizations recognized and responded to a number of environmental signals through the adoption of a new organizational form, the SDWT. SDWTs are innovative because they are new. But, as experienced, they required a series of structural, cultural and systems changes. Although these changes were viewed frequently by informants as "innovative," the researcher considers these changes to be vastly more encompassing organizationally.

Research Questions

Called 'grand tour' questions by Creswell (1984), the research questions in this study were intended to help the researcher explore how process, culture and environment shape organizational reality and give it meaning. The questions are:

1. Why did each site decide to adopt self-directed work teams?
2. How was the decision to adopt self-directed work teams made?
3. Who was involved (and how) in making the decision to adopt self-directed work teams?

As the research progressed, it became clear that answers emerging from the study pointed to a single grand tour question, not three. In addition, the study data suggested a variety of themes within and across study sites, prompting the researcher to create three sub-questions for analyzing the data, assigning meaning, and inducing theory.

Grand Tour Question
What conditions, strategies and processes characterized the adoption of self-directed work teams at each study site?

Sub-question #1
What conditions led to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Sub-question #2
What organizational factors were antecedent to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Sub-question #3
What other factors surfaced at each study site that played a significant role in either facilitating or impeding the adoption self-directed teams?

The researcher used these sub-questions as a framework within which to posit a number of theoretical propositions that emerged from the data.

Definitions

The following definitions of key terms will be used throughout this study:

Readiness to Innovate: A set of internal organizational conditions, norms, capacities, patterns of thought and action, and their degree of fit with the operational requirements of an administrative innovation.

Innovation: A process, system, practice, or strategy that is new to an organization.

Organizational Culture: An organization's predominating set of operating norms including values, behaviors and other patterns of thought and/or action.

State Cooperative Extension Organization: The state-level government partner organization of the United States Department of Agriculture's Cooperative Extension System. Federal, state and local (county) governments provide funding for State Cooperative Extension organizations.

Significance of the Study

A study of organizational readiness to adopt organizational change and innovation is relevant in two significant arenas.

For Practice: The study sheds light on the internal organizational conditions that enhance and impede the adoption of administrative innovations. This knowledge can be used by state extension organizations specifically, and government organizations generally, to organize and operate in ways that increase program and service quality, and enhance operational efficiency.

For Scholarly Research and Literature: A modest (but growing) literature focuses on self-directed work teams. However, this literature focuses almost exclusively on private sector experiences. The researcher was unable to locate any literature focusing on either the adoption of administrative innovation within state extension organizations. In addition, he was able to locate only a very modest amount of literature on organizational readiness to adopt self-directed work teams. This study, therefore, represents an opportunity to conduct pioneering research on the topic of organizational readiness to adopt administrative change and innovation within a public organization, the state extension organization.

Use of the Literature

Literature will be used in three ways during the research. First, literature focusing on the primary research focus, namely, organizational readiness to change and innovate, will be reviewed to acquaint the readers with the current theory and practice. Second, literature of self-directed work teams will be reviewed for the purpose of framing the problem within this study. Finally, to 'make sense' of the data collected, literature will be used in the data collection

and analysis chapters to connect findings with current theory and knowledge. Creswell (1994:23) observes that presenting literature at the end of the study in this manner "...does not guide and direct the study, but rather becomes an aide once patterns or categories have been identified."

Phases of the Research

This research was conducted in three phases with each phase dedicated to a specific research objective. The first phase serves a descriptive function--to reconstruct the decision making process used in each organization to understand and assess the organizational problem, consider options for responding to the problem, and acting to resolve the problem. In-depth interviews were conducted as the principle means of collecting data during Phase I of the study. Subjects were sought who, individually and collectively, represent the spectrum of experience and perspective relating to each study site's innovation experience. This phase also involved an analytic dimension as participants and the researcher engaged in ongoing, iterative interpretation of events as they were described as a means of constructing a descriptive story of the adoption process at each study site.

Phase II of the study serves an analytic function--feeding back the reconstruction of the innovation experience to key informants. Feedback from, and subsequent discussions with, key informants helped the researcher discover multiple meanings attached to the actions of innovators and the organization as a whole. Phase III involves a comparative analysis of the three study sites.

Literature was used throughout this phase of the study to interpret the site findings.

Study Delimitations

The sites were selected because they are among the first Extension organizations to adopt SDWTs. In contemplating the approach to this study, the researcher decided against focusing on the criterion of "successful innovation" because of the perceived difficulties associated with collecting data when a study is framed in terms of "success."

The focus of this research is not on self-directed work teams but on the dynamics and processes associated with how organizations and their leaders get to the point of deciding how and/or whether to adopt administrative innovation. Self-directed work teams were selected as the administrative innovation because they were being adopted at all three study sites.

Further, because the experience each Extension organization has had with SDWTs has been relatively brief, and because benchmarks for success have not been established by any of these Extension organizations, the researcher concluded that studying the success of SDWTs was also not an appropriate focus for the study.

This study was an exploratory study undertaken to tell and learn from the 'stories' of how three Extension organizations approached change and innovation. It was not, however, undertaken to make judgments about the effectiveness of the approaches taken by any of these organizations.

Finally, this study was not undertaken to examine or report on performance challenges associated with the functioning or administration of self-directed work teams. However, the final chapter of the study does contain some comments pertaining to key challenges associated with the process of adopting self-directed work teams.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation includes nine chapters. The study is introduced in this chapter, Chapter 1. Chapter 2 focuses on readiness and other relevant issues associated with the adoption of organizational change and innovation. Self-directed work teams are the topic of attention in Chapter 3. The research design is presented in Chapter 4. Case findings and analysis are presented in Chapters 5-7. Chapter 5 centers on the adoption of self-directed work teams at Michigan State University Extension, and includes an analysis of the adoption process there. The same approach is taken in Chapter 6, with attention shifting to Ohio State University Extension; and in Chapter 7, where the spotlight shines on the University of Wisconsin-Extension/Cooperative Extension. An analysis of the adoption process across all three sites is presented in Chapter 8. Conclusions and recommendations for practice and research are shared in Chapter 9.

CHAPTER TWO
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND INNOVATION

Change Models

A number of theoretical frameworks have been developed to describe the organizational change process. Cummings and Worley (1993) describe four different change models. These include Kurt Lewin's (1951) change model; the action research model (Collier, 1945; Whyte and Hamilton, 1964; Marrow, Bowers, and Seashore, 1967; Coch and French, 1948); a collection of more recent change models, which they term 'contemporary action research,' and, the author's model of planned change.

Lewin's change model theorized that organizations exist in a mobile state of equilibrium between two forces, one that focuses on maintaining the status quo and the other that focuses on producing change. Change occurs when change forces increase and the status quo forces decrease, thereby establishing a new level of equilibrium. Of course, the reverse is true when the forces supporting equilibrium increases while the force supporting change decreases. Lewin goes on to argue that resistance to change is lowest, and an environment for change better, when forces supporting the status quo are highest.

Lewin identifies three steps in the change process--unfreezing, moving, and refreezing. The unfreezing process involves the reduction of forces that maintain status quo behavior. This reduction may be accomplished by illuminating gaps between desired and actual behaviors. When this occurs, organizational members may become open to changing their behaviors to more closely resemble desired behaviors. The moving process "involves developing

new behaviors, values, and attitudes through changes in organizational structures and processes" (Cummings and Worley, 1993, p. 27). Refreezing involves the introduction of desired organizational values, rules, behaviors, expectations, and policies. A number of authors have used Lewin's model as the basis for introducing other change process steps. His unfreeze, move, refreeze model is widely viewed as foundational in describing the basic process through which organizational change occurs.

The action research model (Cummings and Worley (1993, p. 28-30) consists of eight steps: problem identification; consultation with a behavioral science expert; data gathering and preliminary diagnosis; feedback to client or group; joint diagnosis of problem; joint action planning; action; and, finally, data gathering after action. The premise of the action research model is that information learned about an organization may be used to both guide and inform change efforts.

More recent approaches to planned organizational change fall into a single category termed "contemporary action research" (Cummings and Worley, 1993 p. 28, Fig. 2-1). These approaches to change are characterized by an emphasis on stakeholder involvement and participation vs. change designed and implemented by experts. Within the contemporary action research approach is a specific approach called "appreciative inquiry." This approach holds that organizations all display a certain degree of effectiveness, and that positive change occurs through continual support of, and building upon, behaviors and activities that organizations and their members do best.

Cummings and Worley incorporate Lewin's model, the action research model, and contemporary action research model into a model they call the "general model of planned change" (1993, pp. 32-34). This model includes four steps that are performed collaboratively by professional change agents and organizational members. The first activity, entering and contracting, includes the collection of data that describe the need for change, as well as the organizational opportunities and challenges that must be addressed during the change effort. The resulting analysis and discussion provides a basis for deciding whether or not a change effort will be pursued and, if it will, what plan it will follow. Next, diagnostic activities are performed to reveal deeper issues, problems, and opportunities facing an organization. Change agents and organizational members jointly undertake the third stage of the model--planning and implementing change. As a prelude to selecting an intervention strategy, an assessment of an organization's readiness to undergo change is conducted, as are a number of other organizational characteristics including organizational culture, internal power flows, and the capacity of internal change agents to successfully implement a change effort. The actual implementation of the change effort is a management process that "...includes motivating change, creating a desired future vision of the organization, developing political support, managing transition towards the vision, and sustaining momentum for change" (p. 33-34). The evaluation of a change effort includes assessing how well changes have been implemented and institutionalized.

For Robert Quinn (1996) deep change is organizational change "that is major in scope, discontinuous with the past and generally irreversible (p. 3). " In contrast to the view that organizations are synonymous with routine, formal structures and processes and predictability, deep change involves the creation of new organizational systems in response to misalignments that emerge when an organization's internal realities are out of alignment with changes in its external environment. Deep change requires that organizations possess the capacity to learn and adapt as a means of achieving realignment with external realities. Deep change occurs in individuals through a personal commitment to continuous change and development. Deep change may also occur at the organizational level through the adoption of transformational approaches of leadership, in combination with a thorough self-examination of organizational cultural and paradigmatic phenomena that serve as barriers to change.

Nadler and Tusman (in Nadler, Shaw and Walton and Associates, 1995) describe four basic types of organizational change--incremental, discontinuous, anticipatory and reactive. Incremental and discontinuous change are concerned with the scope of change within an organization; anticipatory and reactive change occur when organizational changes take place in anticipation of, or in response to, environmental changes.

Bacharach, Bamberger and Sonnenstuhl's (1996) logic of action model holds that organizations and their members share an interest in establishing and maintaining a sense of organizational stability. They suggest that the technical, managerial and institutional levels within hierarchical organizations engage in a

series of exchange processes intended to establish alignment between organizational ends and means. Where higher levels of means-ends alignment exist between and among organizational levels, higher levels of organizational stability also tend to exist. Conversely, increasing levels of inconsistency between means and ends across organizational levels create within organizational members cognitive dissonance (Kahle, 1984; in Bacharach, Bamberger and Sonnenstuhl's, 1996), followed by attempts to restore an acceptable level of cognitive realignment through behavioral and/or cognitive changes and adjustments. Transformation occurs when changes and adjustments reflect 'transformed' or realigned means-ends exchange mechanisms between the technical, managerial and institutional levels of an organization.

Raymon and Wyman (1998) view change as a management-driven process, on one hand, or as a fully participatory process involving non-managerial employees, on the other. The former is characterized by managerial control of the change strategy and the diagnostic activities preceding it. In participatory change, managerial and non-managerial employees collaborate through a combination of action research, organizational development, and what the authors term "action training and research" (p. 11)--activities to co-diagnose the organization through selected change strategies and processes. The primary question distinguishing the two approaches revolves around whose values dominate the process.

Strategies for Managing Organizational Change

Scholars focus on beliefs held by organizational members. These include beliefs about: 1) one's ability to successfully accomplish what is expected during and following a change process; 2) whether or not incentives to change will, in fact, be offered; and 3) whether or not incentives, once offered, will actually be sufficient to produce individual motivation to change.

Green and Butkus (1999) approach the topic by suggesting that managing organizational change is synonymous with managing the emotional responses of organizational members to change. They suggest that, in managing motivation and performance problems associated with change efforts, managers need to concern themselves with the emotional responses organizational members have to change, and to the belief system associated with these responses. Three beliefs are proposed to predominate among organizational members in the context of organizational change. These include beliefs about ability to successfully do what is asked of them in the change effort; beliefs about whether or not members will get the incentives offered to them; and beliefs about whether or not the incentives offered, if provided, will ultimately be satisfying. These beliefs, in turn, provide a context for the emergence of a number of emotions within organizational members including anger, anxiety, confusion, disappointment, discomfort, excitement, fear, hope, insecurity, sadness, self-doubt, and skepticism. These emotions may then give rise to any one of four basic reactions to change, including disengagement, disidentification,

disorientation and disenchantment. These emotions often adversely affect performance and the acceptance of change efforts. The fundamental strategy of the change manager is to identify the underlying beliefs of organizational members and to reassure members. This strategy is designed to disarm members' negative emotional responses to change. Green and Butkus (1999) suggest that this is effective in managing change within teams and entire organizations, in addition to individuals.

Marks and Shaw (in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995) address the emotional fallout that accompanies organizational change. To help organizational members deal with the emotional upheaval of change, they suggest that change managers help employees view change as a set of opportunities that includes new influence and support networks, extrinsic and intrinsic awards, and fewer constraints on experimentation and risk. The creation of new communication and learning systems is suggested as a means of helping members understand and adapt to planned changes.

Schneider and Rentsch (in Hage, 1988) differentiate between organizational climate and culture while describing their roles and importance in the organizational change process. Climate refers to the network of routines, rewards and behaviors that, when taken together, represent what is important within an organization. Culture refers to the values and norms that underlie these routines, rewards, and behaviors (Schein, 1985). Schneider and Rentsch maintain that successful change management must address five issues linked to both climate and culture. These include: 1) issues relating to organizational

membership attraction, selection, and retention; 2) socialization of members once selected; 3) identity issues that relate to how members learn to adopt and identify with organizational norms; 4) authority issues that determine members' roles in achieving management's goals; 5) interpersonal issues relating to how members communicate; and 6) environmental issues relating to how managers respond to the effects of environmental realities and changes.

Bowman and Deal (1984) consolidated the major theoretical perspectives on organizational forms into four "frames" (p. 4). The first frame, the structural frame, "emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships (p. 5)." The layers depicting organizational subdivisions on organizational charts symbolize the distribution of labor, roles and responsibilities that define the structural frame. The second frame, the human resource frame, emphasizes the role of people as the central feature of organizational form and function. Their third frame, the political frame, holds that organizational life is a constant process of the exercise of power and control for the purpose of allocating scarce resources among organizational actors. Their fourth and final frame, the symbolic frame, portrays organizational reality as a play where actors act out a variety of roles.

Observing that organizational change invariably produces conflict and a sense of loss among organizational members, Bowman and Deal (1991, p. 377) offer four change strategies which address the specific contextual requirements of their organizational frames.

These include:

Human Resource Frame Strategy

Change causes people to feel incompetent, needy, and powerless. Developing new skills, creating opportunities for involvement, and providing psychological support are essential.

Structural Frame Change Strategy:

Change alters the clarity and stability of roles and relationships, creating confusion and chaos. This requires giving attention to realigning and renegotiating formal patterns and policies.

Political Frame Change Strategy:

Change generates conflict and creates winners and losers. Avoiding or smoothing over those issues drives conflict underground. Managing change effectively requires the creation of arenas where issues can be negotiated.

Symbolic Frame Change Strategy:

Change creates loss of meaning and purpose. People form attachments to symbols and symbolic activity. When the attachments are severed, they experience difficulty in letting go. Existential wounds require symbolic healing.

Morris and Raben (in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995) offer a four-stage approach to managing change. The stages include overcoming member resistance to change, providing incentives to motivate change among members, managing the highly uncertain transition period when changes are

being introduced, and managing the dynamics of power and politics that accompany structural realignments.

Walton (in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995) differentiates between organizational hardware ("strategy, structure, work processes, roles, and accountabilities") and organizational software ("values, culture, climate, informal operating style, rituals, communication patterns") (p. 151). She observes that organizational culture presents the most difficult challenge to the organizational change manager. She describes a comprehensive strategy designed to change organizational culture as a precondition for larger organizational change. Walton outlines three sets of decision points facing change managers. These include the content of change, which represents the vision of the new, preferred culture; leverage points for change, which refers to what and how to change; and a set of tactical choices, which address when and where to change (p. 156).

Schein (1992, pp. 305-319) posits that the change mechanism is a function of the evolutionary stages of an organization's culture. Change mechanisms used during one stage remain operational during subsequent stages. The first stage, founding and early growth, includes three strategies. The first -- incremental change through general and specific evolution--occurs through assimilating what seems to work best, over time. General evolution, characterized by increasing levels operational of diversification and complexity, provides a basis for generating new, more creative organizational processes. Specific evolution occurs when changes occurring in one organizational

environment impact the culture or activities of the entire organization. The second strategy, change through insight from organizational therapy, characterizes organizational culture as a learned defense mechanism generated to minimize uncertainty and anxiety produced by change efforts. The third strategy, change through promotion of hybrids within the culture, involves the "promotion of organizational insiders whose own assumptions are better adapted to the new external realities (p. 308-309)." This strategy holds that insiders have better credibility than externals, suggesting that organizational members are more open to their ideas about change. It also requires organizational insight into "what is broken," in the first place.

The second stage, mid-life, includes three strategies. The first strategy, change through systematic promotion from selected subcultures, assumes that organizational strength is a function of the diversity among subcultures. This strategy works by assessing strengths and weaknesses of subcultures and then "biasing" the total culture toward a successful subculture (p. 315). This strategy also often involves promoting organizational insiders and positioning them as change agents to leverage their inherent credibility. The second strategy, planned change through organization development projects and the creation of parallel learning structures (p. 317), begins at the top of the organizational hierarchy. It involves pursuing organizational development projects using internal or external consultants and the development of a new, temporary learning system to learn and test new assumptions. A major goal of this strategy is to move incongruent sub-cultures toward accepting an integrated agenda in

organization-wide change. This strategy presumes a significant degree of managerial insight into the organization's own culture. The third strategy, unfreezing and change through technological seduction, reflects Lewin's change model by recognizing the need to unfreeze as an antecedent to change. It is based upon the notion that the introduction of new technology will serve as the trigger to bring about a larger cultural change. In this strategy, new technology is introduced to "seduce" members into new behaviors that, in turn, "require them to reexamine their present assumptions and possibly adapt new values, beliefs, and assumptions (p. 318)."

The final stage, maturity and decline, includes five strategies. The first, change through infusion of outsiders, works through changing the mix of people within an organization to change the mix of shared assumptions that shape organizational culture and behavior. This strategy requires a crisis, the purpose of which is to create doubts about existing culture and assumptions. Outsiders are then ushered in, accompanied by new ideas and assumptions that, at first, threaten the existing culture. If these new assumptions solve the crisis, they are adopted. If they are not, the change effort generally fails. The second strategy, unfreezing through scandal and myth expulsion, is predicated on the idea that myths are a traditional aspect of organizational life. Argyris and Schon (1974, 1978) call these myths "espoused theories." These often differ from what Argyris and Schon call "theories-in-use," which reflect how people and organizations actually behave. When a scandal or some other situation arises that illuminates a significant difference between an espoused theory and a

theory-in-use, the myth is exploded with the intent of closing the gap between preferred and actual behavior. The third strategy, change through turnarounds, utilizes all other change mechanisms, but begins with unfreezing. A "turnaround manager or team" (p. 329), equipped with a clear change objective/destination, a change strategy, and the power to implement the strategy takes over after unfreezing occurs. In the absence of a change destination or plan, or the power to implement the intended change, the change effort will usually fail. The fourth strategy, change through coercive persuasion, involves the use of prolonged punishment or negative feedback for espoused beliefs. This is intended to produce a redefinition of beliefs to better fit the preferred context, thereby eliminating the motivation behind the punishment or negative feedback. The fifth and final strategy, destruction and rebirth, involves the dissolution of the organization or its culture through mergers, acquisitions, wholesale personnel changes, or some other vehicle. Once 'destroyed' the opportunity/change strategy is to rebuild a new. Objectives of this strategy often include true transformational change.

Kriegel & Brandt (1996, pp. 278-284) identify seven traits of "change readiness." They include resourcefulness, optimism, adventurousness, drive, adaptability, confidence, and tolerance for ambiguity. The pace at which change is introduced has been identified as an important factor in the degree to which resistance to change develops. Bastien (in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989), warns against introducing a change prior to the resolution of previous change attempts. He suggests that the introduction of too many changes, that

are too close together, can create conflict and uncertainty because organizations learn more slowly than individuals. Making a similar point, Argyris & Schon (1974) argue that learning occurs naturally but, in the absence of reflection, it is low quality.

Ring and Rands (in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989) offer a model, which they call Emergent Interpersonal Transaction Processes (EITP)" (p. 342-343). According to the authors, individual commitment to change is preceded by the development of cognitive maps, called sense making, which is followed by understanding, during which time shared cognitive maps are developed. Commitment then follows with "...individuals, seeking inclusion as agents or principles, bind themselves and/or their organizations to act (p. 342)."

Models of Innovation

King (in West and Farr, 1990) describe a number of models pertaining to the stages of innovation. These include Wilson's (1966) three-stage model in which an innovation starts with the conception of an innovation or change, is followed by the innovation or change being proposed, and then is finally adopted and implemented. Harvey and Mill's (1970) model starts with a perception of an issue, followed by goal formation, a search for solutions, the choice of a solution, and the redefinition of the issue given the solution. Hage and Aiken's (1970) four-stage model starts with evaluation, and moves through initiation, implementation, and routinization

Zaltman et al. (1973) propose a two-stage model in which the first stage—initiation-- begins with the development of knowledge or awareness, is followed by the formation of attitudes about a proposed innovation, and concludes with a decision to adopt an innovation. The second stage, implementation, moves through two sub-stages, the first being an initial implementation effort followed by a longer-term effort intended to sustain the implementation process. Kimberly's (1981) three-stage 'Innovation Life Cycle' model follows an adoption, utilization, innovation process in which the final stage refers to a return to the adoption stage. Rogers (1983) developed a two-stage model incorporating initiation and implementation. These steps or stages in these models usually begin with some type of combination of initiation and implementation activity, followed by the generation of an innovation idea that often proceeds from the recognition of a performance gap, followed by an ending process that attempts to routinize the innovation.

Innovation Strategy

The definition of innovation is a function of how it is being analyzed. Nicholson (1984) approaches the concept in the context of roles, and characterizes role innovation as the introduction of new roles, methods, materials and relationships in the accomplishment of a new task. Myers and Marquis (1969, in West and Farr, 1990) consider innovation to be a continuum of activities that begin with the conceptualization of a new idea, proceed through problem solution, and end with the realization of some economic or social value.

Zaltman et al. (1973, in West and Farr, 1990) define innovation as "...and idea, practice, or material artifact perceived to be new by the relevant unit of adoption (P. 10)." To Kanter (1983, in West and Farr, 1990), innovation is "...the process of bringing any new problem-solving idea into use (p. 20)." Senge (1990), suggests that innovation is a new idea that "...can be replicated reliably on a meaningful scale at practical costs.

West and Farr (in West and Farr, 1990), in outlining a typology of innovation, differentiate between technical and administrative innovation. The former relates to what an organization produces, while the latter is concerned with relationships between people, and between people and their work. Examples include rules, policies, procedures and structures concerned with communication between people, and between work environments and people. (Damanpour & Evan, 1984 in West and Farr, 1990). West and Farr note that administrative innovation tends to trigger technical innovation, but not the reverse (Evans, 1984; Damanpour & Evan, 1984, in West and Farr, 1990).

Zaltman (1973, in West and Farr, 1990) describes three dimensions of innovation. The first, programmed vs. non-programmed innovations, holds that programmed innovations are scheduled in advance while non-programmed innovations are not. The second, instrumental innovations are introduced to facilitate the subsequent introduction of ultimate innovations. The third dimension, radicalness, represents a combination of an innovation's novelty and risk.

Bouwen, De Visch and Steyaert (in Hosking and Anderson, eds., 1992), describe organizational innovation as "...any organizational or business change where disruption is experienced by those involved between the existing and the desired situation (p. 124)." Objects of organizational innovation diversification, management in which an innovation "...is experienced as jumping from familiar ground into unknown, sometimes challenging domains (p. 124)." Other types of innovation are also described in the literature including managerial innovation (Kimberly, 1981), educational innovation (Carlson, 1968), medical innovation, Coleman et al., 1966), corporate innovation (Ackermann and Harrop, 1985), and product innovation (Normann, 1971; Cooper, 1984). On this note, Watkins and Marsick (1993) suggest that product innovation can trigger organizational learning.

Managing Innovation

Lindquist and Muriel (in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989) differentiate between depth and breadth with regard to innovation adoption strategies. Breadth refers to the number of horizontal lines crossed within the organization during process of adopting an adoption. Measures of breadth include the number of affected organizational units, the amount of communication across lines, and whether it is a priority for top administration. Breadth emphasizes cross-divisional communication and the development of better organization-wide communication capacity. The depth strategy focuses on a specific

organizational unit, emphasizing the involvement of external stakeholders and its intra-divisional communication.

Staging the adoption of innovation is an important consideration in determining when and whether to employ a breadth or a depth strategy. In the initiation phase of innovation a "...more open, decentralized, and organic organizational approach is required. A more centralized, bureaucratic, and routinized process is typically used (and needed more) at the implementation phase (p. 563). This suggests that moving from a breadth strategy to a depth strategy will tend to "...facilitate innovation adoption (p. 564)."

Lindquist and Muriel's research on the adoption of a school-based management approach in two Minnesota public school systems lends support to four propositions (p. 577).

- Assuming that a breadth approach has top management's support, it will be more sustainable because barriers to its implementation are more easily overcome. Conversely, depth-based innovation, following the original pronouncement, is often quickly overlooked when other priorities surface.
- The more independent the adopting units are, the less important the need is for the support of top management support, which reduces the need for a breadth approach.

Depth approaches, because they are constrained by more rules and regulations, start more slowly. Breadth approaches start faster because they are not as constrained.

- Time required to implement an innovation varies with depth and breadth approach. Depth-based innovation takes more time during improvisation but less during expansion or disappearance. Breadth-based innovation requires less time during improvisation but more time during disappearance.

In related research, Munson and Pelz (1982) define depth as the extent of organization change required by those directly affected by the innovation. Breadth measures the percentage of people within the organization affected by the innovation. Pelz and Andrews (1976), in examining depth versus breadth in their study of lab groups of scientists and engineers, observed that depth referred to a high degree of similarity in technical approach and to the preference for a broad interest in new problem areas versus narrow specialization. On the other hands, breadth referred to more diversity in technical approach and a preference for addressing new problems and issues.

Van de Ven (1980) and Van de Ven and Poole (1986) compared broad program planning models with narrow planning approaches. Findings suggest that breadth, when applied in a planning model that crosses more organizational and agency lines, leads to more successful adoptions of innovations.

Damanpour (citing Ross, 1974, in West & Farr, 1990, pp. 136-137) identified three mechanisms necessary for the successful adoption of innovation in organizations. These include an initiating mechanism to bring new ideas to the organization, a sustaining mechanism to create a favorable internal climate for adoption, and a feedback mechanism to evaluate outcomes and provide information for retention, modification, or abandonment of the innovation.

Much has been written referring to the need for some type of catalyzing occurrence to unfreeze organizations, thus enabling them to innovate and change. Van de Ven (1986) suggests that 'jolts' are overcome inertia in organizations. Wilson (1963) believes that organizations are not likely to innovate in the absence of some kind of crisis. Additional support is found in the work of Marcus and Weber (1989) and by Cyert and March (1963), who note that organizations continue to do what they have always done until changing events compel them to change. Intervening influences include a large gap between expectations and aspirations, continuing failure to meet objectives, and externally-induced demands. Finally, Schon (1971) notes that events that threaten an organization's social system are often required to stimulate the organization to introduce new ways of doing business.

A number of authors have focused on the role policy makers play in facilitating innovation and change. Roberts and King (in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989, pp. 326-27) observe that some sort of provocation is needed to help move an organizational system past status quo and open it to change. They describe policy entrepreneurs as catalytic agents when they challenge the

conventional system, and suggest that crises often emerge when policy changes are not made at critical times. In similar research, Kingdom (1984, cited by Roberts and King, in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989) suggests that policy entrepreneurs link problems to solution, and that problems, solutions and alternatives exists in a state of chaos with the policy entrepreneur playing the role of connector. Reflecting a different view, Roberts and King (in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989) suggest that policy entrepreneurs act more strategically, deliberately, and consciously than Kingdom suggests in pursuit of self-interest. They argue that policy entrepreneurs give others permission to "to probe, question, and challenge the existing order" (p. 330).

Readiness to Innovate

Tushman and O'Reilly (1997) maintain that, in order for organizations to be able to consistently generate and sustain innovation, they must exhibit both "ambidexterity and congruence.' Ambidextrous organizations are those that possess the ability to host "...multiple, internally inconsistent architectures, competencies, and cultures, with built-in capabilities for efficiency, consistency, and reliability on the one hand and experimentation, improvisation, and luck on the other" (p. 167).

Ambidextrous organizations also possess the ability to undergo different types of innovations simultaneously. Three types of innovation, or "innovation streams" (p. 14), are described. They include incremental innovation, architectural innovation, and discontinuous innovation. Incremental innovation is

characterized by continual product or service improvements that build on previous improvements through modest extensions of existing technologies and processes. Architectural innovation involves the reconfiguration of existing technologies and processes in which relationships and linkages across organizational sub-units are encouraged and rewarded. Discontinuous innovation involves the development of completely new technologies and processes through learning and experimentation where breakthrough thinking is a primary objective.

Managing for multiple innovation streams requires that change managers/leaders develop "highly differentiated and highly integrated organizations" (p. 171) through the articulation of a clear vision, a diverse change management team, and effective team processes. Knowing when and how to move from one innovation stream to another is the primary challenge facing change managers in an ambidextrous organization. Understanding that incremental innovation is limiting in a rapidly changing, competitive environment is one thing. Knowing when and how to overcome the inertia that prevents the emergence of discontinuous innovation in the same environment is quite another.

The second innovation antecedent described by Tushman and O'Reilly has to do with how organizations solve problems associated with performance or opportunity shortfalls. The authors suggest that the alignment, or congruence, between strategy and four organizational building blocks -- critical tasks and work flows, formal organizational relationships, people, and culture -- drives today's

successes (p. 58)." Harrison (1996) also mentions this concept. He suggests that "...fit, congruence, or alignment refer to the extent to which the behavioral or organizational requirements and the constraints in one part of a system are compatible with those in other parts (p. 75).

Strebel (1992) offers approaches to managing innovation. These include organizational spin-offs, intrapreneurship, task forces for innovation, and restructuring for team competition. Parallel organizations, which are tied to but are allowed to operate independent of the central organization, are called "spin-offs" (p. 127). They are recommended when a central organization exhibits strong resistance to change or when other factors inhibit the emergence of innovation. The role of an innovation spin-off is to concentrate on the creation of new products, technologies, or processes. Intrapreneurship focuses on "the spontaneous emergence of self-motivated project champions and teams" (p. 128). Autonomy and encouragement are used as tools to foster innovation. Opportunities for process innovations developed by teams to spread to the larger organization suggest that this approach is appropriate for organizations exhibiting a low resistance to change. Unlike intrapreneurship teams, which emerge spontaneously, task forces for innovation are created by management around the need to bring innovation to the accomplishment of some critical task. Innovation task forces are intended to be autonomous, and they are often employed to stimulate incremental innovation within the larger organization. Restructuring for team competition refers to the desegregation of an organization into separate units, each pursuing a separate product or service. Another

iteration of a team-based structure, restructured teams, require entrepreneurial managers who excel in a competitive environment and see potential and opportunity in this approach to change.

Characteristics of Organizational Leaders and Managers

Mohr's (1969) classic study of innovation in American and Canadian health organizations found a significant, positive relationship between leader motivation (as ideology-activism) and frequency of innovation. It was found that a more liberal ideology, combined with a more interactive role, produced higher levels of innovation. Kimberly & Evaisko (1981), in examining leader characteristics and innovation in United States health organizations, found individual leader characteristics to be a poorer predictor of technological innovation than organizational factors. Pierce & Delbecq (1977) & Patti (1974) suggest that organizational innovation is facilitated by "strategic decision makers" (p. 29) when those individuals possess pro-change values.

Van de Ven (1986) suggests that leaders and managers must stress three principles if organizations are to develop an innovation-friendly infrastructure. These include the definition of limits for innovation through the establishment of values and standards; the development of double loop learning capacity, which refers to the capacity to detect and correct deviations from organizational standards, as well as the standards themselves; and the preservation of uncertainty and diversity. Rogers (1983), in examining the role of change

agents who are frequently from outside an organization, observed that success is positively related to seven factors: 1) a client orientation rather than a change-agency orientation; 2) the degree to which the diffusion program is compatible with clients' needs; 3) the change agents' empathy with clients; 4) his or her homophily with clients; 5) credibility in the clients' eyes; 6) the extent to which he or she works through opinion leaders; and 7) increasing clients' ability to evaluate innovations, (p. 343).

Resistance to Change

Watson (1973) and Zaltman & Duncan (1977) discuss how selective perception explains why people, after they form an attitude, tend to respond to change suggestions within the confines of that attitude. Bedeian (1980, in West and Farr, 1990, p. 31) identify five factors associated with resistance to innovation. These include: 1) vested interests of organizational members; 2) rejection of outsiders when an innovation is introduced by an external change agent; 3) misunderstandings due to lack of clarity especially between higher management and those on whom an innovation is imposed; 4) an organizational structure incompatible with the innovation; and 5) lack of top-level support and commitment. It should be noted that the last three factors played a major role in the failure of a new teaching system in Gross et al.'s (1971) study of innovation in an educational setting. West & Farr (1990) note that resistance to change can be positive in the face of negative, unanticipated consequences associated with an innovation.

Innovation and Organizational Characteristics

An organizational characteristic of interest to a number of authors is organizational size. A number of researchers (Kimberly & Evanisko, 1981; Kaluzny et al., 1974; Mohr, 1969, Mytinger, 1968) found that larger health care facilities adopted more technological and administrative innovations, although dissimilar results were observed by Rogers (1983). However, Kimberly (1976) notes the difficulty in relying on organizational size to predict innovation performance. Rogers (1983) asserts that organizational size may serve as an intervening variable in determining innovativeness.

The relationship between innovativeness and four dimensions of organizational structure have also been examined, including centralization, formalization, complexity, and stratification. Zaltman et al. (1973) observed that low centralization and formalization in combination facilitates initiation of innovation with high complexity. High centralization and formalization, and low complexity, facilitates the implementation of innovation. Hage & Aiken (1967), Burns & Stalker (1961), and Shepard (1967) found that high centralization inhibits innovation because it restricts channels of communication and reduces information. West & Farr (1990) posit that decentralized structures increase participation because it folds in more viewpoints and produces greater diversity of ideas.

Zaltman et al. (1973) suggest that formalization inhibits the initiation of innovation because strict rules may keep decision makers away from new sources of information. Neal and Radnor (1971) suggest that formalization

(through the deployment of rules and procedures) supports innovation. Zaltman et al. (1973) note that complexity supports the initiation of innovation through the introduction of new information and knowledge. However, conflicts that develop around new knowledge and information tend to make innovation more difficult to implement when a consensus model is used. In organizations where a hierarchical structure dominates, Kanter (1983) observes that stratification serves as a barrier to innovation and the creativity that gives rise to it.

A number of authors believe that an abundance of resources are positively associated with innovation, particularly when resources are sufficient to produce 'slack that is needed to give organizations room to innovate (Mohr, 1969; Rogers & Agarwala-Rogers, 1976; Rogers, 1983). However, too much slack may generate negative consequences when it insulates an organization against environmental jolts (Meyer, 1982). When investment in an innovation is high, an organization can become reluctant to abandon it even though it needs to or should (Teger (1980; Kimberly, 1981).

Other organizational characteristics that have been examined in relation to innovation include organizational knowledge of innovation (West & Farr, 1990; Rodgers and Agarwala-Rogers, 1976; Kimberly, 1978; Tushman, 1977; Kimberly & Evanisko (1981); organizational age (Aiken and Aldord, 1970; Pierce & Delbecq, 1977); and organization strategy, climate and culture (Meyer, 1982; Brooks-Rooney et al., 1987: Morgan, 1986; Bower, 1965; Duncan, 1972; and Handy, 1985).

Innovation and Extra-Organizational Characteristics

Retaining or securing a competitive advantage is a major reason why organizations decide to innovate (Walton, 1987; Foster, 1986). Kimberly (1981) and Caplow (1964) note that the status and prestige generally associated with competitive advantage also serve as reasons why organizations innovate. However, pointing to the development of the 'new' Coca-Cola beverage, West and Farr (1990) suggest that innovation is not always the best response to competition.

Aiken & Alford (1970) posit that instability and unpredictability stimulate innovation by making an organization more aware of 'cues' to innovate. Additionally, evidence strongly supports the notion that complexity stimulates innovation (Baldridge & Burnham, 1975; Kimberly, 1981)

Conclusions

Change Models

Several models describe kinds of change (Quinn, 1996; Nadler and Tusman, in Nadler, Shaw and Walton and Associates, 1995) or the transactions that occur within organizations during the change process (Bacharach, Bamberger and Sonnenstuhl's (1996). In some way, most if not all of these models build upon or incorporate Lewin's (1951) unfreeze-move-refreeze model.

Change Management Strategy

Some authors on change strategy focus on the emotional dimensions of individuals (Green and Butkus, 1999; Marks and Shaw, in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995). Others address the larger organizational cultural environments in which change unfolds (Schein, 1985; Schneider and Rentsch, in Hage, 1988). Bowman and Deal's unique approach describes the organizational contexts that frame the change process (Bowman and Deal, 1984). Some authors focus on specific change management steps or stages (Morris and Raben, in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995; Ring and Rands, in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989). Kriegel & Brandt (1996) focus on variables associated with organizational readiness to under change.

What this literature suggests is that organizational change is a very complex process that unfolds differently within different organizations based upon unique and changing conditions. While certain dimensions of change may be managed, many more are difficult to predict or control. Organizations anticipating change are wise to reflect on their readiness to change, the degree to which culture impacts readiness, and what strategies make sense given organizational realities.

Innovation Strategy

On this topic, authors have defined (Zaltman et al., 1973, in West and Farr, 1990; Nicholson, 1984) and described innovation (Bouwen, De Visch and Steyaert, in Hosking and Anderson, eds., 1992); West and Farr, 1990; Myers

and Marquis, 1969 in West and Farr, 1990;). Some authors have constructed typologies of innovation (West and Farr, 1990), while others have outlined how innovation occurs within an organization (Lindquist and Muriel, in Van de Ven, Angle and Poole, 1989) or have addressed issues associated with readiness to innovate (Damanpour (citing Ross, 1974, in West & Farr, 1990). Van de Ven (1986) and Wilson (1963), tying together Lewin's (1951) change model to innovation, address organizational conditions they consider to be antecedent to innovation. Tushman and O'Reilly (1997) describe organizational conditions that must be in place before organizations can sustain innovation.

This literature helps to clarify that innovation is a type of change--the introduction of something new to an organization. Whether the innovation is a new administrative process, a new organizational structure, or a new technology, it represents organizational change. Because innovation often requires organizational changes that vary greatly in size and scope, differences in strategy often reflect differences of degree rather than kind.

Characteristics of Organizational Leaders

This section addresses the roles and influence of organizational leaders and managers relative to organizational change and innovation (Van de Ven, 1986; Bedeian, 1980, in West and Farr, 1990; Zaltman & Duncan, 1977; Watson, 1973; Mohr, 1969).

The roles available to organizational leaders in the adoption and management of change and innovation are numerous, and the impact they can

have strategy and implementation profound. Change management typically requires managers to be skilled at many roles, including decision maker, coach, facilitator, scholar, and diagnostician.

CHAPTER THREE

SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS

Introduction

Self-Directed Work Teams (SDWTs), like most other innovations, evolved out of a need to improve something. In this case, the problem involves the way that organizations function. Conventional ways of doing business, particularly in the United States, involve vertical organizational structures in which organizational goals begin at the top and flow progressively downward through and to lower organizational levels. This structural model assumes that creativity and, to a great degree, general organizational and leadership competency, rises to and "lives" at the top of organizations. The lower levels are reserved for the 'doers,' the middle is for the 'practiced,' and the top is reserved for the leaders—the directors and executives.

Origins of the Self Directed Work Team

Deeprose (1995) recognizes the importance of research undertaken in the 1950s by Trist and Bamforth of the Tavistock Institute on teams in British coal mines and in and other organizations. Trist (1951) found that "...workers who were more involved in the operation were better equipped to respond to changing market and political conditions--something that large and rigid organizations found difficult" (reported by Wellins et al., 1991; p. 8). Harrington-Mackin (1994) reports that SDWT experiments were conducted during the 1950s

by General Foods, Inc. Other early applications of SDWTs surfaced in companies such as Proctor & Gamble (Wellins et al., 1991; Fisher, 1993; Deeprose, 1995) and the Gaines Dog Food Company (Wellins et al., 1991). Over time, many companies embraced SDWTs, including Xerox, Best Foods, General Electric, IBM, Corning, Digital Equipment Corporation, Colgate-Palmolive Company (Wellins et al., 1991; Orsborn et al., 1990).

Why Teams?

Vertical/hierarchical organizational structures have been successful over time. This organizational form has helped make the U.S. economy the largest the world has ever known. So why, then, is there a need to do something different? The answer lies embedded in the concern that hierarchical organizational structures are slow in responding to increasing competition and do not adequately harness an organization's creative energy (Wellins et al., 1991; Orsborn et al., 1990; Fisher, 1993; Deeprose, 1995).

Wellins, Byham and Wilson (1991) identify "improved quality, productivity and service; greater (organizational) flexibility; reduced operating costs; faster response to technological change; fewer, simpler job classifications; better response to worker values; and the ability to attract and retain the best people" as operational advantages of teams. Orsborn et al. (1990) identify "productivity, streamlining flexibility, quality, commitment and customer satisfaction" as the advantages of SDWTs. Quick (1992) identifies collaboration between team members as the main benefit of organizing work around teams. Quick (1992)

discovered collaboration, communication, resources, simultaneously-made decisions and solutions, commitment, and quality as the benefits of team-based organization. Clearly, as a means of accomplishing high performance goals associated with product and service and product quality, internal efficiency, harnessing the talents of employees and flexibility in dealing with changing business environments, teams and SDWTs offer a great deal.

Organizational Issues Associated With the Adoption of SDWTs

There is more than sufficient evidence to suggest that SDWTs offer performance-based advantages over the conventional "command and control" model. However, if an organization's operating mode is firmly rooted in a command and control paradigm, attempts to get it to move toward or adopt SDWTs will likely prove difficult. Marshall (1995) terms this conflict "culture war." This war is a conflict of values and it may permeate the entire organization, not just upper. He continues:

> "Just as management is in conflict, so too are members of the workforce, some of whom want to be told what to do, while others insist on significant participation in real decisions. No one is wrong or right; the question is, what process will work in the new realities?" (p.16)

The literature provides some guidance as to what organizational conditions are necessary for SDWTs to succeed. Wellins et al. (1991), asserting that empowerment is central to the development and operation of SDWTs, note that clarifying organizational values and developing a vision around them is a prerequisite for the emergence of an "empowered culture (p. 89)." Shaffer and Anundsen (1993:pp. 272-273) note that teams, in order to thrive, require an

organizational environment characterized by "trust and respect." Fisher (1993) warns that a lack of managerial support for a transition to SDWTs may surface as a reluctance to provide necessary levels of fiscal and human resources (p. 22).

Given the importance of 'SDWT-friendly' conditions, how can organizations assess their readiness to incorporate SDWTs? The literature contains a number of useful guides for organizations wishing to undertake such as self-assessment. Orsborn et al. (1990, pp. 40) identify six domains for analyzing organizational readiness for SDWTs: 1) compatibility of work processes; 2) employee willingness and ability to accomplish self-directed work; 3) the ability of managers to adapt to hands-off leadership; 4) whether or not the market is robust enough to support increased productivity without workforce reductions; 5) whether or not the organization's policies and culture (in both corporate and field locations) will support the transition to SDWTs; and 6) whether or not broader stakeholders will support an organization's transition to SDWTs. This cluster of 'readiness criteria' suggests the importance of organization-wide acceptance of, and 'buy-in' to, the SDWT concept.

Wellins et al. (1991) also offer an assessment tool for determining organizational readiness for SDWTs. Their fifteen-question instrument measures employee attitudes about

- Management's belief in the appropriateness and ability to make decisions that affect their work

- The ability of employees to recommend and implement workplace improvements without several levels of managerial approval
- The degree to which the nature of work performed is consistent with either a team or an individual approach
- The capacity of availability technology to accommodate team functioning
- Whether work can be organized so that teams can take responsibility for their work; employee willingness to work in teams
- Whether employees believe the organizational culture supports teams and empowerment
- The history of the organization in following through on other organizational development activities
- Employee confidence in management's ability to adopt team and empowerment-based roles and behaviors
- The availability of technical, support and other resources necessary to support SDWTs
- The degree to which management understands and is willing to commit to the lengthy team development process
- The organization's capacity to communicate with front-line employees
- The degree to which employees possess sufficient skills to accept greater control over their work, and
- The degree to which supervisors are willing to train their employees in team-based work concepts and methods (pp. 95-99).

Taken together, successful introduction of SDWTs requires organizational cultures that encourage, support, and live empowerment. There must be an authentic willingness to: share power and control; operate based on honesty, openness, mutual trust and respect; encourage risk-taking and employee growth; embrace participative leadership at all levels; have the organizational support systems necessary to launch and sustain SDWTs; and, most importantly, possess a firm conceptual understanding of, and demonstrable commitment to, SDWT principles and processes.

Fundamental Concepts of Self Directed Work Teams

The literature on SDWTs is young but growing. Five concepts emerge from the theory and research associated with this emerging field: empowerment, leadership, learning and team, and collaboration.

Empowerment

Empowerment has come to be used almost to the point of overuse, which lends to confusion over its meaning. Virtually all of the available literature on SDWTs holds empowerment to be the central quality of what 'self-directed' really means. Wellins et al. (1991) sees empowerment as increasing levels of employee participation in workplace decisions and process. He offers a useful definition that reflects the role played by empowerment in SDWTs:

> ....empowerment occurs when power goes to employees who then experience a sense of ownership and control over their jobs. Empowered individuals know that their jobs belong to them. Given "a say" in how things are done, employees feel more responsible.

When they feel responsible, they show more initiative in their work, get more done, and enjoy the work more." (p. 22)

Bucholz (1987:p. 31) adds that the process of empowering employees "suggests that you give responsibility, communicate the importance of each team member, provide the opportunity for value, and allow each participant to become an equal member of the team." Fisher (1993: pp. 13-15) offers a formula for empowerment as a way to define it. This formula holds that empowerment is a function of four variables: authority, resources, information and accountability, expressed as: Empowerment = f (Authority, Resources, Information, Accountability). He holds that if any of these is equal to equal zero, empowerment ceases to exist. Fisher goes on to offer his "Empowerment Continuum" (adaptation of "The Involvement Continuum" from Belgard, Fisher, Rayner, 1989), which links empowerment to levels of employee involvement in various dimensions of their work/jobs (Fisher, 1993:p. 14). He found that employee suggestions are at the low end of this continuum; in the middle are task forces and quality circles; and at the high end are SDWTs (p. 15). Fisher's treatment of empowerment is particularly useful because he uses it to link SDWTs with employee participation in, and control of, their work.

Marshall (1995), speaking to empowered teams, links empowerment to team-based accountability in the process of defining his "collaborative team-based-organization." He provides a useful matrix that, like Fisher, links high levels of empowerment with higher levels of team autonomy, and low levels of empowerment with higher levels of managerial control over operations. Orsborrn et al. (p. 34) outline eight levels of employee involvement/participation and link

each to a "primary outcome." They include: information sharing (conformance); dialogue (acceptance); special problem solving (contribution); intra-group problem solving (commitment); inter-group problem solving (cooperation); focused problem solving (concentration); limited self-direction (accountability); and total self-direction (ownership).

It is important, though, to distinguish between empowering a team for self-direction, on one hand, and cutting it adrift, on the other. Deeprose (1995:p. 59), speaking to the role of team coaches, speaks to this issue. She states:

Team coaches use all the skills discussed to develop empowered teams. But coaches also need another capability that may seem out of line with those we have discussed. They need to be able to intervene. They also need to be able to determine when an intervention is appropriate and what kind of intervention will support the goals of the organization and the team, while bolstering the team's ability to handle a similar situation on its own next time. In some cases, avoiding intervention isn't empowerment; it's abdication. It's giving the team enough rope to hang itself." (p. 59)

Empowerment, as an end, provides teams the power they need to function and the motivation they need to have significant control over, and commitment to, their work. As a means it fosters the development of mutual accountability (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993) and provides a seedbed for the emergence of team confidence to be productively self-directed.

Leadership

Perhaps Stewart and Manz (1995) have conducted the most useful research connecting leadership to SDWTs. Their work produced a model that establishes two leadership continuums. The first is concerned with the degree of involvement a leader may have within a team setting, moving from passive to active involvement; the second involves the amount of power a leader wields within a team setting, moving between autocratic and democratic leadership. Based upon this model, the researchers identify four types of leader behavior: overpowering leadership, powerless leadership, power building leadership and empowered leadership.

Their research succeeded in illustrating how different leadership styles produce different team behaviors. For example, overpowering leadership tends to be associated with autocratic organizational structures led by autocratic managers; and with leaders possessing limited leadership experience and a "high need for power" combined with a "low need for affiliation." Empowered leadership, on the other hand, is likely to be reflected in organizations primarily concerned with long-term performance goals, which are led by experienced managers with low power needs and high affiliation needs. These leaders permit autonomy to develop at lower organizational levels, enabling teams to "develop and mature."

These conclusions suggest that empowering leadership is more conducive to team-based organization. The literature is rife with examples of styles or types of leadership and how some tend to be more closely associated

with the success of SDWTs than others. For many, leadership for SDWTs embodies a new and emerging leadership paradigm. Transactional leadership are generally regarded as the "old leadership paradigm" in that leaders and followers enter into an exchange transaction. Leaders provide direction, resources and rewards in exchange for followers' work, or services. In newer leadership approaches, such as transformational leadership, "followers" are encouraged to develop into leaders. Newer leadership approaches reflect these values: increased employee/member participation, democratic approaches to work, an emphasis on relationship building, and increased consideration of the needs of followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Bucholz & Roth (1987) write of the difference between authoritative and participative leadership. They make the point that the ability of employees to work more independently rises with increasing levels of participative leadership, where employees have more influence over their work, the rules that govern it, and their own progress. They view the development of independent employees as essential to the development of high performance teams. Advocates the new leadership paradigm (e.g., Deeprose,1995; Fisher, 1993) call for a departure from traditional views of leadership as supervision to viewing leadership as a developmental process designed to build follower leadership capacity, independence, and technical competence. Deeprose (1995: p. 52) identifies listening, communicating, advocating, team building, facilitating decision making, training, educating and mentoring as key leadership-as-coach skills. Fisher (1993) identifies a number of competencies he considers essential for leaders of

teams, including modeling, facilitating change, providing vision and coaching. Fisher's "new leader" leads by example, striving to empower team members, encouraging collaborative behavior, and serving as a team resource through her/his facilitative, analytical and managerial skills. Orsburn et al (1990:p. 21) include "leader-centered teams" as one of the stages teams go through on the way to becoming fully self-directed. They note the importance of followers developing into leaders, leaders behaving as coaches, and the necessary blurring of the lines between those who manage and those who are managed.

Marshall (1995:p. 78), advocating a collaborative approach to leadership, offers a menu of team leader roles including facilitation, coach, change agent/catalyst, healer, member and manager/administrator. Wellins (1991) distinguishes between the leader of a group and the leader of a team, suggesting that group leaders exist outside the team while "team leaders" exist as part of the team. This distinction is useful through the guidance it provides supervisors and managers who are transitioning to a SDWT model by providing them with role definitions (as group leaders) when they are not part of a working team. Finally, Covey (1992) connects four levels of leadership to four key principles: organizational leadership to the principle of alignment; managerial leadership to the principle of empowerment; interpersonal leadership to the principle of trust; and personal leadership to the principle of trustworthiness. He holds trust supreme, stating that "trust-or the lack of it" is at the root of success or failure in relationships and in the bottom-line results of business, industry, education, and government (p. 31), and identifies a number of leadership

qualities he associates with his concept of "principle-centered leadership." Understanding why Covey believes certain leadership principles to be essential for the basic operation of organizational activity (trust), we can better understand the value of the characteristics he assigns to principle-centered leaders. He maintains (pp. 33-39) that principle-centered leaders are constantly learning, are service-oriented, radiate positive energy, believe in other people, lead balanced lives, see life as an adventure, are synergistic and exercise for self-renewal.

While the connection between some of these characteristics SDWTs might be somewhat unclear, it is important to consider that leadership attitude and behavior is a function of the psyche, and that one's leadership flows from who one is and how one relates to the world.

Learning

Individuals, teams and organizations all have the opportunity to learn from experience. Wellins et al. (1991) suggest that the opportunity to learn is not always matched with either an expectation to learn or the knowledge of how to learn. They state that:

> Learning is acquired early in life from accredited experts and that, when formal schooling ends, learning gives way to work. As a result, our capacity and ability to learn atrophies (p. 185)."

The importance of team/organizational learning cannot be understated if organizations are to be conducive to collaborative team processes. Marshall (1995: pp. 35-36) underscores the value of learning as a part of the development of teams. Emphasizing that recognition of team and team member

accomplishments and their professional growth is essential to the development of a collaborative team dynamic, he states:

> As part of the project cycle, for example, there should be a debriefing on every aspect of a project for lessons learned--both positive and negative--and any suggested improvements should be integrated and institutionalized in the next project cycle. But this approach to continuous improvement also applies to group and individual learning. The focus must be on process skills and cultural adjustments as well as on the bottom-line systems or structural changes (pp. 35-36)."

The level of interest and energy invested in learning processes and systems--the degree to which we choose to consciously learn from our experience--is critical in team and organizational learning.

Schon (1983) maintains that conscious reflection about experience is the essential process through which we learn, as organizations, teams and individuals. Schon maintains that, when managers consciously self-question themselves about their experiences (a concept he calls reflection-in-action), they accumulate knowledge for use in subsequent organizational. The degree to which an organization promotes or encourages reflection-in-action determines the degree to which a "learning system" exists or does not exist within it (pp. 241-242). His point is that managers may or may not reflect, or be encouraged to reflect, upon their experiences as a way of consciously connecting with knowledge generated through those experiences, and then pass it on to the organization at large. He also raises the question as to whether or not an organization has a systematic way of either capturing and using that knowledge.

Morgan (1986) also focuses on the process of self-questioning, labeling it double-loop learning (p. 87). In his view, self-questioning is directed at the

assumptions and predominant operating norms that undergird organizational paradigms. He posits three blocks to double-loop learning: thought that is constrained by organizational paradigms; employee reluctance to consider complex problems for fear of not being viewed as capable of solving them; and "group think" (and other self-serving thought patterns) that arise from an interest in appearing, to themselves or others, as more competent than they may actually be. In terms of how to learn how to learn, Schon suggests that "...the whole process of learning to learn hinges on an ability to remain open to changes occurring in the environment, and on an ability to challenge operating assumptions in a most fundamental way (p. 91)."

Chapter 12 of Peter Senge's 1990 book, The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization is entitled "Team Learning." In this chapter, Senge offers a number of concepts he considers fundamental to the process of team learning. One these concepts is alignment (p. 234), a phenomenon where "a group of people functions as a whole." Senge maintains that "alignment is the necessary condition before empowering the individual will empower the whole team" (p. 234). He believes synergy between and among members and a shared vision of mission and goals as fundamental to the emergence of alignment. According to Senge, team learning requires that team members give thoughtful attention to complex issues as a basis for designing innovative, coordinated actions.

Becoming a Team

Definitions of "team" abound in the literature. Senge's (1990:p. 234) concept of alignment is useful in characterizing team as "when a group of people function as a whole." Marshall (1995) holds that teams are, above all else, collaborative by nature and function. Quick's (1992) definition is particularly appealing because it captures the basic characteristics of team found throughout the literature. He states:

> The most distinguishing characteristic of a team is that its members have, as their highest priority, the accomplishment of team goals. They may be strong personalities, possess highly developed specialized skills, and commit themselves to a variety of personal objectives they hope to achieve through their activity; but, to them, the most important business at hand is the success of the group in reaching the goal that its members, collectively and with one voice, have set. The members support one another, collaborate freely, and communicate openly and clearly with one another.
> Most non-team groups, on the other hand, tend to be collections of personalities with their own agendas, which may be more valuable to those personalities than the agenda that the majority of the group members seek to fulfill. Discussions and relationships in such groups are often characterized by shifting agendas, power subgroups, a going along with decisions rather than a wholehearted commitment, and even a win-lose orientation: One person or subgroup gains its wishes over another (p. 3).

Quick's definition contains or refers to a number of widely accepted team-based characteristics including commitment, collaboration, shared team goals/vision, accomplishment/success and mutual support. Others include synergy (Senge, 1990; Bucholz 1987), shared responsibility (Senge, 1990); Bucholz, 1987); shared vision (Bucholz, 1987) and an 'other' or 'team' orientation (Katzenbach, & Smith, 1993; Quick, 1992; Fisher, 1993; Orsburn et al., 1990; Covey, 1991). Joining Quick in highlighting the difference between team and

group is Katzenbach & Smith (1993). They state that "...real teams -- not just groups that management calls "teams" -- should be the basic unit of performance for most organizations, regardless of size, and that teams "are more productive than groups that have no clear performance objectives because their members are committed to deliver tangible performance results (p. 15)."

The literature reveals a number of consistent processes teams employ or in pursuit of their goals. These processes include team building (Quick, 1990), developing trust (Quick 1992; Bucholz, 1987; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Covey, 1991; Deeprose, 1995); dealing with conflict (Deeprose, 1995; Shaffer & Anundsen, 1993; Quick, 1992; Senge, 1990; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Harrington-Mackin, 1994; Marshall, 1995); group decision making (Deeprose, 1995; Quick, 1992; Buchholz & Roth, 1987; Fisher, 1993; Orsburn et al, 1990); group problem solving (Deeprose, 1995; Senge, 1990; Harrington-Mackin, 1994; Buchholz & Roth, 1987; Wellins, et al., 1991; Orsburn et al, 1990); dealing with change (Covey, 1991; Senge, 1990; Marshall, 1995; Wellins, et al., 1991; communication (Wellins, et al., 1991; Marshall, 1995; Covey, 1991; Harrington-Mackin, 1994; Fisher, 1993; Orsburn et al, 1990; Buchholz & Roth, 1987; Quick, 1992; Deeprose, 1995); maturation (Deeprose, 1995; Orsburn et al, 1990; Fisher, 1993); developing team member commitment (Wellins, et al., 1991; Marshall, 1995; Senge, 1990; Senge, 1990; Fisher, 1993; Orsburn et al, 1990); team/peer appraisal (Quick, 1992; Deeprose, 1995; Orsburn et al, 1990; Fisher, 1993; Harrington-Mackin, 1994; Marshall, 1995; Wellins, et al., 1991); and team member rewards/recognition (Wellins, et al., 1991; ; Marshall, 1995; Katzenbach

& Smith, 1993; Harrington-Mackin, 1994; Fisher, 1993; Orsburn et al, 1990; Deeprose, 1995; Quick, 1992).

Implementing Self Directed Work Teams

The way in which an organization makes the transition to SDWTs represents a critical factor associated with the eventual success of teams. The process includes the implementation plan; conceptual framework; re-orienting supervisors and managers; understanding and bypassing barriers; and an ongoing "care and feeding program".

It seems common sense enough to suggest that implementing SDWTs requires a well conceived and thoughtfully considered plan. This is particularly true given the cultural conversion many organizations will have to undergo in order to successfully transition to SDWTs. The literature abounds with examples of what considerations should be included in such a plan. Wellins et al. (1991:p. 102) offer an approach design that includes four planning principles:

- Vision--developing consensus as to the need for change and how the organization wants change to unfold
- Design--a plan of action that includes an analysis of where the organization is, where it needs to go, and a step-by-step strategy for getting there
- Implementation--unfolding of the plan, and
- Monitoring--a double-loop evaluation and re-design process.

This approach requires a number of self-questioning exercises designed to assess whether and how SDWTs fit into an organization's culture and goals. Orsburn et al, (1990:p. 220) offer an implementation menu that includes

- Employee involvement (alternatives to self-direction)
- The steering committee
- The feasibility study
- The development of a mission statement
- The design team, team member and manager' supervisor training
- Employee training
- Awareness training
- Workplace analysis
- The peer discipline and performance review processes
- Recognition and reward techniques
- "Mature team-new team" coaching, and
- Diffusion strategies.

For each item, they ask a "what" question (concerning the step's importance), a "when" question (when to use the technique), a "who" question (person or persons primarily responsible for implementing the technique), a "how" question (how to implement the technique), a "what's next" question (what can be expected as a result of implementing the technique and the next steps associated with it), and a "case in point" question (how something actually worked).

Fisher (1993:pp.164-171) proposes a five-stage model for SDWT implementation. It includes investigation (exploring and understanding the organizational investments necessary to implement SDWTs); preparation (developing organizational support for the transition to SDWTs and developing new operating procedures and policies); implementation (the operational unfolding of the plan in which teams are formed and work through the uncertainty, confusion and unfamiliarity of a new way of working); transition (often through trial and error, the development of team skills that enable teamwork and self-direction to surface and improve); and maturation (the process of team learning and continual improvement of team skills as a function of experience with SDWTs).

All the approaches described here recognize the need to adequately assess the organization for its cultural and operational readiness for SDWTs. They also see the need for organization-wide orientation concerning the need and value of SDWTs, and training including how and why SDWTs work. Also necessary are the development of plans for redesigning organizational activities based on SDWT concepts, and a process for organizational learning so that lessons learned can be captured and folded into ongoing implementation.

Pitfalls of Implementation

Several authors remind us that certain barriers impede the successful implementation of SDWTs. Pitfalls that are most common to the introduction of SDWTs involve resistance to change.

We have all heard the adage that 'it all starts at the top.' This means that the management needs to be genuinely committed to the concept of SDWTs. Harrington-Mackin (1994:pp. 1-2) begins her book by stating the importance of managerial commitment by stating that management "at all levels must support team efforts openly and without reservation if it expects teams to succeed (p. 1)." She goes on to link this support to team productivity: "If the team members feel support and commitment from management, they will exhibit high productivity. If team members are angry because of a lack of organizational support, they will limit their efforts (p. 2)." Wellins et al. (1991) and Marshall (1995) express similar views. Fisher (1993:p. 22) identifies "lack of managerial commitment...as the single biggest reason" SDWTs fail to produce expected organizational improvements.

Wellins et al. (1991) mention a number of other pitfalls to the successful implementation of SDWTs. On the subject of managerial/supervisory participation in the design process, they suggest that gaining the support and ownership of managers and supervisors is absolutely essential. A critical step is involving them in the early design stages. They also contend that selecting the wrong people to lead SDWT transition or design teams can be problematic: Many teams have discovered that good selection is a critical and often irreversible part of the process. If the team is inadvertently stacked with dysfunctional members, it will be difficult to change their behavior or remove them from the team without disrupting the cohesiveness of the team (p. 144).

Transitioning the roles of supervisors and managers from supervision/management to new leadership forms based on a more facilitative, support role can also be a challenge. Wellins et al. (1991:pp. 127-128) state that this change in leadership roles "often elicits fear, anger, ambiguity, and resistance" in supervisors and managers in response to the disappearance of an vertical organizational ladder to climb. They ask the question: "If teams begin to manage themselves, what is left for the leader to do (p. 128)?" In response to this fear, they suggest that "...it is important to provide leaders with new responsibilities to replace those that have been shifted to the team (p. 134)."

Summary

The contribution that SDWTs can make to organizational performance and effectiveness is well documented. When properly designed and introduced into an organization that is truly ready for them, we can expect to see higher levels of employee performance in such areas as employee/member creativity, commitment, initiative, trust, openness and communication, and collaboration. This can translate into higher product and service quality, lower operating costs, more effective long-range planning and market positioning, and a more enjoyable workplace.

In spite of these benefits, SDWTs do not represent a panacea. Organizations lacking the administrative will to bring their cultural norms and operating procedures in line with a conceptual framework based upon empowerment and collaboration should seriously consider not implementing them. A willingness to go through an exhaustive self-analysis for readiness will

accomplish two goals. First, it will give an organization an accurate picture of itself, in terms of its values, strengths, and weaknesses. It will also act as a yardstick for measuring itself in relation to potential gaps between where it is and where it wants to go. The best advice is to do it honestly, carefully, and completely. Even if an organization chooses not to adopt SDWTs, it will know itself more fully by having undertaken a readiness analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A Case Study Approach

This study examined variables associated with organizational readiness to adopt change and innovation. A collective case study approach was selected for this research due to this method's ability to illustrate emergent issues across multiple organizational contexts (Creswell, 1998). A particular strength of the case study approach is its ability to examine the relationships between complex social variables and organizational phenomena (Merriam, 1998).

Selection of Study Sites

The researcher also established a number of decision criteria as the basis for determining whether, in fact, each prospective study site was adopting self-directed work teams as opposed to some other team-based work form.

Based upon the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, these minimal criteria include a moderate to high degree of freedom in determining what work will be produced; the creation of joint work products; mutual accountability among team members; team-based generation and implementation of operating processes, guidelines, and other rules; and an expectation that the team will take an entrepreneurial approach to resource development to include the ability to identify and pursue funding outside the formal Extension organization. The researcher's first hand knowledge of how SDWTs were conceived and

operationalized at both Michigan State University Extension and the University of Wisconsin-Extension/Cooperative Extension was sufficient for him to establish that self-directed work teams were being adopted at both institutions. The researcher conducted a preliminary round of telephone interviews with change managers at Ohio State University to establish that SDWTs were, in fact, being adopted there, which they were.

Selection of Participants

The focus of this research is organizational readiness to adopt self-directed work teams (SDWTs) in Extension organizations. An assumption of this study is that concepts associated with organizational readiness to adopt SDWTs teams represent a set of considerations made by individuals who contribute to, or influence: 1) institutional decisions concerning whether SDWTs are adopted or not; and 2) how SDWTs are conceptualized, introduced and/or implemented.

The researcher chose respondents at each study site who had early and significant participation in the decision-making processes to adopt and/or frame the adoption of SDWTs. Individuals were invited to participate in this study who: 1) participated directly in the earliest stages of adoption, or 2) were repeatedly identified to possess first-hand knowledge of the earliest stages of the adoption process.

The procedures used by the researcher to invite participation varied with the study site. The final interview question during each interview asked participants to identify other individuals (beside themselves) who met the

selection criteria. When names were mentioned repeatedly, those individuals were added to the list of potential study participants, and were subsequently invited to participate in the study. The only exception was when a potential participant's involvement in, or contribution to, the adoption process was consistently associated with, and fully described in, a specific document or other source of data that could be secured and thoroughly examined by the researcher.

The Researcher's Role in the Study Organizations at Michigan State University and at the University of Wisconsin

The researcher's knowledge of the adoption process varied considerably across the cases. As a graduate assistant with MSU Extension from 1992 through 1996, the researcher had an opportunity to observe how SDWTs were being adopted there, as well as to know who was leading and participating in the adoption process. As a county-based Extension Faculty member with UW-Extension from 1997 through the conclusion of this study, the researcher was asked to participate in (and even help design) SDWT strategy and adoption activities. These experiences familiarized the researcher with the people and processes associated with the SDWT innovation effort at UWEX/COOP Extension. Consequently, at both MSU and UWEX/COOP Extension, the researcher had a reasonable knowledge level of SDWT innovation processes (through observation at MSU and via active participation at UWEX).

Contacting the Study Participants at All Three Sites

To solicit study participants at both MSU Extension and UWEX/COOP Extension, the researcher sent e-mail letter communications to individuals whom he sought to include as study participants (see e-mail communication in Appendix A). As participants agreed to participate in the study, they were sent an Informed Consent Form letter (see Appendix B) for signature.

In the case of Ohio State University Extension, the researcher was unfamiliar with the process used to adopt SDWTs and the people involved in the adoption process. OSU was recommended for this study by the Directors of Extension at both MSU and UWEX/COOP, each of whom had made independent assertions to this researcher that SDWTs had been adopted by OSU Extension. Before including OSU Extension in this study, the researcher confirmed this assertion. First, the researcher sent an e-mail communication to the Director of OSU Extension (see Appendix C) explaining the purpose of the study and requesting a list of potential study participants (using the criteria previously stated and applied in the MSU and UW cases). The OSU Extension Director responded positively to both requests. Then, the researcher sent e-mail messages to each of the potential study participants identified by the Director of Extension, inviting their participation in the study. Upon receipt of a positive response, the researcher sent each participant an Informed Consent Form letter (See Appendix D) for signature. Finally, the researcher conducted a preliminary round of telephone interviews with OSU Extension participants to establish the validity of OSU Extension as a study site. The results of these preliminary

interviews confirmed that OSU Extension had, in fact, engaged in a process designed to adopt SDWTs. At that point, OSU Extension was selected as the third study site.

Phases of the Research

This study began as a three-phase design. Informants were first asked to describe how SDWTs were adopted in the respective Extension organizations. In the second phase, the researcher was to aggregate these descriptions into a single adoption 'story.' This was to be followed by a second round of interviews to provide informants with an opportunity to examine the researcher's stories for accuracy and credibility, and to offer additional interpretations and meaning concerning these descriptions. Finally, a third phase was to involve a cross-case analysis as the basis for identifying and explaining themes and shared meanings across cases.

As the first phase unfolded, the researcher discovered that the initial data collection process produced rich discussions between the researcher and the informants. As informants reconstructed the events and conditions that preceded and accompanied the adoption of SDWTs, they began naturally to offer potential explanations for the events they described, based on their interpretations of circumstances and context. Because of that, rather than conducting a second round of interviews to examine phase one results for themes and meaning, the researcher felt that the data collected in round one appeared rich enough for preliminary thematic analysis. Unexpectedly, data

collection and analysis occurred simultaneously during the first round of interviews. Probes and open discussion made it possible for informants to describe events and reflect on what had taken place and, from their perspective, why. This outcome mitigated the need to conduct a second round of interviews. Because of that, the "stories" were prepared and forwarded to informants, and they were asked to examine them for accuracy and credibility. Because each participant was invited to assign new meaning, as well as to check the researcher's stories for accuracy, participants were given the opportunity to add new information and perspectives to the data set, as if they had been interviewed a second time.

The Interviews

The in-person, one-on-one interview was selected as the primary data gathering method. This method is particularly appropriate when the purpose of a study is to create or verify reconstruction of events and circumstances. This method was selected because it fit with the researcher's purpose of understanding events, the sequence of events, and the assignment of meaning to these events. Through interviews, participants were able to describe environmental conditions (as they understood them), and then reconstruct events and place them in the context of the conditions in which they occurred. This approach also permitted the researcher to use probes and follow-up questions to verify, identify and/or explore themes and multiple meanings (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

In-person interviews were conducted at all three study sites between February and April 2000. All interviews were conducted in participants' offices with the exception of one interview at Michigan State University, which was conducted at the participant's home. A focused interview format was used (Yin, 1994; Merton et al., 1990). This approach was selected for three reasons. First, it enabled the researcher to ask the same questions of all participants. Second, it permitted a conversational style and the inclusion of open-ended questions, which gave participants an opportunity to elaborate and offer richer responses. Third, it gave the researcher an opportunity to use probes and to pursue issues across interviews.

A list of interview questions was e-mailed to each participant approximately two weeks prior to an interview. This was done to give respondents time to examine questions and reconstruct events. At the beginning of each interview, the researcher explained that the interview questions would serve as a basic guide, but that a dynamic, interactive approach was sought during the interview. Participants were encouraged to speak freely and address issues they considered relevant even when a response might not have been directly related to a specific interview question.

Data Collection and Interpretation

The researcher used both handwritten notes and a tape recorder to record all interview sessions. Guba and Lincoln (1985) note that hand-written notes provide the researcher with an opportunity to capture nonverbal communications,

and to make other observations without interfering with the interview flow. They also note that taking handwritten notes forces the interviewer to pay closer attention to what is being said. Despite their observation that taking handwritten notes usually prevents the interviewer from gathering everything the participant is saying, they recommend this method over tape recording. Merriam (1998) developed the interview log technique as a compromise to tape recorded and verbatim transcriptions, observing that verbatim transcription is often cost prohibitive. This technique involves tape recording an interview, from which notes are taken to capture main points and themes.

As a way to combine the best elements of the techniques used, the researcher combined handwritten notes, tape recording, and semi-verbatim transcription. First, a tape recorder was used to tape each interview in its entirety. Handwritten notes were taken throughout each interview. Notations were made to record emphasis in spoken words, observations of non-verbal communication, and ongoing analytical observations that might point to emerging themes, areas of emphasis, and new meanings.

Immediately following each interview, the researcher prepared quasi-literal transcriptions of the interview tape and compared the transcriptions with his handwritten notes. This technique proved to be extremely helpful in capturing subtleties and contextual "fine points" that, otherwise, would have been impossible to capture had literal transcriptions been used. After all of interviews at a study site were completed and the interview outcomes prepared, the researcher put together a detailed narrative describing the events and

conditions, in sequence, characterizing the presumed SDWT adoption process. The researcher understood that he would need to establish the accuracy and credibility of the recreation he prepared for each study site.

A number of authors (Ely, et al., 1991; Erlandson et al., 1993; Glesne and Perskin, 1992; Guba and Lincoln, 1985; Merriam, 1988; Creswell, 1998) describe the importance of feeding back to participants data and interpretations for establishing the accuracy and credibility of the researcher's account of an interview. The researcher provided participants at each study site an electronic draft of his account of the adoption process at that site. An accompanying e-mail communication asked each respondent to thoroughly review the draft for accuracy and to suggest changes to improve the validity of the story line. All participants responded to the researcher with comments concerning the accuracy and credibility of the researcher's account. With one exception (across the sites) participants responded that the researcher's interpretations of the adoption process was both accurate and credible. The single respondent expressing a concern declined to recommend changes to the researcher's draft rendition. Some respondents corrected minor items, such as dates of events. Most respondents were affirming. Typical comments received were: "Nice job capturing things here." That tells the story pretty well."

Analysis

The analytical strategy used was one of iterative explanation building (Yin, 1994). This strategy calls for the development of several plausible or rival

explanations that represent causal links to, and emerge from, the data. Yin observes that such explanations gain strength when they "...have reflected some theoretically significant propositions" (pp. 110-111). Yin (p. 110) suggests that, when such explanations are applied to multiple case studies, "...the result of the explanation-building process is also the creation of a cross-case analysis, not simply an analysis of each individual case."

In this research, individual case descriptions were first developed through interviews with study participants. Second, themes emerged from these descriptions. Third, the researcher began building explanations for the themes in relationship to a set of theoretical propositions and in connection with the literature of organizational change and innovation. Marshall and Rossman (1989, in Creswell, 1994) describe this process as one in which data is, first, reduced into categories and then analyzed through the use of an analytic framework. In this research, data were first aggregated into themes. Then, a theoretical framework was used as to make sense of the themes. To accomplish this, a number of categories emerged from the interviews that were subsequently used to code the data. These categories are described in Table 1.

TABLE 1.

Categories Emerging from the Interviews Conducted at the Study Sites

MSU Extension	OSU Extension	UWEX/COOP
Signs that Something is Wrong	Changing Environmental Conditions	**Something Is Wrong**
Early Experiences with Self-Directed Teams	Early Experiences with Self-Directed Teams	Significant Internal Environmental Conditions
Paradigmatic Shifts Among Change Agents	Strategy Development and Implementation	Paradigmatic Shifts
Benefits Sought Through the Deployment of Self-Directed Teams	Early Responses to Self-Directed Teams	Benefits Sought Through the Deployment of Self Directed Work Teams
Changing Environmental Conditions		Strategy Development and Implementation

The theoretical propositions associated with this study are:

Theoretical Proposition 1A
Some conditions (or combination of conditions) serve to precipitate change within organizations.

Theoretical Proposition 1B
Organizational change unfolds within one or more theoretical change models.

Theoretical Proposition 1C
An organization's change strategy unfolds within a theoretical framework comprised of the members' and change manages' theories-in-use.

Theoretical Proposition 2A
A shared leadership paradigm among change managers and leaders facilitates organizational change.

Theoretical Proposition 2B
A participatory approach to change management facilitates member acceptance and support of change efforts.

Theoretical Proposition 2C
The degree of fit between organizational change, culture and organizational systems has an impact upon resistance to change.

Theoretical Proposition 3A

Change strategy reflects a number of variables associated with change managers that include:

- Familiarity with the theory and practice of change management;
- Skill in developing and implementing change strategy (experience, skill, leadership);
- Interpretation of environmental conditions

The four-stage explanation building process used by the researcher is described below:

Stage #1: A Story Emerges (Descriptive)

Stage #2: Themes Emerge from the Stories (Analytical)

Stage #3: Theoretical Propositions Emerge from the Themes and the Literature

Stage #4: Cross-Case Themes Emerge as the Basis for Cross-Case Analysis

1. The Adoption Process
   a. The approach used to make the adoption decision
   b. Adoption strategies

2. Change Managers' Theories-in-Use
   a. Theories-in use about Extension:
   b. Theories-in use about the organization

3. Congruence between:
   a. Strategy and critical tasks and work flows
   b. Strategy and formal organizational relationships
   c. Strategy and people
   d. Strategy and culture
   e. Other elements of organizational culture
   f.

Reliability and Internal Validity

Internal Validity

A significant challenge for the researcher pertained to the matter of internal validity—the extent to which study conclusions are accurate and represent reality. Creswell (1994) identifies several methods for ensuring that a

study is internally valid. These include the use of multiple sources of information, feedback from informants on the validity of themes and conclusions asserted by the researcher, and involving participants in the research.

In this research, sources of data included one-on-one interviews, internal documents, and public documents secured from the worldwide web. The researcher carefully examined these documents and compared them to the data following the descriptive stage, and during each phase of data analysis. He looked for contradictions between his analysis and the way each Extension organization communicated its intentions through written organizational policies, plans, and pronouncements. In reality, the adoption of SDWTs proceeded at each study site with a modest amount of written documentation. Still, the written documentation extant reflected the "paradigmatic leanings" of change managers. Some documents included statements pertaining to organizational values, vision, and a rationale for adopting SDWTs. These documents were helpful to the researcher in corroborating the "mental models" of Extension administrators and organizational members.

Guba and Lincoln (1988) note the importance of staying "as close as possible" to the study participants. The researcher was able to do this more easily at the University of Wisconsin-Extension due to his employment there during the study cycle. His knowledge of the adoption process helped him considerably in making decisions concerning whom to invite to participate in the study.

The researcher was farthest from the research in the case of OSU Extension. However, conducting two separate sets of interviews with participants there--one on the telephone and one in person--helped the participants understand more clearly what kind of data the researcher sought. In fact, the second round of interviews there provided a considerable amount of data and participant-supplied analysis that had not come forward from the first round of interviews.

The researcher's prior experience as a graduate assistant with MSU Extension brought him in contact with many of the individuals who served as study participants. His relationships with these individuals ranged from unfamiliarity, in one case, to a close personal friendship in another. Overall, he knew all but one participant, and had a reasonably good knowledge of the range of their roles during the process of SDWTs. This familiarity was of considerable value for making decisions concerning whom to select as study participants.

Finally, the researcher involved all study participants in both constructing and reviewing descriptive and analytical phases of the research. Interviews were conducted using an iterative, conversational approach that engaged both the participant and the researcher in a process of simultaneously describing and analyzing events. Consequently, each interview sought to produce a shared understanding of what happened and why. The researcher believes that this reflective approach to description was largely responsible for the almost unanimous agreement among participants concerning the accuracy of the adoption stories at all three study sites.

External validity

External validity refers to the generalizability of findings (Creswell, 1994; Guba & Lincoln, 1988). Creswell (1994) notes that generalizability is not an objective of qualitative research, but that the interpretation of results is. Despite these disparate research goals, study results suggest the presence of a relationship between the organizational readiness to change and innovate, and a number of variables across all three cases. These variables include the paradigmatic orientations of change managers, organizational culture, change managers' theories-in-use, and congruence. A basis for generalizability did surface with regard to the relationship between some of these variables and resistance to change. A positive relationship was observed between resistance to change and each of these variables.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the replicability of a study. Crewsell (1994) suggests that multi-case studies provide a sound basis for evaluating reliability through their potential to produce patterns or themes across cases. This was certainly the case with the present research.

One factor strengthening the reliability of this study emanates from the fact that all three organizations are part of a national organization that shares cultural similarities and a long history. This point is important in reflecting upon contextual differences and similarities between each organization. While each organization exists within considerably different university and state/county cultures, they also share a number of cultural and functional similarities. They:

1) share an educational mission that emphasizes local needs; 2) offer educational programs in similar learning domains and to similar learners; 3) connect to the overarching outreach function of their respective universities; and 4) have compatible administrative architectures.

CHAPTER FIVE

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Changing Environmental Conditions

The concept of self-directed teams at MSU Extension is consistent with the ethos of executive leaders—the director and associate director of Extension, and the Vice Provost for University Outreach (VPUO), in particular. They came to MSU during the late 1980s through mid-1990s from positions at other universities, and introduced a package of changes, including SDWTs. The overarching objective was to energized the University's capacity to connect its knowledge resources, through various forms of scholarship and service, with priority issues as identified by Michigan citizens and other stakeholder groups. SDWTs, introduced in 1994, were one of the tools introduced to achieve that vision.

Consistent with the Provost's vision of Extension as an institutional instrument for supporting a significantly enhanced University outreach function, the Director of Extension began to report to both the Vice Provost and Dean, Agriculture and Natural Resources (VP&D, ANR) and the VPUO. Prior to this realignment, the Extension Director reported only to the VP&D, ANR. With Extension now reporting to both administrators, Extension's focus broadened—from limited and focused (ANR-related) to span the breadth of the institution. Functionally, this change meant that Extension would now work collaboratively across many colleges and academic departments on issues of importance to

Michigan's citizens and communities. This restructuring, itself a "new way of doing business" at MSU, prompted new thinking within Extension and ANR about how to work in an inclusive, integrated manner with traditional and non-traditional stakeholders outside the University. This paradigmatic evolution and shift, spawned by the Provost's vision, culminated in selecting an Assistant Provost for Lifelong Education (title later became VPUO) in 1989. A new Director of Extension was hired in 1991, and a new Associate Extension Director of Extension was hired in 1992.

Both the new Director and Associate Director of Extension exhibited a strong predisposition for and commitment to: shared leadership, strategic forms of planning, and interdisciplinary, team-based approaches to Extension programming. They also shared an appreciation for "flatter" organizational structures, responsive processes that encouraged teamwork and collaboration, and approaches that engaged customers in identifying issues (associated with Extension programming) of importance to them. Reflecting the view that customers can and should be full partners in the development of Extension's research and programmatic priorities and even programs, this approach required that state specialists, county-based Extension staff, and customers to work together, in an integrated fashion, to identify issues and co-generate educational responses to them. During this period, patterns of thought and action began to emerge that gave rise to operating principles and strategies for operationalizing this new vision for MSU Extension and the organizational norms it represented.

Something Is Wrong

During the late 1980s, MSU Extension administrators and faculty began hearing from stakeholder groups about concerns that Extension agents were unprepared to address many complex problems that were emerging around structural and institutional changes in agriculture. In response to these expressions of concern, Extension administrators began to consider how Extension might organize itself in ways to enable campus specialists and county staff to work more effectively together to address these external concerns. Specific objectives underlying this effort included: 1) a desire for more integration and collaboration between campus specialists and county staff; 2) more integrated, interdisciplinary work across agriculture-related academic departments; 3) expanded opportunities for county-based Extension agents to specialize; 4) more relevant Extension programs; 5) quicker responses to constituent issues and concerns, and 6) more direct involvement of constituents in the development of Extension research and education programs.

As these objectives were identified in 1994, the Associate Dean of Extension searched for organizational innovations to address MSU Extension's challenges. This search revealed that SDWTs had proven to be successful in accomplishing similar objectives within the private sector. Encouraged by this evidence, and supported by considerable agreement within and between MSU Extension administration and the University Outreach Office over organizational form and function, discussion began to build within MSU Extension's

administrative leadership team concerning how SDWTs might be employed to address MSU Extension's objectives.

Economic and Related Conditions

Occurring simultaneously, but unrelated to levels of stakeholder satisfaction with MSU Extension, was the reality that the organization faced a $3.5 Million budget shortfall in FY 1992-93. MSU Extension, College, and University-level administrators believed that SDWTs represented a new approach to Extension work that could generate support and funding for a new legislative initiative associated with animal agriculture.

In response to these budget conditions, MSU Extension began to develop and adopt a number of strategies designed to provide an acceptable level of service to its traditional agricultural constituencies, in the face of dramatically reduced resources. In addition to a dramatic downsizing effort with MSU Extension, which will be described later, these strategies included not filling a number of vacant state-level Extension specialist positions spread among a number of agricultural disciplines. This decision began to heighten concern on- and off-campus about the capacity of Extension to respond adequately to constituent needs at a time of increasing scrutiny and growing dissatisfaction around Extension's responsiveness and relevance.

Reductions in Extension state specialist faculty alarmed leaders associated with a number of agricultural commodity groups. Due to changes in and the diversity of Michigan's agriculture, complex technical issues and

questions were facing farm operators, agri-businesses and commodity groups. This situation generated a desire for more specialized Extension faculty. Issues to be addressed ranged from how the apple industry would respond to public concerns over food safety...to implications of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996...to concerns over the impact of environmental regulations in the fruit and vegetable industries...to swine industry concerns over vertical market integration. When a number of agriculture state specialist positions went unfilled, a number of commodity and agriculture-based interest groups began expressing concern that many of the county-based Extension agents lacked the specialized knowledge necessary to adequately and promptly help them. These groups insisted that there were too few state specialists to compensate for the perceived "expertise gap" among agents. A major internal response to this criticism was for field-based agents to express an interest in becoming more specialized.

Agent Specialization

As early as the late 1980s, county-based Extension staff began examining their relationships with external constituent groups, and to consider ways to improve their responsiveness to these groups. In 1990-1991, a survey conducted by the Michigan Council of Extension Associations (a group internal to MSU Extension, comprised of county-based staff) revealed concerns among agents regarding the quality of their relationship with, and responsiveness to, their constituents. As a follow-up to this survey, an Extension-wide working group (called the Empowerment Committee) was formed to discuss this issue in

more depth, and to recommend strategies that would enable agents to respond in faster, more meaningful ways to customer needs. A major theme was a desire by agriculture agents to offer clientele more specialized knowledge and support.

Self-directed Work Team

Strategy Development and Implementation

An early attempt was made to experiment with various team-based initiatives. In January 1994, the Associate Director of Extension created three self-directed teams called Area of Expertise Teams (AoEs). This first group of SDWTs included a Dairy Team, a Livestock Team, and a Field Crops Team.

A significant factor in determining the success of these earliest teams was the quality of the relationships that existed between members and associated constituencies. For example, campus specialists, county agents, and associated external stakeholder who made up the Field Crops AoE Team had a history of cooperation prior to the formation of the team. The quality of these relationships extended to the Team experience, permitting team process and activities to develop with reasonable speed and stability. However, counterparts on the Dairy AoE Team lacked a history of solid working relationships. This challenged the development of unity among members, and had an affect on the team's ability to establish a shared sense of purpose and direction.

To help the Dairy AoE Team, the Associate Director of Extension introduced in 1994 a process called Developing a Curriculum (DACUM). Based on the idea that process was at least as important as product, DACUM was

employed to help the Dairy Team develop a list of individual competencies that agents would need to be optimally effective in assisting external stakeholders. DACUM, in combination with highly valuable administrative coaching support, helped the Dairy AoE Team move forward. One indication of the Dairy Team's formative progress was their ability to generate a set of rules, called 'boundary conditions,' that put forward performance and operational expectations for use in guiding their relationships and responsiveness to external constituencies and to each other. Later, boundary conditions were adopted by other teams to determine why they were working together, what they would do together, and how they would work together.

When the dramatic $3.5 Million budget shortfall hit Extension in 1994-95, painful organizational downsizing ensued. The budget crisis was not viewed as a major consideration in MSU Extension's decision to adopt SDWTs. The budget shortfall did, however, make the move to SDWTs harder by dramatically reducing the availability of resources with which to fund early teams and provide coaching support during the formative stages of team development.

Perhaps the most significant feature of MSU Extension's restructuring was eliminating traditional program area administrative units that had directed and supported Extension programming, along with the associated Program Director positions. Of particular significance was the reality that Program Directors would not be present to provide administrative and coaching support to new and emerging AoE Teams.

As a response to the eliminating program areas, MSU Extension began creating more AoE teams—in effect, replacing an administrative-based structure with a team-based structure. By 2000, 33 teams span MSU Extension, 22 of them focusing primarily on agriculture-related subject matter.

Early Responses to Self Directed Work Teams

Responses from County-based Agents

In response to external feedback suggesting that they needed more specialized skills, some agents concluded that specialization was "a fad" that would pass with time. Others concluded that they did, in fact, need to develop more specialized skills. And some concluded that they needed to connect more quickly with campus specialists. Despite the attractiveness of increasing one's individual skills and knowledge through expanded training and team resources, some agents were concerned that they not lose their traditionally close connections with local constituents as they spent time working as a member of a state-wide team.

As time passed, some of the slower-to-change agents began to associate a number of personal and professional benefits with the SDWT approach (such as increased professional development and specialization opportunities) and began to warm to the team concept. The State of Michigan's funding of MSU's Animal Initiative—an Extension and Agriculture Experiment Station program designed to focus specialized research and education activities on the State's production animal agriculture sector—provided additional dollars to team

members interested in building their expertise. In addition, agents soon realized that they now had greater access to team members who possessed specialized skills and knowledge. The effect—increasing 'buy-in' to SDWTs by county agents.

Responses from County Government and Other External Stakeholders

Some agents were concerned that local County officials might resist the idea of "their agent" spending significant time out of the county to work on teams with a statewide focus. However, as it became clearer that team members would be able to leverage new and more extensive knowledge resources, these concerns began to dissipate. In fact, the team concept quickly became popular with county officials anxious to bring more expertise into their counties. Dramatic rises in county funding of county agents (from $12 million in 1997 to $22 million in 1999) were viewed as evidence that some county government officials supported teams and the value they had for county-based programming.

An additional feature of Extension's move toward greater connections between campus and county was the involvement of local, non-governmental stakeholders in the process of hiring County Extension staff. One notable effect of this approach was to strengthen local stakeholder identification with county agents and their work, thereby broadening the support of agents locally. Often, those who had been most critical of agents now became ardent supporters, particularly when they learned how much expertise "their" agent would be able to bring home as a member of a state SDWT.

To further strengthen local and state support for teams, MSU Extension began forming Advisory Councils for AoEs. The addition of these councils provided external constituents with another venue for interacting with Extension. Already in place were County Extension Councils (in 76 of 83 counties), the State Extension and Experiment Station Council, and less common structures called "Extension Coalitions," which formed around specific programming priorities. Constituents serving on both County Extension Councils and AoE Advisory Councils stakeholders were able to observe and understand the links between AoE-based programming across county lines. The affect of this increased understanding was to educate many external stakeholders about the benefits of AoE Teams while maintaining support for county-based Extension education programs. When AoEs experience successes, those successes were more readily noticed across wider expanses of people, organizations and influence, thereby building the political capital of Extension at both the state and local levels.

Responses from Campus Faculty

Early responses to SDWTs among department chairpersons and faculty specialists in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources were mixed. Some faculty simply did not want to work within a team structure, particularly if doing so meant that they had to share credit for their work. This was a particular concern among some non-tenured faculty who saw the need to share credit for team-based work as a threat to their ability to get tenure, with its traditional

dependence upon the demonstration of scholarship by individual faculty members. Some well-established faculty members had negative opinions about teams, feeling that they would sap resources and dilute the quality of their work. Others were aware of and concerned about "the disconnects" between the University and its traditional clientele groups, and between themselves and county-based Extension agents. They were anxious to bridge these gaps through a team-oriented approach.

Early interest among department chairpersons in SDWTs emerged largely as a function of a legislative initiative (called "Revitalization of Michigan Animal Agriculture"), which was intended to address the many complex issues facing dairy and livestock operators. Called the "Animal Initiative" within the University, this $4.03 million program brought $1.58 million to MSU Extension. The five participating campus departments included Large Animal Sciences Clinical Sciences, Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Food Science and Human Nutrition, and Animal Science. These funds served as a powerful incentive to department chairpersons and faculty to find ways for integrating knowledge and resources through team-based forms of planning and program development.

While the idea of teams working across disciplines was appealing to (perhaps) a majority of campus-based specialists, some faculty and department chairpersons lacked knowledge and experience in operating in a team-based environment. Acceptance of teams was easier in units where administrators and faculty members already valued team-based research and publication efforts.

Summary

The adoption of SDWTs within MSU Extension grew from a paradigmatic shift and from synergies associated with that shift. The development of an implementation strategy grew out of a shared understanding of and appreciation for what teams are, and how they might serve MSU Extension. Compelling environmental signals suggested that change was required in the way Extension related to its stakeholders. A severe budget crisis provided the rationale to move as quickly and as comprehensively as possible.

FINDINGS

Subquestion #1
What conditions led to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Theoretical Proposition 1A
Some condition or combination of conditions serve to precipitate change within organizations.

Theoretical Proposition 1B
Organizational change unfolds within one or more theoretical change models.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Change at MSU Extension

The data collected in this study suggest that the adoption of SDWTs at MSU was both intentional and evolutionary. On one hand, there was a clear intention among decision-makers to adopt self-directed teams. On the other hand, there was a willingness to "learn as we go along." Consequently, the adoption strategy was deliberate and emergent.

In the beginning, considerable effort was expended to understand the potential for the success of self-directed teams, but this effort was tempered by a general understanding among decision makers that they were exploring uncharted waters as organizational change agents and as an organization. This approach relies much less on decision makers deliberating about theoretical perspectives associated with organizational change and much more on their personal theories-in-use (Argyris), peer understanding (knowledge of experiences at other institutions), understanding of the literature associated with self-directed teams. The study data also suggest that organizational change occurred through an intentional effort to respond to a combination of observed environmental signals and internal conditions with the specific innovation of self-directed teams.

While no single model stands alone in its ability to explain the adoption of self-directed teams at MSU Extension, elements of several models were observed and, in combination, may provide a theoretical basis for understanding how organizational change and innovation occurred in MSU Extension. A number of authors have observed that innovation is often a reaction to external factors (Zaltman and Duncan; 1977; Terreberry; Downs, 1967; Cummings and Worley, 1993; Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995). The study data suggest that both internal and external factors contributed to the decision to adopt self-directed teams at MSU Extension.

Cummings and Worley (1993) describe an eight step action research model of change that includes problem identification; consultation with a

behavioral science expert; data gathering and preliminary diagnosis; feedback to client or group; joint diagnosis of the problem; joint action planning; and data gathering following action. During the late 1980s, a number of commodity agriculture groups in Michigan began to express their displeasure with Extension's level of preparedness to help farm operators and agri-businesses deal successfully with diverse and complex agriculture issues. Subsequent developments resemble a string of organizational thought and action that approximate Cummings and Worley's change model. As University and Extension administrators became aware of these concerns, they began talking with Extension officials, agricultural commodity representatives, and others within and outside the University to determine the nature of the problem and its causes. They then conducted a preliminary search for solutions (i.e., problem identification, data gathering and analysis, problem diagnosis, and action planning).

The preliminary "diagnosis"--the problem was related to disconnects that had occurred between Extension campus specialists and county agents, and between Extension and its constituent groups in the agricultural community. Placed in a university-wide frame, this problem was examined in the context of a larger concern with the extent to which the University's outreach mission was being achieved. Extension's role in achieving that mission was examined, as was its connectivity to the University at large. The decision to have the Director of Extension report to both the VP&D, ANR and the VPUO signaled a basic philosophical change in what was going to be expected from Extension, on-

campus and off. Specifically, Extension was going to connect the knowledge resources of the entire University in relationship to a reconceived state-wide outreach mandate. This would require Extension to be more connective and expansive though the development of new, cross-college collaborations.

Nadler and Tusman's (1995) four-part model of organizational change may be useful for understanding both the changes that were occurring within the University and the changes that would eventually take place within MSU Extension. Nadler and Tushman identify four basic types of change: incremental change, discontinuous change, reactive change, and anticipatory change. The last two types of change are important for understanding change prompted by forces associated with an organization's operating environment. The University's top leaders believed that the University's future lay in its ability to be relevant in the lives of Michigan's citizens and communities. The decision to reinforce the University's outreach activities by enhancing Extension's outreach role may be seen as a reactive change made in response to an environmental signal from Michigan citizens. This type of change is also incremental, as it did not involve organization-wide system change but, rather, evolved through inter-organizational adjustments in the form of re-routed reporting lines.

Once a new Extension Director was hired, a paradigmatic 'critical mass' was reached, which provided a sufficiently supportive administrative environment for the emergence of self-directed work teams. This internal environment would soon look much different from previous Extension organizations at Michigan State University. The prior '"look" involved fixed program area structures that

provided administrative direction, resources, and support for county-based agents. Consistent with Lewin's (1951) model of change in which forces supporting both the status quo and change within organizations exist in equilibrium until one force gains the upper hand, the new Extension administrative regime made a clear departure from how Extension had operated at MSU. It is also consistent with Schein's (1992) view that, in response to some crisis or problem, change may be ushered in by outsiders whose ideas form the basis of new organization-wide assumptions and behaviors. Change is adopted if the outsider's ideas and assumptions defuse the crisis or solve the problem. If the outsider's ideas are unsuccessful in solving the problem, the change effort will likely fail. The new Extension Director (hired in 1991) and the new Associate Director (hired in 1992) worked together to establish an approach in which decisions affecting program direction would: 1) involve a wider array of organizational members, external stakeholders and administrators; and 2) be made in a more decentralized and pluralistic fashion.

Lewin's (1951) change model is also helpful in explaining the conditions associated with the adoption of SDWTs at MSU Extension. The first of Lewin's steps, unfreezing, involves reducing forces that maintain status quo behavior. The traditional technology transfer model of Extension predominated Extension education at MSU prior to the adoption of SDWTs. The predominant role of campus specialists was to conduct research and generate knowledge. The role of county-agents was to disseminate this knowledge to constituents through a variety of educational venues including workshops, newsletters, presentations,

and one-on-one consultations. The role of constituents was to "consume this knowledge." However, it soon became apparent that a number of disconnects had occurred that, when taken together, suggested that this approach had become ineffective as a means of addressing the needs of a broad array of agricultural constituents across the state. Specifically, the complexity of Michigan agriculture with its numerous commodities, on combination with a plethora of new federal environmental regulations, generated educational needs among many farm operators and organizations that Extension was ill equipped to address. The traditional research approach, often driven by researcher interests, sometimes differed considerably from constituents' needs. Consequently, Extension's expertise was found by many agricultural constituents to be of questionable relevance. Additionally, the questions being asked of many county-based agents required specialized knowledge that many agents, who had traditionally focused on a broad array of agriculture issues, did not possess. Soon, concerns began to surface among Extension's traditional agricultural constituencies that Extension researchers and agents were increasingly unable to provide the specialized knowledge needed to address an emerging set of complex issues and concerns. Traditionally, these constituencies (agricultural commodity groups) were among Extension's most ardent supporters. Their political influence represented a formidable force in Michigan. Once these constituent groups became dissatisfied with Extension's capacity to respond to their most pressing issues, they stood in opposition to the status quo model. Their voice became a force for change.

Quinn's (1996) "deep change" model also speaks to MSU Extension's problems with its agricultural constituents. According to this model, new organizational systems are created in response to misalignments that emerge when an organization's internal realities (in this case the traditional Extension education delivery model described above) and changes in its external environment (represented in this study by changing constituent needs). The kinds of organizational changes Quinn addresses include the adoption of transformational approaches to leadership and an organizational self-examination to explore internal cultural barriers to change. Both of these functions were features of MSU Extension's adoption of self-directed teams.

Finally, Bacharach, Bamberger and Sonnenstuhl's (1996) action model of organizational change holds that organizations and their members share an interest in establishing and maintaining a sense of organizational stability. That model is useful for understanding how MSU Extension's stakeholder-based concerns connected to the organization's change theory. MSU Extension has traditionally based its educational program, perceived or assessed, on the needs of constituents. This premise has been fundamental to MSU Extension's organizational mission since its earliest days, and provides a stable conceptual foundation for the work of Extension and its many employees. When stakeholder dissatisfaction with agent responsiveness and skill began to surface in the early 1990s, Extension administrators began considering how organizational effectiveness and efficiency might be improved in ways that would result in increased agent effectiveness at the local level. Self-directed teams were viewed

by Extension administrators as a way to substantially improve Extension program design and delivery. Specifically, self-directed teams were a structural means to enhance agent capacity, as well as to improve connectivity and programmatic synergy between campus specialists and county-based agents.

Theoretical Proposition 1C
An organization's change strategy unfolds within a theoretical framework comprised of the members' and change manager's Theories-in-use.

Theories-In-Use

Argyris (1976) and Argyris and Schon (1974) suggest that organizational members operate based on implicit assumptions that guide behavior and influence how they perceive, think, and feel about things. They describe these assumptions as "theories-in-use." Applying this theory to Extension helps to explain how a need for change was perceived within MSU Extension, and how a response to that need was framed. The following sections describe what the data revealed to be several theories-in-use that surfaced during data collection, accompanied by a brief explanation as to how each may have influenced the adoption of self directed teams at MSU Extension.

Theories-In-Use About Extension

Theory #1
Extension programs would be better if delivered through SDWTs.

Following an overview of some of the literature describing these benefits, decision makers concluded that Extension educators would be able to produce and deliver more innovative programs to their constituencies through self-

directed teams. They also concluded that teams would permit county agents a venue through which to specialize. Besides addressing the interests of county agents directly, specialization was viewed by Extension administrators as a means by which county agents and state specialists could forge stronger relationship and pursue more applied research and education initiatives.

Theory #2
Extension employees generally possess a team-based work orientation.

Committees have been a common work form within MSU Extension for many years. Committees have been used to perform a wide variety of organizational activities, including the development and delivery of educational programs, services and projects; the allocation of resources; and the identification of issues. Consequently, MSU Extension employees have considerable experience working as members of committees and in other forms of groups.

This sustained, organization-wide experience with group-based work served to influence two organizational assumptions that supported the transition to the adoption of a more extensive, expansive, and transformative team approach—SDWTs. The first is that MSU Extension employees are, as a group, comfortable with group-based work and familiar with the concepts upon which it is based. The second assumption is that teams and committees are basically the same thing, and that differences between the two concepts are related primarily to the quality of relationships, and the synergy generated between and among members.

Taken together, these assumptions appear to have at least encouraged the emergence of a general belief among decision makers that the comfort of working on self-directed work teams would engender the same depth of understanding as working in traditional forms, such as committees and task forces. Another way of stating this: working as members of self-directed teams would not be viewed by employees as fundamentally different from working as members of committees, task forces and other work groups. As one respondent put it, "We believed that self directed work teams wouldn't be much of a stretch for our employees."

Theory #3
SDWTs 'fit' Extension's organizational culture.

Examples of consistency between decision makers' values surrounding SDWTs emerged frequently during the data collection process. All individuals who were significantly involved in the decision to adopt SDWTs at MSU Extension had worked for MSU Extension for several years, had worked for Extension organizations in other states, or both. In addition, all decision makers expressed support for a fundamental Extension organizational value: Extension's basics purposes is to empower people as a means of building individual, organizational, and community capacity. Additionally, many decision makers expressed the belief that Extension employees would share their enthusiasm for SDWTs.

Decision makers believed strongly that MSU Extension employees shared a number of values that were consistent with the values required to work

successfully as members and leaders of self-directed work teams. A frequently-cited example: MSU Extension's long history of working with and through collaborative work structures, such as committees and task forces, which often included campus and county-based employees from multiple administrative levels and program areas, and which generally employed consensus-based decision making procedures. Common responses given to explain Extension's widespread practice of working with and through committees and task forces included:

- Groups represent a participatory approach, a core value in MSU Extension.
- Groups bring multiple perspectives to bear on issues, projects, etc. which, in turn, lead to broader and more creative solutions and ideas.
- Many employees value and enjoy the collegiality associated with working with their colleagues, often more than working alone or with one or two other people.
- County office staffs are encouraged to incorporate team-based values, including mutual support and collaboration, into program planning, design and delivery.

Respondents believed, virtually without exception, that these values were an integral part of MSU Extension's organizational culture, particularly among county-based employees and administrators.

An equally strong belief existed among respondents that the dimension of MSU Extension's culture represented by these values represented an exceptionally high degree of fit with the values required by self-directed work teams. This belief absolutely dominated the thinking of decision makers. In fact, the researcher failed to uncover any evidence to suggest that any other interventions (other than self-directed work teams) were explored or considered

in response to the issues and concerns that had surfaced from within and outside Extension. No reason for this surfaced during data collection.

Theories-In-Use About Organization

Theory #1
Shared leadership is more effective than concentrated leadership.

Change managers, most specifically the Director and Associate Extension Director, shared the view that leadership was most effective when it was shared with organizational members. They also believed that a fundamental role of leaders was to develop leadership capacity in others.

Theory #2
Team-based work is more effective than individual-based work.

Change managers believed that collaboration and team-based work forms, which foster multiple perspectives on issues and solutions, foster the development of more relevant and responsive Extension education programs.

Theory #3
Decentralized authority is more effective than centralized authority.

Change managers believed that decisions pertaining to program design and delivery were best made by those with the most contact and closest proximity to constituents. It was generally believed that, because county-based staff members work directly with constituents, they have a better sense of constituents' needs and concerns.

Theory #4
SDWTs fit well with MSU Extension's culture.

Based upon their understanding of self-directed work teams, in combination with their belief that MSU Extension's long history of conducting business using committees and collaborative work forms, a general belief emerged among change managers that MSU Extension's culture was highly conducive to self-directed work teams.

Theory #5
SDWTs would be successful in Extension as permanent structures.

Despite the many differences in organizational culture and operations between private sector organizations and large public bureaucratic organizations, change managers were unconcerned that virtually all of the literature on self-directed work teams reflected the private sector experience. They were also unconcerned that self-directed work teams were generally employed as temporary organizational tools rather than as permanent organizational structures.

Theory #6
Extension would be more effective with SDWTs than without them.

Based upon their knowledge of the organizational efficiencies and other advantages associated with self-directed teams as described in the literature, as well as their concerns with a number of disconnects that were being reported between state specialists and campus-based Extension staff, change managers believed that self-directed work teams offered an obvious solution to an

emerging problem. Specifically, change managers believed self-directed work teams represented a venue for producing enhanced interaction and collaboration between state specialists and county-base staff that would result in more relevant, innovative research initiatives and educational programs.

Theory #7

Member resistance to change was Inevitable and Extension could adjust its systems to accommodate SDWTs.

Adoption decision makers generally believed that resistance to self-directed teams would surface. And while respondents generally believed that resistance would be stronger among state specialists and academic departments, no clear consensus emerged from the data concerning where such resistance would surface, how strong it might be, or what form or forms it would take. However, a number of respondents did indicate that they expected to encounter resistance to teams where University faculty specialists and departments placed higher value upon independent, individual contributions and work while placing less value on team-based work activities. Another common assumption among decision makers was that organizational resistance to self-directed teams could and would be overcome with the successful adoption of self-directed teams in MSU Extension being the result. Much of this optimism emanated out of two additional assumptions. The first was that, as an organization, Extension would be able to adapt its systems, policies and culture sufficiently to accommodate the requirements of self-directed teams. The second assumption was that, through a combination of administrative authority,

peer pressure, persuasion and demonstrable success, resistance in all its forms could and would be eliminated or reduced enough for self-directed teams to be successful.

Subquestion #2

What organizational factors were antecedent to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Theoretical Proposition 2A
A shared leadership paradigm among change managers and leaders facilitates organizational change.

Paradigmatic Consistency Among Decision Makers

As was previously described, the executive leaders in MSUE and at MSU at the time shared the view that organizations work best when employees participate in making decisions that influence organizational directions. They also shared the view that organizations were most effective when groups of employees were empowered with the authority to make decisions affecting their immediate work and environment.

Theoretical Proposition 2B
A participatory approach to change management facilitates member acceptance and support of change efforts.

Employee Participation in Adopting Self-directed Work Teams

MSU Extension's change strategy reflected a participatory approach that utilized the perspectives of Extension administrators, Extension employees, and external stakeholders. This approach is consistent with the administrative paradigm shared by Extension and relevant University administrators at the time.

This type of approach to change is driven, simultaneously, by the values and goals of organizational managers, employees and external stakeholders. Management-driven change, on the other hand, is driven solely by the values and goals of management (Raymon and Wyman, 1998).

The change process at MSU Extension included committees, dialogues, needs assessments, and other forms of participation that included or attempted to identify the values, needs and issues held by organizational members and external constituents. While the basic idea of adopting SDWTs originated within administration, administrative decision makers assumed that whatever chances teams might or might not have would ultimately depend upon the degree to which Extension employees and constituents accepted and supported SDWTs. Bruce and Wyman (p. 12) also point out that in participant-driven change, control of the change process is not necessarily shared and may shift toward management-led groups that are dominated by management's agenda. At MSU Extension, much of the change process design and subsequent strategy development was, in fact, performed by committees and task forces that had as members representatives from all of Extension's organizational levels. But individuals who supported management's view about the value and relevance of SDWTs influenced these groups. Nevertheless, change initiators and designers understood the fundamental importance of organization-wide acceptance of and support for SDWTs as a basic condition for success.

Theoretical Proposition 2C
The degree of congruence between pre- and post-change organizational culture and systems has an impact upon resistance to change.

Overcoming Resistance to Self-directed Teams at MSU Extension

While addressing the question of how to manage change, a number of authors have addressed the question of how change may be into institutionalized. Cummings and Worley (1993, pp. 187-199) describe five processes concerning institutionalization of organizational change. The first, socialization, involves "...the transmission of information about beliefs, preferences, norms, and values with respect to the intervention. Because implementation of OD interventions generally involves considerable learning and experimentation, a continual process of socialization is necessary to promote persistence of the change program (p. 187)." While Extension administrators' visits with faculty members and department chairs were intended to inform them of the purpose, value and norms associated with AoE teams, their opportunities to do so were limited. Consequently, Extension was not able to lead an ongoing dialogue about how AoE Teams might or might not fit within CANR departments. This proved to be an inhibitor to widespread understanding of SDWT concepts, and may have contributed to the reluctance of some faculty to more fully consider and reflect upon their own relationships to SDWT concepts generally, and AoE Teams, specifically.

The second institutionalization process, commitment, binds organizational members to the behaviors associated with a particular change. Perhaps recognizing that giving CANR faculty an opportunity to work as a member of an

AoE Team might generate support for the AoE concept among interested or curious faculty, CANR faculty members were invited to join and/or co-lead early AoE Teams. Some faculty who expressed an early interest in teams joined and, in some cases, accepted co-leadership for some of these early teams. The study data suggest that the success experienced by a few of the early teams was related directly to the commitment of some of these faculty.

The third process, reward allocation, holds that linking both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to the behaviors required by a particular change is an important factor in institutionalizing change efforts. Desired behaviors, when properly rewarded, become the preferred behaviors of organizational members, thereby leading to the institutionalizing of both the reward system and the behaviors they were intended to encourage. This process is particularly relevant to the adoption of SDWTs at MSU Extension. The reward system at MSU Extension was initially incongruent with two of the most fundamental concepts associated with MSU Extension's approach to self-directed teams, namely, collaboration and a multi-disciplinary approach. The fact that the reward systems in ANR departments treat the matter of team-based work differently may help explain why there was not universal and enthusiastic acceptance of AoE across the departments.

Extension administrators anticipated at least some of the resistance points to self-directed teams at MSU. Much of their anticipation was based on an understanding that self-directed teams require an organizational culture with systems in place that put considerable value on and reward team-based work. They clearly understood that "demonstrating scholarship" was predominantly

viewed as an individual accomplishment, and that university evaluation and reward systems had historically reflected that view. Consequently, it was assumed that team-based research would not be valued as highly as individually based research, and that non-tenured faculty might be hesitant to make significant investments of time or energy in team-based activities.

To get a better sense of where and how much resistance to SDWTs would emerge from within the University, and to solicit early support for the team concept, Extension administrators began discussing their interest in SDWTs with department chairpersons and faculty. These discussions ranged from informal conversations, to presentations at faculty meetings, to special Extension- and college-wide, meetings to explain SDWT concepts and gain formal feedback to Extension's plans to adopt them.

Through this 'litmus test' process, Extension administrators learned a great deal about the nature and location of faculty resistance to SDWT concepts, and used this knowledge to alter some implementation strategies, as well as to develop new strategies. The degree of resistance was varied and ranged from agent reluctance to join teams to attempts by some faculty to subvert Extension's attempts to implement teams. The single most predominant resistance theme among county-based agents was the concern that team-based work would only add to an already overburdened workload.

Despite that, Extension administrators were confident that MSU Extension's organizational experience and subsequent familiarity with

committee-based work would translate into an acceptable level of acceptance of team-based principles among county-based agents.

On campus, resistance to self-directed teams took a number of forms, emanating largely from two sources--individual faculty members and some departmental chairpersons. Not surprisingly, some faculty who had built their careers and reputations around individual effort and research were not interested in research collaboration and team-based outreach. Additionally, some department chairs believed that AoEs compromised their ability to influence the allocation of dollars within the CANR. And, some believed that team-based Extension work, with its multidisciplinary and often participatory-based approach to defining research problems and conducting research programs, did not represent "true scholarship." These views, particularly when they influenced and/or were reflected in annual review and promotion-tenure decisions, represented a significant disincentive to the adoption of SDWTs.

Resistance to Change

The range of emotions felt by those affected negatively by a change to teams included fear, anger, insecurity, confusion, loss, disenfranchisement, and loss of control. Green and Butkus (1999), noted that managing change is synonymous with managing the emotional responses of people to change, advise change managers to pursue a strategy of anticipating and then disarming individuals' emotional responses to a specific change. In fact, considerable, sustained effort was expended by a number of Extension administrators and

others to address individual emotional responses as they developed. For example, support was solicited from some departmental promotion and tenure review committees for valuing the contributions made by untenured faculty to team-based approaches. Agents, who may have felt overwhelmed by the need to pick up new skills to work more effectively with state specialists and ultimately to meet the changing needs of their constituents, were challenged to view teams as a new and exciting opportunity. To specifically address this issue, the Associate Extension Director introduced "Developing A Curriculum" (DACUM) (Nelson, 1988) as a means of identifying core competencies agents would need to be optimally effective in a changing environment. Funds were provided to teams to pay for training programs based upon the core competencies they identified.

Extension administrators understood that there was little they could do to change faculty attitudes about the validity of collaborative, multidisciplinary scholarship. They did believe, however, that if they were able to make the faculty promotion and tenure system more "team-friendly," they would be able to address a major barrier to faculty support for self-directed teams. In this quest they received strong support from the recently appointed (also from the outside) VP&D, ANR, who valued team-based work a legitimate form of scholarship. He supported the inclusion of team-based work products on faculty vitae during the promotion and tenure process, and was able to generate increased support for team-based work among some departmental tenure review committees.

Some departments continued to place little value on team-based work during tenure review. However, the effect of the Dean's support for team-based work and Extension administrators' attempts to convince faculty and department chairs of the value of team-based work to individual departments, helped to diminish resistance to and the rejection of AoEs. In addition, some department chairs and faculty were drawn to the AoE concept. Supportive chairs encouraged faculty to join and/or provide leadership for early teams. Some faculty considered a participatory approach to research as a valid and valuable form of scholarship, and considered it appropriate, given Extension's outreach mission.

Subquestion #3

What other factors surfaced at each study site that played a significant role in either facilitating or impeding the adoption self-directed teams?

Theoretical Proposition 3A

Change strategy reflects a number of variables associated with change managers that include:

a. familiarity with the theory and practice of change management
b. skill in developing and implementing change Strategy (experience, skill, leadership)
c. interpretation of environmental conditions.

Informed by the Literature of SDWTs

The study data suggest that once administrative decision makers were confident of their assessment of internal and external environmental conditions (including the issues and problems embedded therein), their attention quickly focused on the specific innovation of self-directed teams and its potential within MSU Extension. The data did not suggest that a broad set of intervention alternatives was considered, one of which being self-directed work teams. In

fact, MSU Extension's decision to move toward SDWTs was informed primarily by the literature on self-directed work teams. Literature in areas such as organizational change, the adoption of innovation, and organizational diagnosis, was not mentioned as having guided or informed either the decision to adopt teams or the strategies with which to do so.

Problem Framing and Solution Identification

The selection of a solution to a set of perceived organizational problems occurred quickly. The data suggest that a conscious identification and analysis of a set of alternative interventions was not a major feature of the decision making process. Instead, decision makers, following an exhaustive examination of internal and external conditions and issues, became aware of a specific intervention, were strongly drawn to it, and proceeded to consider how it might be adopted within MSU Extension.

The researcher did not uncover any evidence to suggest that administrative innovations (other than self directed work teams) were considered in response to the issues and opportunities that surfaced within MSU Extension. Rather, strategies focused on structural and other changes that would make the organization more "team friendly." So attractive was the idea that organization-wide gains in efficiency and program quality could be realized through the employment of teams, that the decision about whether or not to introduce teams was a matter of how and when, rather than if.

The researcher discovered that, despite the depth and breadth of literature available concerning how to understand, prepare for and orchestrate organizational change, administrators were willing to adopt structural, cultural and systems change based upon a deeply held belief that the organization would "find a way" to make teams work. Of course, this belief was grounded in administrators' theories-in-use.

An examination into the environmental scanning by one or more organizational leaders, followed by discussion and then by decision, was the predominant means of readiness assessment. A number of authors have emphasized the importance of organizational culture in determining whether and how innovation takes place within organizations. The movement of MSU Extension toward self-directed teams began as a vision generated by Extension administrators. Although the benefits sought through the adoption of teams were generally well understood among Extension administrative decision makers prior to the introduction of the earliest teams, there was a general sense that a "good fit" existed between Extension 's culture and that thought to be required for teams to succeed.

Strategy Development

During 1993, an MSU Extension administrative team consisting of the Director and Associate Director of Extension, along with the three Program Area Leaders from each of MSU Extension's program areas, began to discuss the appropriateness of SDWTs as a means for addressing a number of

organizational concerns. These discussions led, in 1993, to the formation of the Area of Expertise (AoE) Committee, which was MSU Extension's first formal attempt to develop an organization-wide strategy with which to adopt SDWTs. This Committee's final report, issued in April of 1994, contained the following sections: a statement of values upon which Extension's mission statement was based; a "premise" statement describing how AoE teams relate to Extension structure; a statement of long-term goals to be achieved through participation on an AoE team; a set of principles for use in guiding AoE team formation; a description of a process for use in forming AoE teams; and a list of suggested AoE teams.

A December 6, 1994 memorandum (Appendix F) from the MSU-E administrative team was circulated to all county Extension Directors containing the following enclosures: the AoE Committee final report; suggested steps for use in implementing AoE Teams; a description of the roles of both the Area of Expertise and Core Competency Coordination Committee and the Program Area Coordination Committee; potential strategies with which to generate understanding of and support for the AoE team concept among external constituencies; and a number of other documents describing the AoE structure within the Agriculture and Natural Resources Program Area. This document fulfilled a number of purposes, including sensitizing all to the need for change and explaining why AoE teams were an appropriate change tool. It also included operating guidelines for AoE teams and clarified expectations relating team participation.

Unlike Recardo's (1999) approach, in which an organization conducts a proactive readiness assessment intended to determine whether or not teams should be employed and what changes might be implemented before they are introduced, an action research model engages change managers and organizational members as collaborators in discovering how best to conceive and implement change. Moving forward and reflecting on progress proceeds iteratively, as learning how to change and changing how to learn about change go hand in hand.

Cummings and Worley describe two adaptations of the action research model. The first, participatory action research, provides a high level of stakeholder involvement in the change process to include "...diagnosing the organization, designing changes, and implementing and assessing them (p. 30-31)." The second adaptation is called appreciative inquiry. This approach involves building upon the positive actions taken within organizations to effect change, and is guided by the assumption that all organizations are, to one degree or another, effective at bringing about planned change. This approach assumes further that, when organizational members are personally invested in the change process and help generate a vision of a preferred organizational state, they will demonstrate a high level of commitment to realizing that vision.

In the case of MSU Extension, the Associate Director was aware of the desire of many agents to specialize more, and of the general recognition that agents and specialists needed to work more effectively together. At the same time, he was also exploring the organizational development and management

literature to see what interventions were working in the private sector. He then merged what he was learning—from the field and from the literature—into a general vision of how self-directed teams might produce synergy and generate innovation across Extension. That vision formed the basis of an ongoing discussion throughout the organization on the potential of self-directed teams for the organization.

These discussions were subsequently given over to a task force that was asked to recommend suggestions for introducing self-directed teams in Extension. As the first teams were formed, lessons were learned about the nature of resistance to teams. As these issues were discovered by team-leaders, team members and Extension administrators, process and policy adaptations were introduced. For example, one of the early teams, the Dairy Team, established their own operating procedures which they termed 'boundary conditions' which articulated a set of principles for use in guiding team form, function and process.

Discussions occurred throughout Extension concerning the need for agents to improve their level of skill and responsiveness in order to be able to satisfy the expectations of a number of commodity interests. Another discussion concerned the need for county-based agents and campus specialists to work more effectively together to link field-based problems with appropriate campus knowledge resources. Still another discussion concerned the need to be more responsive in delivering relevant programs in what had become a very competitive external environment.

The adoption of self-directed teams at MSU Extension was more of an iterative process than a management decision imposed upon the organization. The decision to introduce teams, which was framed for organizational members as an invitation to move toward a team-based, entrepreneurial approach to work, was clearly supported and encouraged by Extension administration. Still, the study data did not reveal a specific adoption strategy with which to introduce self-directed teams. Neither was there evidence of a systematic diagnosis of the organization as the basis for determining whether or not teams would be the best intervention strategy to address organizational change needs.

Together, these findings suggest the existence of a distinct approach to organizational change and innovation that was introduced and discussed widely within Extension. This approach formed the basis of an invitation to Extension specialists and county-based agents to participate in the shared emergence of a new way to design and deliver Extension education programs. Administrative decision makers understood MSU Extension and its environment well, and were confident that self-directed teams held considerable promise as a means of achieving the benefits they believed would quiet external criticism of Extension.

Coming to an Adoption Decision Quickly

Recardo (1999) observes that organizations often "rush" to introduce teams with the assumption that they are easy to understand and deploy. He counters by arguing that team-based work forms are often misunderstood, are difficult to employ, and may not improve an organization's position in a

competitive environment. As a means of addressing the question of organizational readiness to adopt teams, Recardo suggests that managers consider questions about their organizations. These include:

1. Are teams appropriate for as given location/environment?
2. If appropriate, what type (task force, cross-functional team, work, team, etc.) of team is the best fit?
3. What variables in the organization support and impede team formation?
4. What are the high-level design recommendations to ensure the success of teams?

The approach suggested by Recardo, separate from the merits of conducting such as organizational assessment, reflects the concerned expressed by Cummins and Worley. The researcher discovered that, in the case of MSU Extension, organizational leaders were not guided so much by a strategy as much as they were by the belief that self-directed teams represented, at least on a conceptual level, a solution to a set of unique organizational problems. Reflecting an openness to experiment with teams as a means of discovering and attempting to resolve issues associated with readiness and fit as they emerged, this approach reflects the basic conceptual framework of what Cummings and Worley (1997) describe as the action research model of planned change:

> The action research model focuses on planned change as a cyclical process in which initial research about the organization provides information to guide subsequent action. Then the results of the action are assessed to provide further information to guide further action, and so on. This iterative cycle of research and action involves considerable collaboration between organization members and OD practitioners. It places heavy emphasis on data gathering and diagnosis prior to action planning and implementation, as well as careful evaluation of results after action is taken. (p. 27-28)

CHAPTER SIX

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Changing Environmental Conditions

Paradigmatic Conditions

When this study was undertaken, the Dean of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) had been in that position for over 7 years. Prior to that, he served as Director of OSU Extension. In both capacities, he has remained highly supportive of collaborative work forms and approaches, a philosophy that has been fairly representative of the culture of OSU Extension since at least 1990. The new Extension Director, appointed in 1992, also possesses a predisposition toward collaboration, teamwork, shared leadership, and an interdisciplinary approach to Extension education. The cumulative effect of having a College Dean and Extension Director who shared similar organizational paradigms was to create a fertile environment for the emergence of formal, team-based work structures.

Because no administrative, philosophical barriers to the emergence of self-directed work teams existed at this point in time, discussion about the value of team-based work tended to develop naturally throughout Extension and the College. Faculty and staff with an interest in exploring team-based approaches and structures were encouraged to do so. The actual formation of the first self-directed teams within OSU Extension (in 1991 and 1992) emerged from several,

linked environmental phenomena in combination with the paradigmatic congruence described above.

Economic and Related Conditions

The Ohio legislature's decision in 1987 to dramatically reduce state budget support for Higher Education (including OSU Extension) prompted the University (and Extension) to offer an "early buyout" option for faculty nearing retirement age. This buyout option produced a significant reduction in state Extension specialist resources available to address an increasingly complex set of issues and concerns in the dairy, horticulture, nursery, turf and others industries. In response to the shortage of specialists, a number of county agents and district specialists began discussing the formation of 'clusters' of district specialists and county-based agents. These first discussions focused on the needs of the dairy industry in northeast Ohio, and eventually resulted in the formation of OSU Extension's first self-directed team, the Dairy Excel Team, in 1990.

Constituent Concerns

Some state agricultural commodity group concerns emerged around the ability of OSU Extension to serve their needs following budget-related reductions in specialists resources. This did not appear to be a statewide issue, however. Extension faculty, county agents and administrators understood the value of maintaining credibility with constituent groups and did not want a budget cut to

erode that credibility. The challenge to Extension was to become more responsive and innovative in program development and delivery. The budget crisis, in combination with the emergence of "new ways of doing business" internally, provided the sparked organization-wide interest and effort.

Agent Specialization

This fiscally-constrained environment prompted agents to consider how they might meet clientele needs with significantly fewer state specialist resources. One strategy that emerged was for agents to increase their individual knowledge and skills within their areas of interest and specialization. These discussions soon expanded to include Extension administrators, who began considering how agent specialization might link with team concepts that were beginning to emerge at the College level.

As a way to move team-based concepts through the organization, Extension administration began encouraging agents in 1993 to devote up to 25% of their time working in a preferred area of specialization. They also encouraged agents and specialists to work together, across county lines, and to experiment with new partnerships inside and outside Extension. To support this approach, Extension Administration made a number of incentives and support systems available to agents and specialists. These included: 1) making per-agent/specialist budget allocations to support travel; 2) funding professional development in support of specialization interests; 3) purchasing equipment and resource materials for team-based projects; 4) providing release time from

county responsibilities to attend team meetings and professional development programs; and 5) extending invitations to present the results of team-based efforts to peers at conferences. Somewhat later, teams were encouraged to apply for special Extension funds made available to encourage the development of new, innovative Extension programs. Because opportunities for agent specialization and team formation were voluntary, they tended to attract agents and specialists with an interest in collaborating with other Extension faculty and staff on specific projects. These personnel saw potential in teams for producing high-quality Extension programs in an environment of severely limited financial and human resources.

Structural Reorganization

In 1994, The W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded The Ohio State University $133,000 to fund a visioning process to explore what a land grant university should look like in the 21st Century. Emphasis was placed on how OSU might meet the needs of students and constituents from food-related businesses and industries. Called Project Reinvent, the broad visioning process included a number of partners within and outside the University. A major objective of the visioning process was to create a plan to sustain the agreed-upon changes over time.

In 1996, the Kellogg Foundation provided $1.5 million to the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences to implement a more connected, pluralistic and team-based culture within the College. These objectives included

exploring alternative faculty and staff reward systems that encourage team-based work among faculty and between departments; enacting organizational realignments intended to generate synergies between departments; putting in place more stakeholder-centered decision making process; and creating new resource allocation strategies to support these objectives.

A significant result of Project Reinvent was the merger of the departments of Agronomy, Horticulture, and Crop Science. Other changes included: combining the Animal, Dairy and Poultry Departments into the Animal Sciences Department; moving Rural Sociology from Agricultural Economics into Agriculture Education, which then became the Department of Human, Community, and Resource Development; and transitioning faculty from the Soils Department to the School of Natural Resources.

Together, these initiatives signaled a cultural transformation within the College and OSU Extension and established a foundation for the subsequent proliferation of team-centered thought and action within OSU Extension.

Strategy Development and Implementation

An Organizational Strategy

A specific, sequenced plan to introduce and adopt self-directed teams was not developed within either OSU Extension or the College. However, there was virtual unanimity among Extension and College administrators that teams should be encouraged to develop where sufficient need and interest existed.

Specific and deliberate strategies were developed, focusing on internal changes to support the emergence and development of self-directed teams.

Conceptualization

As previously reported, all executive administrators in Extension and the College embraced organizational philosophies consistent with, and supportive of, self-directed teams. However, little exploration of the literature of self-directed work teams had been undertaken to guide, inform, or support the adoption of self-directed teams. A major reason for this was that little had been written at the time on this subject.

As teams began emerging, team coordinators and members began taking a more active interest in the scholarly foundations of teams and team-based forms of leadership. There was general agreement that, if a scholarly approach had been taken in the design stage, more teams may have formed earlier and those that had formed might have experienced less confusion about how to work effectively.

Early Self-Directed Teams

The complex stew of environmental conditions that marked the late 1980s and early 1990s sparked discussions concerning how to serve constituents in an environment characterized by reduced resources and heightened expectations. Much of this discussion focused on strategies that involved collaborating across disciplines and county lines. There was corresponding interest in bringing about

organizational changes that would be lasting, and that would require increasing dependence on teams as an organizing form.

During 1987, some county agents formed multi-county clusters to address traditional and emerging issues. Then, in 1990, a Dairy Excel Team formed to address questions associated with how to do a better of job of working together to address the needs of the dairy industry in northeast Ohio. The Extension Nursery and Landscape (ENLT) Team formed in 1992 to address specific concerns in the turf and nursery industries. As the notion of teaming began to generate interest across the state, new teams began to form around a number of other agricultural commodities and contemporary issues.

The early teams published fact sheets and developed curricula. They tended to be self-regulating, making decisions about what professional development opportunities they would pursue, what performance standards they would adopt, where they might look for additional sources of funds, and which members they would invite to join. As interest grew within and outside Extension, teams began forming around agricultural commodities and interest areas including swine, beef, small fruit, tree fruit, waste, forage/grazing systems, floriculture, and agronomic crops.

Early Responses to Self-directed Work Teams

Internal Stakeholder Response

Buoyed by strong administrative, philosophical, and logistical support, self-directed teams at OSU Extension developed naturally. They sprang from

the interests and desires of faculty, staff, and constituents. While the process of development was slow, early teams reflected shared enthusiasm for team concepts. Teams were viewed as a symbol of both faculty/staff collaboration, and as evidence of administrative capacity to "walk its talk."

As has been reported, many county agents wanted to do a better job of focusing increasingly scarce specialist resources on the needs of local farm operators and agricultural commodity groups. Teams represented a new venue for doing this. Active involvement with a state team provided agents interested in acquiring more specialized knowledge and skills with new opportunities for professional development. Teams also permitted agents to work in closer proximity with state and district specialists.

Faculty began viewing a united team as a powerful lever through which to garner administrative support for program-related issues and hiring needs. Because the College was highly sensitive to the need to incorporate faculty members' team-based contributions during promotion and tenure decisions, little resistance emerged from junior faculty to working on state teams. And, because the adoption of self-directed teams at OSU Extension was a process of emergent and collaborative change—not an administrative mandate—resistance from faculty and staff was low.

External Stakeholder Response

Some agricultural interest groups were aware of a certain level of agent frustration with not being able to connect more specialists to local needs and

issues. They also understood the budget constraints underlying these frustrations. Consequently, most agricultural and horticulture interest groups were anxious to identify a solution that would permit Extension agents to be more effective locally. They were supportive of Extension's efforts to try new strategies, including SDWTs, if doing so would create a more responsive Extension education delivery system. As teams began to develop, agricultural interest groups began to take notice of some of the innovative projects and products being developed by teams. Their response to these early successes was supportive and enthusiastic.

As evidence of team success mounted, some agricultural interest groups not represented by teams expressed a desire in getting 'their own' Extension team. One compelling example of the level of support is the decision made by the Ohio Nursery and Landscape Association to provide launch funding to the Extension Nursery & Landscape Team (ENLT). That support has grown to an annual contribution of $35,000 to support team programming and operations.

Summary

Self-directed teams emerged within OSU Extension due to a combination of a "team-friendly" culture, a College-wide change process, and the need and interest to become more efficient locally. Teams were not forced upon Extension; they emerged naturally. Consequently, little or no resistance developed to frustrate their development. The adoption of self-directed work teams at OSU Extension is an example of how a serendipitous event, such as

OSU Extension's budget crises, can transform a pattern of thought into a congruent pattern of action.

FINDINGS

Subquestion #1
What conditions led to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Theoretical Proposition 1A
Some condition or combination of conditions serve to precipitate change within organizations.

Economic Conditions and Changing Roles of Agents and Specialists

A dramatic reduction of state funds for Extension in 1987 set in motion a number of changes in how Extension agents and specialists worked. The budget reduction prompted a reduction of state specialist resources through an early retirement program offered to conserve base dollars. Consequently, fewer state specialists were available to respond to the needs of an increasingly complex and diverse agricultural community.

The demands upon producers were growing rapidly to respond to mandates such as environmental protection rules. At the same time, some specialists were becoming concerned that their traditional technology transfer model was losing effectiveness as a means of responding to constituent needs. It quickly became apparent to some agents, specialists and administrators that Extension faculty and staff needed to work together to focus research and education on relevant and current issues. It also reflected a growing recognition among some specialists that an action research model might be more effective

in meeting constituent needs than the traditional combination of pure research and technology transfer.

A broader organizational issue emerged simultaneously around a concern held by many agents, specialists and administrators that Extension's credibility as an effective and responsive partner to agriculture was eroding because of a budget shortfall and its fallout. In response to these concerns, agents and district specialists began experimenting with a particular type of work group, locally called a cluster, enabling the pooling of intellectual and financial resources. The clusters and early self-directed teams that emerged in northeast Ohio were a direct response to these economic and constituent-driven conditions. A second response to the reduction in specialist resources was an increased desire among many agents to pursue specialized training and education.

County agents were increasingly being asked by constituent groups and individuals for help in identifying problems and developing solutions to them. Their traditional approach would be to bring in state or regional specialists. However, with fewer specialist resources available to them, many agents found themselves unable to respond adequately. In response, many county agents began expressing a desire to specialize in subject areas. They also expressed a desire to expand their teaching and research roles while scaling back their facilitative and information dissemination roles. This training, supported financially and logistically by Extension Administration, was intended to help them specialize in areas of local need and/or professional interest.

Theoretical Proposition 1B
Organizational change unfolds within one or more theoretical change models.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Change at OSU Extension

A number of theoretical perspectives are useful in explaining change at OSU Extension. From a macro perspective, the appreciative inquiry approach to organizational change embedded within the action research change model is particularly useful in explaining how self-directed work teams emerged within OSU Extension. This approach assumes that all organizations do some things well, and that positive change occurs by building upon what that which works well within an organization.

Using Nadler and Tushman's (1995) typology, change within OSU Extension has been both incremental and reactive. In this model, the clusters that agents and district specialists formed to pool resources and skills represented individual innovations at the sub-unit level of Extension that emerged as a reaction to resource reductions. Because these changes did not emerge throughout the entire organization, and because they did not represent fundamental strategic or service/product changes for Extension, they cannot be considered discontinuous. Because they did not emerge in anticipation of resource constraints, they cannot be considered anticipatory.

The logic model of planned change developed by Bacharach, Bamberger and Sonnenstuhl (1996) holds that organizations seek stability by maintaining an acceptable level of fit or congruence between an organization's ends and the means it has available to achieve those ends. The purpose of change within this

model is to restore or improve the degree of congruence between organizational ends and means. In the context of this study, OSU Extension's end seems to be that of maintaining an acceptable level of service to clients in a rapidly changing agricultural environment. The traditional means by which to accomplish this end was not working as well as it once had. The reduction in state specialist resources following the 1987 budget significantly created an imbalance in the means-ends congruence relationship. To re-establish proper balance in the means-ends relationship, agent/district clusters emerged as a new means of serving constituents. The net effect of this change was to re-establish organizational stability through the introduction of a new means.

Theoretical Proposition 1C
An organization's change strategy unfolds within a theoretical framework comprised of the members' and change manager's Theories-in-use.

Theories-In-Use About Extension

Theory #1
Self-directed work teams represented a good "fit" with Extension's culture.

OSU Extension administrators understood the organizational culture quite well. Once they came to understand self-directed team concepts, they understood that these concepts were highly congruent with OSU Extension's culture. Value-based similarities between OSU Extension culture and self-directed work team concepts include:

- Valuing employee empowerment
- Encouraging employees to take risks on behalf of the organization
- Promoting the entrepreneurial approach to resource acquisition
- Assigning a high value to multiple perspectives and solutions based upon diverse perspectives
- Valuing team membership

- Valuing the involvement of customers/clients in problem identification, and
- Believing that empowerment and self-direction nurtures creativity and, in turn, promotes innovation.

Theory #2
Encouraging self-directed teams to form voluntarily is consistent with organizational values.

This theory-in-action highlights a fundamentally important characteristic of OSU Extension's culture, which is an administrative commitment to behave in ways that are consistent with espoused organizational values and shared assumptions. Argyris and Schon (1978) describe espoused values as values that are spoken, but not necessarily acted upon. Through a process Schein (1992) calls "cognitive transformation," an espoused value may become a shared assumption or belief among organizational members if adherence to it produces a consistently positive outcome for members. While OSU administrators hoped self-directed teams would become a part of OSU Extension's organizational culture, they also believed that the institutionalization of team-based vales would not occur until a sufficient number of employees were having positive team experiences.

Theory #3
The empowerment and self-direction endemic to self-directed work teams enables team members to self-actualize. This enables them to become more creative, innovative and entrepreneurial.

A central tenant of the OSU Extension culture is that constraining individual autonomy puts limits on employee self-actualization.

Theories-In-Use About Organization

Theory #1
Sharing leadership and decision making authority is more effective than centralized leadership and decision making authority.

OSU Extension administrative leaders assume that, when they empower employees by sharing leadership and the authority for making management decisions, they also develop leadership and confidence among employees. They believe that empowered employees are more likely to express ideas, take reasonable risks, exhibit leadership behaviors, be creative and innovative, and act quickly on behalf of OSU Extension and its interests.

As concern rose over how budget reductions were beginning to affect OSU Extension's ability to remain responsive to agricultural constituencies, a number of agents and state specialists needed little if any encouragement to act in search of solutions. Because it was understood that employees were encouraged to take initiative in acting on behalf of Extension's interests, these individuals engaged the Director of Extension in a discussion concerning the merits of experimenting with team-based work forms to provide specialized support to Ohio's turfgrass industry. These discussions evolved quickly into a consensus decision to form what would later be understood as OSU Extension's first self-directed work teams.

Theory #2
Self-direction encourages self-actualization among employees. This, in turn, stimulates creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors among individuals and within groups.

County agents' desires to specialize were viewed by OSU administrators as a desire to deepen skills and become more competent employees. Extension

administrators viewed self-direction as a higher order of empowerment, one that could free agents to respond to individual desires for professional and personal growth and development. Members of elf-directed teams were encouraged to design and pursue their own professional development plans, and were supported with Extension dollars in doing so.

Theory #3
Team-based synergy produces outputs, outcomes, and impacts that are more relevant to stakeholder interests than those that result from individual effort alone.

Extension administrators and others attracted to SDWT concepts believe that self-directed teams would be comprised of agents and specialists from several disciplines. They believed further that the multiple perspectives inherent in this type of arrangement would permit a team to define and analyze constituent issues and concerns from a multitude of perspectives, thereby expanding the definition of problems and broadening the menu of alternatives by which to address them. This belief was a fundamentally important consideration in deciding to experiment with self-directed teams at OSU Extension. The feeling was that teams would have the potential to generate creative, relevant programs within an organizational culture that was highly customer-sensitive.

Theory #4
Self-directed teams will be most successful when comprised of people who prefer team-based work.

OSU Extension administrators and change agents believe that individuals are most productive when their work aligns with individual interests and temperament. Consequently, at OSU the approach to self-directed teams was, from the beginning, framed as a voluntary experiment. Change managers

assumed that teams would enjoy the most success if they were composed of people who preferred a team-based work environment, enjoyed working with others, and viewed co-producing and sharing recognition for quality work products as a positive dimension of the team experience.

Theoretical Proposition 2A
A shared leadership paradigm among change managers and leaders facilitates organizational change.

Paradigmatic Alignment

Administrative leaders within OSU Extension and the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) after 1992 shared similar value and belief systems regarding how organizations and people should and do work. Both the Director of OSU Extension and the Dean of CFAES were highly supportive of collaborative work forms. In addition, the Director of Extension valued shared leadership, collaboration, teamwork, and an interdisciplinary approach to Extension education. These paradigmatic conditions enabled SDWTs to emerge once administrative awareness of them surfaced for a number of reasons. Overall, SDWTs represented an organizational form that mirrored administrative values and beliefs:

- Multiple perspectives strengthen decisions.
- A fundamental role of leaders is to develop the leadership capacity in others.
- Employee creativity and commitment are positively associated with employee empowerment.
- When comprised of team-inclined individuals, team-based work is often more creative and innovative than individual-based work.

Theoretical Proposition 2B
A participatory approach to change management facilitates member acceptance and support of change efforts.

Self-organizing Around Constituent Needs

The multi-county clusters that formed during 1987 did so with the full knowledge and support of the Extension Director. His encouragement and support of their formation was consistent with his view that employees can and should participate in designing and implementing change systems on behalf of organizational interests. The Dairy Excel Team, which formed during 1990 to address dairy industry needs in northeast Ohio, was an example of this belief in self-organizing in response to emerging needs. The Nursery/Landscape/Turf Team, formed during 1991 and 1992 to get science-based information to these industries, was another. As knowledge of these early teams began to filter through the Agriculture program area, new teams began to self-organize around constituent needs. This dynamic represents a self-organizing, participant-driven approach.

Theoretical Proposition 2C
The degree of fit between organizational change, culture and organizational systems has an impact upon resistance to change.

Organizational Culture

Reflecting the orientation of the Director of Extension prior to 1992, the culture of OSU Extension had historically been friendly to collaborative, team-based work forms. Study respondents often indicated that most if not all OSU Extension administrative leaders, as well as many employees at all levels of the organization, felt that team-based work was endemic to OSU Extension's

organizational culture. The Extension Director hired during 1992 fit well with the culture of Extension. His decisions and judgments, as well as the expectations he had of Extension employees generally, reinforced an organizational culture that was decidedly "team-friendly."

As economic conditions reduced Extension's financial resources, the essential elements upon which OSU Extension's culture had been built (which emphasized empowerment, teamwork and collaboration) set in motion a series of iterative, organic changes. What emerged was 'discovered' as self-directed work teams.

The manner in which the Director of Extension approached his job was fundamentally consistent with the values and beliefs he espoused publicly. Embracing a facilitative approach to leadership and management, he encouraged team formation, while supporting interest in teams wherever it surfaced, both personally and financially. A recurring theme among study participants was that whatever success self-directed teams may have had within OSU Extension was directly related to the ability of the Director of Extension to create a supportive environment for teams to emerge and to grow. Furthermore, Extension employees were encouraged to explore and consider their individual fit within teams without administrative edicts or pressure that might otherwise force them into ways of organizing and working that would be counterproductive for them and/or for Extension.

One respondent also suggested that many OSU Extension employees saw themselves individually, and OSU Extension generally, as fundamentally

innovative. Another respondent identified innovation as a cultural element of OSU Extension. Some early adopters within OSU Extension began to explore some of the new organizational development themes and concepts that surfaced within the literature during the late 1980s and early 1990s. This exploration of administrative innovations and ideas led many of them directly to the early literature on self-directed teams. Consequently, self-directed teams were viewed positively by some simply because they were consistent with an organizational culture that valued innovation. A common response among study participants was that, in self-directed teams, OSU Extension discovered a work form that fit its culture exceptionally well. Once self-directed teams were reasonably well understood conceptually and, after they were accepted culturally, their successful emergence was all but assured.

Participatory Change and Member Resistance

OSU Extension's approach to facilitating the emergence of self-directed teams reflected a commitment to permit employees to make significant workplace choices and associated changes for themselves. The belief underlying this approach was that change designed by employees would result, simultaneously, in changes that were optimally responsive to constituent needs, and would experience minimal employee resistance. Finally, it was believed that acceptance of self-directed teams would emerge far more slowly in the presence of strong organizational resistance to them, which administrators believed would occur if teams were forced upon unwilling or resistant employees.

This approach is supported by Green and Butkus (1999). They suggest that organizational change is most effective when it focuses on the needs of employees rather than the needs of management. At OSU Extension, the motivation to change was essentially the same for both administrators and agents—find ways to be more effective in identifying and responding to constituent needs. What is most significant about OSU Extension, however, is that change was driven by employees not by the administration. On this point, Green and Butkus (p. 179) observe that employee-driven change "...relieves managers of the burden of solving these problems on their own. It recognizes that employees know more about their motivation and performance than anyone else, and it involves them as partners in solving their problems at work."

There is considerable evidence within the literature that resistance to change is minimized when employees participate in the design and implementation of change efforts (French and Bell, 1995; Cummings and Worley, 1993; Redding and Catalanello, 1994). Social cognitive theory, described by Porras (1987), assumes that people take clues from the environments in which they work to identify changes they need to make based upon their interests and abilities. This theoretical perspective is particularly useful in explaining the formation of clusters and early teams within OSU Extension.

The agents and specialists who formed clusters and early teams understood that their reputations, and quite possibly their future employment with Extension, depended upon how they performed. They considered status quo

and change options with this in mind. In doing so, they observed that collaboration, team-work and self-organization were firmly established as cultural norms within OSU Extension. They also considered whether or not teams were a workable approach for them, individually, given other available for working with each other. Ultimately, many decided that clusters, and later teams, represented the best marriage between responsiveness to external environmental imperatives, internal cultural norms, and their own individual interests and strengths.

The study data revealed no evidence of significant resistance to teams within OSU Extension. The resistance that did surface seems to relate more directly to broader cultural differences between OSU Extension and campus academic departments. This resistance usually involved the reluctance of departmental tenure and promotion committees to recognize team-based contributions by tenure-track faculty members vis-à-vis more traditional forms of scholarship. These findings suggest to the researcher that the decision by OSUE administrators to introduce self-directed teams as a purely voluntary innovation was highly effective in avoiding the emergence of significant employee resistance to teams.

Subquestion #3

What other factors surfaced at each study site that played a significant role in either facilitating or impeding the adoption self-directed teams?

Theoretical Proposition 3A

Change strategy reflects a number of variables associated with change managers that include:

A. Familiarity with the theory and practice of change management
B. Skill in developing and implementing change strategy (experience, skill, leadership), and

C. Interpretation of environmental conditions.

Familiarity With Self-directed Work Team Literature

Self-directed teams at OSU Extension emerged naturally, without a clear connection to the theory of self-directed teams or change management. Rather, self-directed teams emerged out of an organizational culture that, for several years prior to this researcher's investigation, had placed considerable value on team-based, collaborative approaches to work. The first clusters and teams that formed did so largely uninformed by the literature of either self-directed teams or change management. Only after these early teams were formed did the literature become a managerial tool. It was used to provide additional meaning and direction to the formation of subsequent teams.

The Role of Leadership

The study data suggest that the leadership literature was more useful during the emergent stages of team development at OSU. That literature seems to have assisted or enabled self-directed teams to emerge. A number of administrators and change managers were reasonably familiar with the literature of transformational leadership. During data collection, some references were made by at least two respondents to the concepts of transformational leadership developed by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). The work of Stewart and Manz (1995) demonstrates that facilitative leadership is positively associated with effective self-directed teams while directive approaches to leadership is negatively associated with effectiveness of self-directed teams. Their research

supports the notion that the facilitative leadership model that characterized OSU Extension had a positive effect in the formation of early self-directed teams regardless of whether or not administrators actually identified these early teams as self-directed teams as described in the literature.

Change Strategy

The change strategy at OSU Extension was not characterized by a conscious, purposeful string of actions designed to bring about the emergence of self-directed teams. Rather, the strategy was one of enabling and supporting individuals who recognized a need to change. Even after Extension administrators and change managers became familiar with self-directed work teams concepts, the change strategy continued to foster emergence and evolution. Reflecting again on Cummings and Worley's (1993) description of appreciative inquiry as a change model, it is apparent to the researcher that OSU Extension "leveraged its culture" in ways that permitted teams to emerge naturally. This approach is particularly elegant when viewed against the backdrop of the budgetary problems and constituent concerns that faced Extension during the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Systems

Study data did shed light on how the University reward system dealt with team-based work. It was learned that promotion and tenure committees in some departments did not value or recognize team-based research as much as pure

research. Others did. Because the Dean of the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences was highly and vocally supportive of team-based work generally, and self-directed teams specifically, this problem was not as significant as it might have been in the absence of such support. Overall, there was evidence that some junior faculty were reluctant to join teams for fear their work might not be fully considered during the tenure review process.

Some concerns over self-directed teams emerged at the county level—that county officials might not want "their" county agents working across county lines. These concerns were rarely if ever substantiated by actual complaints by county officials, however. Instead, Extension administrators received a number of unsolicited, positive comments from county officials indicating that the team-based approach actually brought more expertise to their counties.

Summary

The emergence of teams within OSU Extension was not a function of administrative design. Neither was it informed, in any significant way, by theory or by the experience of other Extension or other organizations. Rather, self-directed teams emerged naturally, out of a combination of internal and external environmental conditions and a conducive, organizational culture.

As such, the emergence of self-directed teams at OSU Extension is a particularly useful example of how a number of theories associated with organizational change and innovation work in practice. These theories include the relationship between facilitative leadership and effective self-directed teams;

the effectiveness of appreciative inquiry as a change model; and the effectiveness of participative approaches to organizational change.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION

Organizational Configuration

The University of Wisconsin system includes thirteen 4-year campuses, thirteen freshman-sophomore campuses, and the University of Wisconsin-Extension. The University of Wisconsin-Extension is a statewide campus with offices in every county and faculty on every campus. UWEX is comprised of four separate units: Continuing Education Extension, Extension Communications, Business and Manufacturing Extension, and Cooperative Extension.

Continuing Education Extension (CEE) programs include continuing education, credit outreach, and distance education at all 26 UW-System campuses; the Learning Innovations unit, which provides print, web and consultant-based educational programs and services; and the School for Labor, which provides educational programs for organized labor organizations. The Division of Extension Communications includes Wisconsin Public Radio, Wisconsin Public Television, and Instructional Communications, which provides electronic and distance education services in support of system-wide distance education efforts. In cooperation with county government, COOP Extension provides county-based educational programs in all 72 Wisconsin counties. Educational programs are offered in Agriculture and Natural Resources; Community, Natural Resources and Economic Development; Family Living; and

4-H Youth Development. Self-directed work teams are being formally adopted in Cooperative Extension.

Early Experiences with Team-Based Work Structures

Team-based work and work structures are not new to the culture of UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension. In fact, they have existed for decades. During the early 1970s, Family Living Programs (FLP) formed Agent/Specialist work groups (or teams) to examine county-based issue data as the basis for program planning. In recognition of the connections between programming issues, FLP began consolidating these work groups into larger teams. For example, separate clothing and textiles groups were consolidated into the Clothing and Textiles group, and the food and nutrition work groups joined to become the Food and Nutrition group. Similarly, the Agriculture and Ag Business program area (now named Agriculture and Natural Resources) had its own version of teams, called "Enterprise Committees," which were formed in the 1970s to identify issues and assess program needs. Among the issues identified were soil and water conservation, farm transfers, and marketing.

Team-based in structure, these early committees fell under the administrative control of respective program areas and sprung largely from priorities identified by program area administrators. Early Ag/Ag Business Committees received funds and direction from program area administrators. Decisions as to choice of work activity and scope were made centrally, and new work activities and direction were subject to approval of the Program Area Office.

Something Is Wrong

Beginning in the mid 1990s, concerns were being raised by Extension administrators about working relationships between state and campus-based faculty and staff in terms of employee satisfaction and the quality of work being produced. In response to these concerns, some administrators toured the state interviewing both state specialists and agents. These interviews revealed a number of "disconnects" between agents, between state specialists and agents, and even between Cooperative Extension and its clientele groups. Of primary interest was the disconnection between specialists and agents due to the fundamental importance they play in developing and delivering Extension programs statewide.

Disconnects between specialists and agents were widely viewed as the result of how each group traditionally worked. Generally, specialists did not make many presentations at the local level due to travel budget constraints and the specialization of some agents, who saw themselves as the primary deliverer of local education programs. Some agents complained that they were not getting the support they needed from specialists, while some specialists did not always see a link between the research they were doing and what agents were doing at the county level.

Some felt that these disconnects were having a negative effect on COOP, from limiting the effectiveness of program development efforts to damaging the credibility of Cooperative Extension with state and federal legislators. As administrative acceptance of these problems grew, a predominant view emerged

among administrators that Extension's organizational structure, in combination with the way specialists and agents worked alone and together, was causing problems.

Other concerns regarding the effectiveness of certain organizational practices and approaches began to surface, as well. Administrators reported that COOP Extension's Planning and Reporting system was viewed as ineffective at capturing program outcome and impact data. Furthermore, the historical division of COOP Extension into four separate program areas—each with its own academic department within the University of Wisconsin-Extension, with its own way of developing programs, with its own approach to how specialists and agents worked together, and with its own culture—tended to further fragment how agents and specialists thought and worked. These multiple cultures made it difficult to introduce new ideas across program areas.

Paradigmatic Shifts

During the mid to late 1990's, when administrative understanding and acceptance of the organizational disconnects was beginning to develop, several key position changes occurred within the UW-Madison College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) and Cooperative Extension. Of primary importance was the appointment of a new Dean of Cooperative Extension and, a short time later, of a new Associate Dean of Cooperative Extension. The hiring of an Interim Dean of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (described later) was a critical event in the paradigmatic shifts within Extension. Additional

administrative changes described later in this chapter would occur within a few years. These changes would have a significant impact on the evolution of self-directed work teams in Cooperative Extension.

In Cooperative Extension, individuals who favored a team-based approach to Extension and possessed an interest in 'flattening' the Cooperative Extension organization filled the Dean and Associate Dean positions. Emerging from the new administrative team was considerable and consistent interest in moving Extension toward a structure where program design and delivery decisions could be made as close as possible to the point of program delivery.

UWEX's historical approach to programming involved state specialist's designing programs that were then delivered locally by county-based faculty. However, a shift in thinking began to emerge that program innovation, quality, and impact could be enhanced if specialists, agents and stakeholders co-identified issues and co-developed programs. This thinking also held that faculty working at the county level often, if not always, possessed superior knowledge of local issues—issues that could form the basis for improved research and program development at the local level and across the state. Along with this emerging belief was the sense that more equitable relationships between campus and county faculty could be established more easily through new structures such as the self-directed work team. In these teams, members would share authority and responsibility for assessing program need and making decisions concerning how to respond to issues of local relevance. Local needs assessments were seen as an important way of getting University specialists'

research agendas to better reflect local needs. This approach was also viewed as being consistent with the 'engaged university' concept that Extension administrators now embrace strongly.

In response to a growing perception that various parts of Extension were not working in harmony with each other, ideas were sought from Extension organizations in states with SDWT experience. These state Extension organizations included Michigan State University Extension, The Ohio State University Extension, and Nebraska Cooperative Extension. Through a series of personal visits, interviews, and exchanges, the administrative team at UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension began developing a conceptual and practical understanding of SDWTs. This understanding would serve as the basis for considering how SDWTs might be deployed in Wisconsin.

In addition to leveraging the lessons learned from other state Extension organizations, the emerging organizational paradigm around SDWTs at UWEX was being fueled "from within." Even as there was growing knowledge of internal organizational dysfunction, some administrators were reviewing the SDWT literature, specifically, and the organizational development literature, generally. This helped to familiarize Extension administrators with the potential benefits of SDWTs and other alternatives to hierarchical organizational structures.

Benefits Sought from Self Directed Work Teams

UWEX administrators were able to identify specific benefits that accrued from SDWTs to other state Extension organizations. This information, in

combination with their own review of the SDWT literature, led them to conclude that SDWTs held considerable potential to address their organization's unique issues and challenges. Specific benefits sought included:

Increased Collegiality

Teams comprised of state specialists and agents would promote mutual appreciation and understanding concerning each others' roles, skills, and interests.

Agents would have increased access to specialists and other agents around the state, thereby feeling less isolated and better able to access their expertise.

Increased Program Quality Synergy

A wider range of perspectives would result in a more complete definition of issues and educational responses to them.

Teams would enable better and more consistent communication between agents, between specialists and agents, between issues of local relevance and campus-based research efforts, and between field and campus-based research objectives and initiatives.

Teams would bring more knowledge resources to bear on specific issues.

Multidisciplinary teams would bring complimentary knowledge to bear on issues requiring a multidisciplinary response.

Multidisciplinary teams would produce a more synergistic working environment.

Teams would shape the research agendas of state specialists so that they would focus more on local needs.

Increased Program Impact Documentation

It was believed that team-based reporting would improve federal and state reports by showing greater impact than the traditional "single success story" approach. Team-based reporting could show broader impact by incorporating individual statistics, impact indicators, impact statements, and success stories, in addition to team-based impacts.

Significant Internal Environmental Conditions

Throughout Cooperative Extension administration, an approach consistent with traditional levels of autonomy at the program area level was favored for use in introducing Cooperative Extension to SDWTs. State Program (Area) Leaders were encouraged to consider how they might employ SDWTs, given the uniqueness of their individual cultures and ways of doing business. In some cases, this was successful. In other cases, particularly where there was little interest in SDWTs as a means to address issues of specialist/agent disconnection or where SDWTs were viewed as nothing new in relation to earlier forms of team-based work structures, SDWTs caught on either more slowly, less enthusiastically, or not at all.

The Agriculture and Natural Resources Extension (ANRE) Program area represents Coop Extension's most complete experience with SDWTs. Administrative support for SDWTs within the ANRE program area has been enthusiastic despite a series of administrative personnel changes within the program area following the appointment of a new Dean and a new Associate Dean.

Prior to 1990, the UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension and the UW-Madison College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) shared a joint position of Associate Dean. In July 1990, the individual holding this joint position retired. At that time, Cooperative Extension—wanting to make its administrative structure consistent across all program areas—decided to create a Program Leader position in the Ag/Ag Business program area, ending the joint Associate Dean position it shared with CALS. In continuing recognition of the close functional relationship between CALS and ANRE, during Spring 1990, CALS filled their open position with an interim Associate Dean for Extension/Outreach, making that appointment permanent in October 1992.

In January 1997, the Extension Program Leader for Ag and Ag Business (AAB) resigned. This resignation prompted a reconsideration of the administrative relationship between CALS and Cooperative Extension, resulting in the decision to re-establish a joint CALS/AAB Associate Dean position that included AAB program leader responsibilities. The search to fill this new joint position was interrupted by the resignation of the Dean of CALS in June 1997. The joint Associate Dean position was then filled through an interim appointment

in July 1997 and a permanent appointment in January 2000. Through this series of events, an Assistant Program Leader position has been maintained in AAB. During Summer 1998, the name of the COOP Extension Ag & Ag Business program area was changed to "Agriculture and Natural Resources," reflecting the importance of natural resource issues within the agriculture sector.

The key to these administrative changes is that the individuals who were selected to serve in both interim and permanent capacities brought to the respective jobs a willingness to explore the idea that SDWTs could benefit Extension. A critical mass of support existed from the Dean of Extension through the ANRE program area to proceed with the development of a strategy for implementing SDWTs in COOP/ANRE. These conditions proved to be essential for successfully adopting SDWTs within COOP/ANRE.

Strategy Development and Implementation

The absence of a permanent administrative team slowed the development of a cohesive strategy with which to implement SDWTs in COOP/ANRE. Six months prior to the appointment of an interim Associate Dean for CALS/ANRE, and with leadership from Cooperative Extension Administration and the ANRE Program Office, a series of loosely configured, informal discussions occurred throughout the state. The purpose was to assess state and county faculty thinking about the idea of SDWTs as a primary approach to program design and delivery. Generally, these discussions were met with skepticism and lack of enthusiasm. During a six-month period following the appointment of an Interim

Associate Dean, these discussions became more formal, leading eventually to an attempt to create an 'administrative panel' whose purpose was to envision, design, and maintain a SDWT-based structure in COOP/ANRE. That attempt was largely unsuccessful. Many of those involved believed SDWTs represented an unnecessary bureaucratic layer within COOP/ANRE. Despite these feelings, considerable administrative support for moving ahead existed throughout the administrative levels of CALS, COOP Extension and COOP/ANRE.

A committee was formed in January 1997 to plan a two-day conference for ANRE faculty and staff on the changing nature of agriculture. During the next six months, the Committee chair conducted a number of interviews with state and county-based faculty and staff. The purpose was to identify issues related to the conference topic, and to evaluate reports of disconnection between state specialists and county agents. During these interviews, many state specialists and county agents expressed frustration regarding the quality of their mutual relationships and with the level of collegiality. The interview results had a solidifying effect in galvanizing administrative interest in SDWTs, both at the Dean's and Program Office levels. Administrators were convinced that a team-based structure could promote more natural connections between state specialists and county-based faculty and staff.

An agent rose to his feed during a conference planning meeting in June 1997, imploring colleagues to change how they work together or run the risk of failing to meet the challenges of a changing agriculture. This event, and the discussion that followed, had a considerable influence on committee members.

They made the decision to use the 1997 Annual Conference as a venue for introducing SDWTs to ANRE faculty and staff. This 'critical moment' marked a clear commitment to implement SDWTs within ANRE. Pilot teams were formed after the 1997 conference to test the team concept.

Following the decision to proceed, the author was invited to join the Conference Planning Committee to share his knowledge about SDWTs. The author's work with the conference planning committee focused on familiarizing committee members with SDWT theory and practice; conveying the importance of permitting faculty and staff to play a significant role in team development; and describing the potential administrative implications and issues associated with a transition to SDWTs. The author's activities were also intended to prepare ANRE administrators for an expanded role in providing support and encouragement to SDWTs following their formation at the 1998 ANRE Conference. Specifically, the author provided committee members with scholarly articles on SDWTs. Some, but not all, of these articles were included in the conference participant packet as a means to enhance understanding of SDWTs among ANRE state and county-based faculty and staff. As a direct contribution to the conference program, the author was asked to prepare and deliver a presentation on the topic of team-based leadership at the conference, which he subsequently did.

The conference planning committee planned to use the 1998 ANRE Annual Conference as a venue for creating a number of SDWTs around issues that had been identified at district meetings. Input had been by county agents

and state specialists using focus groups and through other needs assessment processes. To prepare participants for this activity, early conference presentations focused on identifying issues and introducing the concept of SDWTs, and describing how specialists and agents would co-plan, co-generate and co-report report on educational programs. Presentations by ANRE administrators described administrative and financial support structures and tools that had been developed by the ANRE administration. Additionally, state specialists with Michigan State University Extension presented a session on the lessons learned to date on the implementation of SDWTs there.

The second half of the first day was dedicated to giving faculty and staff members an opportunity to identify which issue-based team or teams they would like to join. At the conclusion of the first day, it became apparent that ANRE faculty and staff did not support the wholesale organization of SDWTs around issues. In response to this "crisis," two primary leaders of the conference planning committee met long into the night considering an "alternative approach." The alternative offered by the conference planners during the first session of the conference's second day was to permit teams to organize around both traditional agricultural commodities (such as dairy, swine, field crops, and beef) and around agricultural issues. Faculty and staff response to this comprise was very positive due, in part, to the fact that much of the history, programming, political considerations and organization of ANRE had developed around commodities. The conference planning committee, ANRE administrators, and the Cooperative Extension administrators concluded that this compromise prevented the outright

rejection of SDWTs. Conference participants proceeded to form several teams, some around issues and some around traditional agricultural commodities. The remainder of the conference was dedicated to permitting teams to meet to discuss how they would organize, select leadership, and plan their meeting schedule.

Summary

The process by which self-directed work teams were established at UW-Extension and within the COOP/ANRE program area continues to unfold through a series of unplanned critical events, conscious decisions, formal and informal environmental assessments, and learning experiences. The author views this implementation process as more of an evolution than as an unfolding of a strategic plan. The fact is that administrative curiosity with and affinity for a set of concepts caught the attention of many faculty and staff who also sensed that something new needed to be introduced. The adoption of SDWTs at UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension has been, and continues to be, an iterative, learn-by-doing experience. As institutional experience with SDWTs grows, new issues arise and become visible, new lessons are learned, and more informed strategy and thinking is employed for moving forward.

FINDINGS

Subquestion #1
What conditions led to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Theoretical Proposition 1A
Some condition or combination of conditions serve to precipitate change within organizations.

The Impetus for Change Within UWEX/Cooperative Extension

The adoption of self-directed teams within UWEX/Cooperative Extension was largely a matter of an organization being asked to adopt structural changes in response to an emergent set of relational and structural concerns within Cooperative Extension. These weaknesses were viewed by many Extension employees within and outside COOP administrative ranks as actual or potential threats to both program quality and to COOP's reputation among key elected officials at the state level. These concerns originated within Extension administration and were subsequently verified through numerous discussions with county-based faculty and academic staff across the state.

Agent/Specialist Disconnects

During the early 1990s, some administrators became concerned that state specialists and county faculty/staff were not working well together. Administrators heard reports that some agents felt they were not getting the support they needed from specialists. Agents and specialists agreed that some specialists did not always see a link between their research programs and the work agents were doing at the county level. Some specialists cited expectations placed upon them

by their non-Extension departments, which emphasized more traditional research and less applied research. This was a concern to COOP Extension administration. Considerable investments were being made in specialists at UW-Madison and other system campuses. The net results of this disconnect were twofold. First, it produced a deepening feeling among some ANRE county-based faculty and staff of being increasingly isolated from specialist resources. Second, it created administrative concern that the research of some specialists was out of touch with the needs of local constituents. This had the potential of eroding Cooperative Extension's relationship with, and support by, local constituencies.

An Administrative Desire for a 'Flatter' Organizational Structure

The UWEX/COOP Dean and Associate Dean were interested in creating organizational systems and other arrangements that enabled program and research decisions to be made closer to constituents. Self-directed work teams were viewed as a means of doing so. This belief was based upon the assumption that teams would rely heavily on constituent input to drive education program design and research direction, and might even include external stakeholders as members.

Lessons Learned from Other Extension Organizations

UWEX/COOP Extension administrators consulted with representatives from both Michigan State University Extension and The Ohio State University

Extension prior to moving toward self-directed teams. These Extension organizations expressed varying levels of concern regarding agent-specialist disconnects and the potential to weaken constituent support. Consequently, when examining their own organization and environments, UWEX/COOP Extension administrators were particularly sensitive to the possibility that agent-specialist disconnects held at least the potential to negatively impact constituent support. Both MSU Extension and OSU Extension expressed the view that, based upon their respective experiences, self-directed teams were an effective means of reversing specialist-agent disconnects, building constituent support, and designing and delivering Extension innovative and responsive education and research programs.

Theoretical Proposition 1B
Organizational change unfolds within one or more theoretical change models.

Change Models at UW-Extension

The adoption of SDWTs within UW-Extension was change driven by administrative interest in addressing organizational concerns and issues previously described. Raymon and Wyman's (1998) depiction of change as being either management-driven or more broadly participative is relevant for identifying the impetus for change within UW-Extension. Particularly useful in explaining the change process within COOP is the involvement of non-managerial employees. The study data provide considerable evidence that change within COOP began as a management-driven process, including the

surfacing of organizational concerns and associated diagnostic activities intended to confirm both their existence and significance. As the adoption process proceeded, non-administrative employee participation increased noticeably, particularly during the diagnosis stage when county faculty/staff were queried about their concerns relative to specialists. Nevertheless, the adoption of self-directed teams within COOP was a predominantly administrative intervention that was driven by administrative interests and actors.

Cummings and Worley's (1993, p. 32) general model of planned change includes four basic phases. These include entering and contracting, diagnosing, planning and implementing change, and evaluating and institutionalizing change. They also identify five tasks that change managers perform to plan and implement change. These include motivating change, creating a vision of the post-change organization, developing political support for change, managing the transition from its pr-change state to its post-change state, and sustaining momentum for change. While their change model and progression of change steps is good for describing how change should occur, the prescriptive nature of their approach is not particularly useful for explaining change as it actually occurs in context. However, they do point out that differences in the degree of organization, within an organization, that is helpful for explaining why organizations vary in how they change.

Cummings and Worley (1993, p. 37) describe under-organized organizations as those in which "...there is too little constraint or regulation for effective task performance. Leadership, structure, job design, and policy are ill

defined and fail to control task behaviors effectively." UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension is such an organization, largely because of the way it is organized. Within Cooperative Extension, four departments serve as academic homes to faculty while the Academic Staff Council serves as the organizing unit for academic staff. Each faculty department has rules and policies for governing the activities of its members in matters of promotion and tenure. The Academic Staff Council serves the same purpose for its members except that academic staff do not receive tenure. Additionally, Extension Administration, through a system of administrative districts, has its own set of policies and guidelines pertaining to additional performance evaluation, salary and benefits. Finally, county-based faculty and staff are subject to additional county government-based personnel policies and rules through COOP's formal arrangements with county governments.

The net effect of this organizing scheme is that county-based faculty and staff must respond to many bosses and job performance expectations. There is no single set of policies or rules guiding the performance of county-based faculty and staff. The administration of Cooperative Extension, generally, and the planning and implementation of change within COOP, specifically, is not a coordinated effort involving faculty governance, academic staff governance, district-level administration, and county government. Consequently, change efforts driven by administrative interests unfold and are interpreted through a number of institutional filters, communication networks, and leaders.

Cummings and Worley (p.38) suggest that the phases of planned change may be altered for under-organized organizations by "...clarifying leadership roles, structuring communication between managers and employees, and specifying job and departmental responsibilities." Their model of planned change, modified for under-organized organizations, includes four steps. These include identification, which includes the identification of individuals or groups that need to be involved in the change effort; convention, which involves bringing together relevant change agents for the purpose of organizing the change effort; organization, which involves the creation of mechanisms with which to structure communication and relationships between people and departments involved with the change effort; and evaluation, which involves assessing the outcomes of the change effort. This modified model is very useful in explaining the adoption of self-directed teams within COOP Extension.

Identification

COOP/ANRE understood that change efforts within ANRE needed to be led by individuals who were broadly respected by organizational members and stakeholders. Consequently, individuals who met this criterion were selected to introduce and lead the change effort.

Convention

Change leaders then formed a team and began to meet regularly to design a change strategy. This team also identified a number of

opportunities for use in disseminating information about SDWT concepts, for developing political support, and for involving agents and specialists, in various ways, in the design of the adoption strategy.

Organization

The strategy team identified the Fall1998 Annual ANRE Conference as the mechanism for forming the first self-directed teams. Teams were subsequently formed, including the appointment or volunteering of interim team leaders and co-leaders. Permanent team leaders and co-leaders would be elected from within the teams following an organizing phase.

Evaluation

This phase had not yet occurred during the period this research was being conducted.

Cummings and Worley's modified change model succeeds as a means of explaining the change process within COOP/ANRE precisely because it fits the organizational idiosyncrasies of COOP Extension. And, its breadth permits it to be sufficiently descriptive without being prescriptive.

Theoretical Proposition 1C
An organization's change strategy unfolds within a theoretical framework comprised of the members' and change manager's Theories-in-use.

Theories-In-Use About UWEX/Cooperative Extension

Theory #1
The benefits of self-directed work teams will accrue to UWEX if they are adopted.

This theory was adopted by some Extension administrators following their discussions with other state Extension organizations and in combination with their exploration of the literature on SDWTs. The underlying assumption was that the adoption of SDWTs was the fundamental barrier standing in the way of increased collaboration between agents and specialists, more effective reporting of program impacts, and more innovative programming.

Theory #2
Cooperative Extension's organizational structure and culture are consistent with the adoption of self-directed teams.

UWEX/Cooperative Extension, like most Extension and other government bureaucracies, is organized vertically. A faculty governance committee, which administers the promotion and tenure process for county-based faculty structure, exists alongside COOP's administrative structure. Similarly, the Council of Academic Staff handles promotions for county and campus-based academic staff. Finally, COOP is divided into four separate program areas, each with its own set of program priorities, rules and priorities, and influence over the evaluation of faculty and academic staff. COOP's organizational structure contains a number of organizational cultures—administrative, academic, and programmatic—that reflect a varied and often conflicted set of rules, values, expectations and standards for faculty and staff. Despite the complexity of this culture, there was an overriding belief among most COOP administrators that self-directed teams could be successfully introduced across the entire

organization through a combination of administrative control, education, and persuasion.

An additional assumption driving this belief was that COOP's organizational culture was self-directed and team-ready. Because COOP Extension had traditionally utilized administrative, faculty, and program-related committees to accomplish its work, administrators assumed that self-directed teams did not represent a significant cultural or operational change. In fact, it was believed that SDWTs had existed in some program areas for years, but that they were not thought of or called "self-directed teams."

Theory #3
Program Leaders would support the introduction of SDWTs within their administrative units.

COOP administrators assumed that Program Area leaders would support the adoption of self-directed teams. The underlying assumption was that the benefits of SDWTs to program areas would be self-evident, and that interest in adopting them throughout all four of COOPs program areas would be reasonable high.

Theories-In-Use About Organization

Theory #1
Determining the need for organizational change and providing leadership for that change are primarily administrative responsibilities.

COOP Administrators tended to view the initiation of organizational change and innovation as their responsibility, as opposed to looking to

organizational members to identify the need for broad organizational change. The earliest interest in teams was administrative, and the energy for and direction of the adoption process was downward through Cooperative Extension. Feedback from county-based staff and state specialists was solicited to verify the existence or prevalence of a number of organizational issues and concerns. But this feedback was sought in the context of administrative interest in determining whether teams would produce the same results in Wisconsin as they had in Michigan and elsewhere.

Theory #2
Self-direction encourages creativity, innovation, synergy and entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors among individuals and within groups

COOP Extension administrators were impressed with the positive benefits of self-directed teams at MSU Extension. The message coming from Michigan was that self-directed teams had led to increased collaboration between specialists and county-based agents, more innovative programs, increased entrepreneurial behavior among staff, and more satisfied constituent groups. These reports led directly to the assumption that self-directed teams could and would produce similar results if adopted within Wisconsin.

Theory #3
Organizations are most effective when decisions are made as closely as possible to where an organization serves its constituents.

Self-directed teams were viewed as a venue for moving program design and delivery decisions closer to the point where Extension interfaced with its

constituents. By involving constituents directly as team members and/or advisors, SDWTs were thought to be an ideal means for accomplishing a number of objectives. These included involving constituents directly in identifying local needs upon which educational programs are based, and determining what types and formats of programs would be most relevant locally.

Theory #4
Self-directed teams promote collegiality and synergy among team members.

COOP Administrators and ANRE change managers who were familiar with some of the literature on self-directed teams understood some of the advantages of teams. Individuals from MSU Extension and the researcher made presentations to the 1998 conference describing these benefits.

Subquestion #2
What organizational factors were antecedent to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Theoretical Proposition 2A
A shared leadership paradigm among change managers and leaders facilitates organizational change.

Paradigmatic Alignment

Both the Dean and Associate Dean of Cooperative Extension believed that initiating broad organizational leading change was a critical component of their administrative responsibilities. They also believed that the use administrative authority to initiate change was appropriate and even necessary when support for proposed changes was not universal across COOP's administrative team. Both individuals believed strongly in the potential benefits

of self-directed teams and considered their adoption to be a major priority within COOP Extension. Finally, both individuals believed that program design and delivery decisions ought to be made in concert with local constituents to ensure program relevance and as a means for building political support at the local level. In the case of the adoption of self-directed teams in COP Extension, the importance of these areas of agreement cannot be understated as they represent agreement on both the ends and the means of organizational change.

Theoretical Proposition 2B
A participatory approach to change management facilitates member acceptance and support of change efforts.

Organizing Around Faculty/Staff Interests

The adoption approach taken by the Dean was to permit program areas to determine for themselves how best to adopt SDWTs in their respective program areas. The adoption approach taken by the College of ANRE was to put together a well-respected adoption team to gauge organizational interest in, and resistance to, self directed teams and to develop an adoption strategy based upon their findings. While there was significant resistance to teams among campus specialists, the county-based faculty and staff were generally open to SDWT concepts. The major issue to address was how teams would work in reality.

The members of the adoption team believed that for faculty and staff to support teams they should have some level of involvement in determining how SDWTs work. Consequently, the adoption team decided to dedicate the 1998

annual conference to the task of working with ANRE faculty and staff to adopt a team structure and approach. During that conference, the adoption team proposed a team structure in which teams would be organized around agricultural issues. However, it quickly became apparent that faculty and staff preferred to be given a choice to organize around either issues or agricultural commodities. Historically, agents and many specialists had built relationships with commodity groups and were comfortable working with and on behalf of these groups. Following the expression of concern with the adoption team's proposed structure, the afternoon of the first day of the conference was dedicated to a conference-wide discussion concerning the value of being given a choice of how to affiliate with teams. The adoption team's decision that night to permit teams to organize around either issues or commodities was fundamentally important because it averted significant resistance among faculty and staff over how teams should be organized. This decision served as a dramatic demonstration of the proposition that employee resistance to change can be mitigated by involving employees in the process of designing and implementing change (Bowman and Deal,1984; Green and Butkus, 1999; Morris and Raben, in Nadler, Shaw & Walton and Associates, 1995; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1995).

Resistance to self-directed teams surfaced in two different areas. First, when ANR change managers presented the ideas of self-directed teams to a group of campus specialists and academic department chairs, some expressed the view that this was an attempt by COOP Administration to force a structural

change that did not respect the way campus faculty traditionally worked. Specifically, some believed that this was change in response to a concern that did not exist.

Theoretical Proposition 2C
The degree of fit between organizational change, culture and organizational systems has an impact upon resistance to change.

Organizational Culture

The assumption that the COOP Extension's organization culture fit well with self-directed teams is, in large part, accurate. UW-Extension's faculty and Academic Staff structures, in particular, have historically worked through, and placed considerable value upon, collegiality and collaboration. Faculty and Academic Staff committee structures have served as the primary venue through which scholarship and performance are recognized. These are historically democratic organizations that have established and maintained their own standards for scholarship and performance. In this sense, they are self-directed organizations. While COOP Extension's academic structures demonstrate some elements of congruence with the central concepts that define self-directed teams, they contain incongruent elements.

The tenure provisions embedded within the faculty system represent a stronger measure of protection for tenured faculty than is available for academic staff, whose employment is contractual. The institution of tenure has historically defined scholarship as a matter of individual performance rather than as team-based performance. Consequently, some non-tenured county-base faculty were

reluctant to invest significantly in teams for fear that their team-based contributions would not be adequately valued during the tenure review process. Having said that, at the same time early teams were being formed within ANRE, a new tenure review document—the portfolio—was approved by the Faculty Senate. This new option was designed to reflect a broader array of scholarly work by tying a faculty member's performance to supporting documents, such as annual plans of work and annual performance evaluations. The vita, in contrast, relied more on the design and delivery of educational programs and the demonstration of measurable outcomes and impacts of those programs. Consequently, the portfolio was seen by some as providing a slightly better opportunity for non-tenured faculty to include team-based work on their tenure documents, provided such work was included on their annual plans of work and was seen as a positive element of their overall performance profile. However, the focus of the tenure process remains a process designed to highlight and reward individual performance. As such, it remains an institution that discourages, to varying degrees, uninhibited investment in self-directed teams by non-tenured faculty.

The cultures of non-Extension UW-System universities reflect many of the same acceptance and resistance points as UWEX county-based faculty. The independence of campus-based faculty in relation to associated administrative structures has traditionally been stronger than that within UW-Extension. Academic freedom to construct research programs and teach stands is a core value of institutions of higher education throughout the United States, and this is

no different in UW-System universities. The notion that stakeholders should significantly influence the research activities of University faculty with Extension appointments faces considerable resistance among many state specialists. Many campus faculty members have built their professional reputations on their research programs. This view holds that research brings in more outside money, is more congruent with the expectations of their campus departments, and is a more legitimate form of scholarship than team-based, applied research. Additionally, a number of non-tenured campus faculty members expressed concern over the issue of whether campus department promotion and tenure committees would adequately value and recognize team-based work on their vita documents.

Despite the concerns associated with tenure, resistance to self-directed teams was far lower among county-based faculty than among campus-based faculty. Because academic staff members were not granted tenure, study participants reported that tenure was not viewed as a significant concern among ANRE county-based academic staff in supporting the introduction of self-directed teams. The most active resistance to teams came from two groups. First, some campus-based faculty, both tenured and non-tenured, saw teams as a threat to their academic freedom to choose and/or fully invest in their own research interests. Second, teams were viewed as a liability during tenure review by some non-tenured faculty. Overall, faculty resistance to self-directed teams revealed cultural incongruencies concerning how scholarship was defined and

demonstrated, and how academic freedom was supposed to work for faculty members.

Subquestion #3

What other factors surfaced at each study site that played a significant role in either facilitating or impeding the adoption self-directed teams?

Theoretical Proposition 3A

Change strategy reflects a number of variables associated with change managers that include:

A. familiarity with the theory and practice of change management
B. skill in developing and implementing change strategy (experience, skill, leadership)
C. interpretation of environmental conditions

Familiarity with Self-directed Work Team Literature

COOP administrators familiarized themselves with some of the literature on self-directed work teams. There was much less evidence, however, concerning the literature of organizational change and innovation. The adoption process was driven by the SDWT literature. The lessons learned reflected evidence that attention to the change and innovation literature may have changed the approach to, and pace of, adoption.

The Role of Leadership

The literature on organizational change and innovation, and the literature on self-directed work teams, is peppered with attention to the role of leadership in the management of organizational change and in the adoption and management of self-directed teams. COOP administrators and others involved with the adoption of self-directed teams in COOP Extension/ANRE demonstrated

a number of leadership philosophies and approaches, some of which were more effective than others.

The Dean and Associate Dean of Cooperative Extension provided primary leadership for the adoption of self-directed teams across all of COOP Extension, and were the ones who made the administrative decision to adopt teams. Their approach was to permit Program Leaders to decide how best to introduce teams within their respective program areas. This approach permitted ANRE administrators to manage the adoption process based upon their own understanding of organizational culture and systems, and to develop strategies based upon that understanding. By permitting program leaders to proceed independently, the Dean and Associate Dean employed a participative approach. They shared a significant portion of how to adopt SDWTs with the Program Leaders. However, the choice of whether or not to adopt teams was made by the Dean and Associate Dean of COOP.

The flexibility given to ANRE administrators permitted the adoption process to be led by individuals whose own credibility within ANRE was reported to be a an important factor in determining the degree of resistance to teams by University faculty and staff. Study data suggest that many campus and county-based faculty were open to the team concept because individuals who enjoyed enormous respect among colleagues led the adoption process. As a result, the team concept inherited a degree of the credibility of those who had primary responsibility for leading the adoption process.

The fact that several self-directed teams formed during the 1998 annual ANRE conference, and that they continue to function and improve, suggests that the decision made by COOP's Dean and Associate Dean to permit ANRE to decide how to adopt has met with some degree of success. Study data also suggest that, whatever success the adoption process met with in ANRE, that success is due (in part) to the ANRE program leader, the adoption team members, and the approach and strategies they designed and implemented within ANRE.

Summary

The initial interest within Cooperative Extension/ANR in self-directed work teams, and their potential to improve Extension education programs, was connected primarily to issues internal to Cooperative Extension. Exposure to the experiences of other state Extension organizations that had adopted self-directed teams, in combination with a modest exploration of the literature on self-directed teams, were also powerful motivations for COOP Administrators in their consideration of whether or not to adopt self-directed teams. Ultimately, the decision to adopt self-directed teams was made by the Dean and Associate Dean of Cooperative Extension. The basis for this decision was a belief that self-directed teams would ultimately be an effective means of addressing the internal issues that prompted their consideration, in the first place. An ANR adoption team led and selected by the ANR Program Leader then designed the adoption process.

Cooperative Extension and ANR administrators believed that the adoption process needed to be inherently participative, and their respective approaches reflected that belief. The participatory adoption approach taken by ANR administrators was, to a large degree, effective in mitigating the impact of some culture-based resistance to self-directed teams.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CROSS CASE ANALYSIS

Why Teams?

Four organizational phenomena emerged from the research that prompted innovative change in the form of self-directed work teams. These phenomena are:

- Economic crisis
- External stakeholder dissatisfaction
- Concern about the quality and depth of connectedness between county- and campus-based specialists, and
- Administrative interest in stimulating ongoing innovativeness in Extension education programs.

Study data suggest that the phenomena are interrelated and dynamic. In the case of MSU Extension, the most compelling reason for change was external stakeholder satisfaction. Specific improvements sought included organizing programs around relevant issues. "Better" Extension education programs, as perceived locally, were seen as the "currency" of more satisfied constituents. Change at OSU Extension was prompted by an economic crisis, which translated into constrained resources for specialists. As with MSU Extension, self-directed teams were thought to produce more relevant Extension research and education programs by involving constituents more meaningfully in determining program

purpose and design. At UW-Extension/Cooperative Extension, the decision to adopt self-directed teams was primarily a proactive measure to avoid constituent dissatisfaction.

All three Extension organizations saw SDWTs as having potential for increasing the level and quality of collaboration between specialists and agents. However, this benefit was seen as either secondary to the satisfaction of constituent needs and/or as a means to it.

The Adoption Process

The Approach Used to Make the Adoption Decision

At both UWEX/Cooperative Extension and MSU Extension, the decision to adopt teams was an administrative decision made by an administrative group within the offices of the Dean or Director of Extension. At OSU Extension, on the other hand, the decision was put fundamentally in the hands of agents and specialists. This approach stands out for two reasons. First, the decision to allow faculty and staff the freedom to decide is consistent with espoused administrative values. It reflects a commitment to employee participation in, and ownership of, decisions that affect them directly. It also aligns with a belief that empowered employees are "free to be excellent" through the power to self-express. This self-expression is perceived to stimulate individual and group creativity and entrepreneurial behavior.

Employees were involved in the dialogue about teams at both MSU Extension and UWEX/Cooperative Extension. These interactions were

predicated on an administrative-level decision that teams were going to be adopted. Organizational members at those institutions were involved primarily in decisions as how to make the transition to SDWTs. This approach was especially evident in the approach taken by UWEX/COOP when the administration backed away from a "one size fits all approach," affirming optional paths—teams could form around issues or commodities.

Adoption Strategies

UWEX/COOP decided that strategies by which to introduce and adopt SDWTs would be determined and implemented by the Program Leaders of each of four program areas. This meant that the decision to adopt was made at the highest levels of the organization, but the determination of strategy was left in the hands of administrative unit leaders. At MSUE, administrative leaders (change managers) made adoption and strategy decisions as a group, and actively engaged district and county-based unit managers in the implementation process. At OSUE, all decisions pertaining to adoption and strategy were left to non-administrative staff.

At OSU Extension, there were no "change managers," per se, because there was no grand vision or strategy for SDWTs. However, administrative leaders sanctioned the idea of teams and lent encouragement and support for team development and proliferation. Agents and specialists determined how best to form and work through teams. As institutional knowledge about self-directed teams grew, the administration took an increasingly active role in

supporting teams that formed but, in doing so, did not exercise more or less control around the decision to form teams or promulgating how they should function.

At MSU Extension, the administrative team incorporated a number of concepts and strategies drawn from the SDWT literature. The MSUE strategy reflected an understanding that team members and leaders were likely to respond better to coaching and facilitative leadership than to management-driven, directive leadership. Consequently, the leaders of early teams were selected primarily for their capacity and skills as facilitative leaders. Additionally, the Director of Extension devoted considerable time and energy to coaching team leaders. The MSUE strategy also reflected the understanding that teams, to succeed over time, would need adequate resources and other forms of administrative support. At UWEX/COOP and, to a lesser extent, at OSU Extension, coaching was seen as important as well. At UWEX/COOP, a team of coaches was formed. Each coach, in addition to other responsibilities within in the organization, coached up to three teams. Like MSUE, UWEX/COOP provided seed dollars to the early teams. OSUE Teams were more entrepreneurial than the early teams at either MSUE or UWEX/COOP. But they also received financial support, largely in the form of funding professional development opportunities for team members.

Change Managers' Theories-in-Use

One of the most important findings of this study is that the decision to adopt SDWTs at the three institutions reflected administrators' theories-in-use about change, organizations, leadership, and employees. There are differences and similarities in the uncovered theories-in-use. Organized into themes, these are summarized below.

Theories-In-Use About Extension

SDWTs Degree of Fit to the Extension Culture

- MSUE: Extension employees generally possess a team-based work orientation.
- MSUE and OSU: SDWTs represent a good 'fit' with MSU Extension's culture.
- UWEX: Cooperative Extension's organizational structure and culture are consistent with what is required to adopt SDWTs.

SDWTs Benefit to Extension

- MSUE: Extension programs would be better if developed and delivered through SDWTs.
- UWEX: Benefits will accrue to UWEX if SDWTs are adopted.
- MSUE: Extension would be more effective with SDWTs than without them.
- OSUE: The empowerment and self-direction endemic to self-directed work teams enables team members to self-actualize which, in turn, enables them to become more creative, innovative and entrepreneurial.

Successfully Adopted SDWTs

- OSUE: Permitting SDWTs to form (rather than mandating their creation) is consistent with organizational values. Resistance to SDWT formation is reduced when employees make the turnkey decision.
- UWEX: Program Leaders would lead the introduction of SDWTs within their administrative units.
- MSUE: Extension could adjust its systems enough to accommodate SDWTs.
- MSUE: SDWTs would be successful in Extension as permanent structures.

Theories-In-Use About Organization

Shared Leadership is an Effective Organizational Approach

- MSUE: Shared leadership is more effective than concentrated leadership,

and decentralized authority is more effective than centralized authority.
- OSUE: Sharing leadership and decision making authority is more effective than centralized leadership and decision making authority.
- UWEX: Organizations are most effective when decisions are made as closely as possible to where an organization serves its constituents.

Self Directed Work Forms Are Associated with Several Organizational Benefits
- MSUE: Team-based work is more effective than individually- based work.
- OSUE: Team-based synergy produces outputs, outcomes and impacts that are more relevant to stakeholder interests than those that result from individual effort alone.
- UWEX: Self-directed teams promote collegiality and synergy among team members.
- OSUE: Self-direction encourages employee self-actualization, which in turn stimulates creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors among individuals and within groups.
- UWEX: Self-direction encourages creativity, innovation, synergy and entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors among individuals and within groups.

Miscellaneous
- MSUE: Resistance to change is inevitable.
- OSUE: Self-directed teams will be most successful if comprised of people who prefer team-based work.
- UWEX: Determining the need for organizational change, and providing leadership for that change, are primarily administrative responsibilities.

Framed as a set of adoption decision points, these theories-in-use suggest to the researcher that change managers across all three Extension organizations considered four primary variables in arriving at a "go / no go" decision about SDWTs. These include beliefs that:

1. SDWTs offer a number of organizational benefits.
2. These benefits are more likely to be achieved via SDWTs than through alternative structures and approaches.
3. SDWTs fit well with the organizational culture.
4. SDWTs can be successfully adopted in the respective organizations.

In assessing the potential to successfully adopt teams at all three study sites, consideration was given to a number of systems congruence variables, but these considerations were relatively minor compared to the consideration

change managers gave to cultural congruence. Study findings support the conclusion that change managers assumed that systems variables could be successfully addressed through operational adjustments. Cultural congruence, however, was seen as far important than systems congruence, perhaps because change managers understood from the literature and from prior experiences that organizational culture is a difficult thing to change.

Congruence

Tushman and O'Reilly (1997) describe a congruence or alignment relationship between strategy and four variables that they associate with how organizations solve problems associated with performance or opportunity shortfalls. These include critical tasks and work flows; formal organizational relationships; people; and culture. The following sections describe the major findings concerning these relationships at each study site.

Congruence between Strategy and Critical Tasks and Work Flows

Resource allocation

Overall, change managers understood the importance of supplying teams with a base level of operating funds, particularly when they were first formed. It was also true that financial constraints in all three Extension organizations made it impossible for change managers to provide what they considered to be adequate start-up funding. Consequently, each Extension organization established a priority system for distributing resources based on a perception of

need. At OSU Extension, largely because agent specialization and self-direction were high priorities among agents, teams and team member were given the opportunity to identify their own professional development needs and opportunities, and were subsequently given funds to support those activities. At UWEX/COOP Extension, an early team priority was team planning. Consequently, early funds were earmarked to support face-to-face team planning meetings.

Change managers at all three sites reported limited ability to provide what they considered to be "critical coaching resources." Change managers performed many of these coaching activities by working directly with team leaders. They believed teams needed dedicated coaches to work with multiple teams, to serve as liaisons with administration, to help resolve conflicts that invariably surfaced with teams, to serve as a communication link between teams, and to assist with a number of administrative activities. Overall, the data suggest that the level of congruence between the allocation of resources and the team structures was a concern among change managers at all three study sites. There is clear evidence that most change managers believed their team structures to be under-funded. There was also evidence that change managers at OSU Extension and UWEX/COOP Extension had insufficient understanding of the need to plan for, and provide adequate funding of, a team structure. At MSU Extension, there was a clear plan for funding team activities when teams were first being considered. However, the budget shortfall dramatically reduced the availability of start-up funds, thereby making the overall adoption process more

difficult.

Teams as opportunities for being overworked

A recurring theme at each study site was a concern among county agents about team-based work as an addition to their regular programming responsibilities. In all three cases, county agents believed initially that team-based work was an "extra responsibility" that often looked more like an "invitation to burnout" than as an opportunity to produce better programs. This concern represents the primary point of resistance to teams among county agents at all three study sites. At OSU Extension, this concern was less critical to agents because participation on a team was not mandatory. The significance of this concern lies with the degree to which agents believed work overload could result from participating on a team. The degree to which this belief affected agent enthusiasm for the team idea does address the larger issue of how agents viewed the relationship between the assignment of work responsibilities and the institution of internal changes as it pertained to their own reality. The researcher speculates that a cultural feature is critical—discouraging agents from removing from their plates some work responsibilities. The data did not reveal the existence of any systematic means, process or specific invitation to agents to realign work responsibilities to accommodate team-based responsibilities while adjusting non-team responsibilities accompanied when team concepts were introduced to county agents. What was broadly communicated, however, was that benefits associated with participating on teams. The implication was that you

can "eat you cake and have it too" by participating in teams. The data suggest that many agents were skeptical about the "magical" power of teams.

Communication

A concern that spanned each site was how team members would communicate. The cost of supporting face-to-face meetings was a concern to administrators. A second concern was the quality of electronic communication. Each study site had its own slate of face-to-face meeting opportunities, as well as its own mix of electronic communication options. Despite the general abundance of these options, there was generally a feeling among change managers that agents were not enthusiastic about the adding meetings associated with team-based activities. Often, the most desirable compromise was regular conference calls and email-based communications. Due to the statewide distribution of team members at each study site, this concern remains unresolved.

Congruence between Strategy and Formal Organizational Relationships

Lines of Accountability/Reporting

Change managers reported that the notion of member accountability to the team rather than to an administrator was new and attractive to county agents and specialists alike. At OSU and MSU Extension agents' feelings of accountability to teams was particularly high. It is important to point out that, at

all three sites, traditional reporting lines of agents and specialists did not disappear when teams were introduced. Rather, a new accountability system was introduced. There was no evidence that agents or specialists viewed the introduction of this new system as a liability. In fact, change managers reported across all three Extension organizations that team members felt quite comfortable with accountability relationships to fellow team members.

Congruence between Strategy and People

Concerns of campus-based faculty

A common theme reported by change managers across all three study sites was the view, among some campus-based faculty, that teams were a threat to either their preference for independent work or to their previously established research collaborations with other colleagues. Study data suggest that campus-based faculty felt this way for a variety of reasons. Some reported an overriding desire to work alone versus as a member of a team. Others were disinclined to join teams IF, in doing so, it meant that they would have less time and/or resources available to invest in individually defined research programs. Still others seemed to value less the applied research and service activities associated with team-based work vis-à-vis "pure" research activities associated with traditional faculty roles. Finally, some campus department chairs were reported to believe that teams siphoned off dollars, and negatively influenced department prestige.

These findings suggest issues surrounding the level of congruence between the introduction of SDWTs and the preferred way of operating for some on-campus faculty and department chairs. This finding is consistent with valuing a traditional academic environment in which faculty are expected to produce individual scholarship first, demonstrate teaching competence second, and engage in outreach and service, third. On the other hand, change managers reported that many faculty placed considerable value on applied research and outreach, and viewed teams as an effective venue for conducting such activities.

Leadership styles of leaders and change managers

In all three cases, change managers performed multiple leadership roles relative to the adoption of self-directed teams within their respective Extension organizations. These roles included originating the idea of introducing SDWTs, being an active proponent, leading the design of an adoption strategy, helping to implement the adoption strategy, and serving as "coach." Often, these leadership roles were performed simultaneously by one or more people. In the final analysis, a predominant leadership style guided the performance of these roles and/or influenced the people who were selected for them. The data suggest that a facilitative, transformational leadership paradigm was present in all three Extension organizations, and the degree to which this style influenced the adoption process varied across the cases.

Several SDWT authors (Fisher, 1993; Orsborn et al., 1990; Wellins et al., 1991) have asserted that managers' capacity and commitment to behave in

ways that are consistent with self-directed teams are antecedent to the successful adoption of teams. In this study, managers in OSU Extension reflected a high level of congruence with SDWT principles. Specifically, the leadership styles of both the Director of Extension and the Dean of the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences reflected a commitment to, and the capacity to practice, participative management and facilitative leadership. They were willing to share authority about fundamental decisions—whether teams would and should be introduced, and how.

At MSU Extension, the Director of Extension was also committed to facilitative leadership. The Director believed that successful adoption depended on the acceptability of teams to Extension agents, campus department chairs, and specialists. The administrator invested considerable time and energy in educating them about what SDWTs were and could do, and involved them in the process of deciding whether and how teams should be introduced. In doing so, the Director demonstrated a willingness to share responsibility for change-based decisions and was a vocal and enthusiastic proponent of self-directed teams. Others viewed this as highly influential during the adoption process. Still, the final decision to adopt teams within MSU Extension was made by an administrative team. That team was informed and influenced by a variety of perspectives, inside and outside Extension and the University.

Where UWEX differs in leadership approach is that, at UWEX, the decision to adopt was primarily an administrative one. The development and implementation of an adoption strategy was left to the program areas. Within

ANR, adoption—once underway—proceed with facilitative, consensus-based leadership. Similar to MSU Extension, a design team was formed to develop an adoption strategy. Like Directors at both OSU Extension and MSU Extension, the Associate Dean of CANR at UWEX believed in and modeled participative, consensus-based decision making. The design team he formed to develop an adoption strategy practiced this approach throughout the adoption process.

Common to all three Extension organizations was an understanding of the value of participative leadership in introducing organizational change. This understanding was operationalized in different ways, and in varying degrees, across each Extension organization.

Knowledge of Change Leaders about Self-directed Teams and Organizational Change

Change managers' depth and breadth of knowledge about self-directed work teams varied greatly within and across each of the three Extension organizations. Prior to adoption, Extension administrators in each case explored a relatively narrow body of literature. There is little evidence they any of them explored the literature of organizational change in any depth.

Because OSU Extension began adopting teams before most of the literature on SDWTs was available, the adoption process was least informed by a knowledge base. The Director of MSU Extension had perhaps the most knowledge of the literature on SDWTs, and reported reading other literature associated with organization development and change. He also had the advantage of being able to examine OSU Extension's experience with self-

directed teams prior to introducing teams in MSU Extension. UWEX/COOP Extension administrators had the best opportunity to learn from other Extension organizations prior to adopting teams. They had extensive discussions with MSU Extension, among others, prior to making any decision to adopt teams at UWEX. However, there was little evidence that they explored the literature on self-directed teams or organizational change prior to their decision to adopt teams. This researcher did provide Extension administrators and ANR change managers with a number of readings, as well as literature review on the topic of self-directed teams. However, this occurred after the decision to adopt teams was made.

Congruence Between Strategy and Culture

Reward system

Evidence suggests that county-based agents at all three study sites generally valued, and had significant experience with, collaborative work forms such as committees, task forces, and teams. The evidence suggests that such work forms were a common feature of organizational life at each study site—so much so, that were commonly referred to as part of the organizational culture. Extension agents in all organizations considered self-directed teams to be akin to commonly used group-based work forms. In fact, at UWEX/COOP, a number of respondents suggested that self-directed work teams had been operating within the organization for years even though they were not called self-directed teams per se.

Respondents reported considerable consistency in their view that campus-based faculty in all sites tended to work within a traditional academic culture that placed more value on individual effort than on team effort. However, some campus-based faculty at each site perceived their research collaborations to be SDWTs. Because of this (and other reasons), a number of campus-based faculty across the sites—both tenured and untenured in status—were enthusiastic members in and supporters of self-directed teams. Still, tenure and promotion processes reflected a bias in favor of individual scholarship as opposed to team-based scholarship. Consequently, the level of congruence between the culture of campus-based academic departments (home to most Extension specialists) and the cultural requirements of self-directed teams was generally low across all three study sites.

Congruence and Other Elements of Organizational Culture

Empowerment and adaptation to change

The process used to consider and arrive at an institutional decision about whether and how to adopt self-directed teams was most empowering within OSU Extension. Because adoption was optional, the decision to adopt, and how, did not represent a change that anyone was required to make. Consequently, the change to teams was made willingly and with little resistance. The study data suggest that the adoption approach taken by OSU Extension was quite consistent with how decisions were made in other dimensions of life within that organization. Likewise, there was no evidence to suggest that the adoption of

self-directed teams proceeded in ways inconsistent with "how business was done" at MSU Extension or at UWEX, either. Consequently, the degree of congruence between the adoption approach taken, on one hand, and historical organizational culture, on the other, was high at all three study sites.

Summary

All three Extension organizations approached the adoption of change and innovation associated with SDWTs from different administrative perspectives. The predominant difference revolved around how Extension administrators defined their own and others' roles and responsibilities relative to the change process.

At UWEX/Cooperative Extension, administrators considered the decision of whether to adopt self-directed teams to be an inherently administrative decision. After the decision to adopt self-directed teams was made, administrative attention turned to how change managers throughout Extension would work on the adoption process in the program areas. At MSU Extension, administrative roles focused, first, on raising the level of institutional understanding of, and enthusiasm for, self-directed teams. While these approaches were representative of different administrative perspectives, in each case, change was led rather than managed.

Across all three organizations, change was based largely in the assumptions administrators had about organizations, leadership, and organizational change. In none of the cases was there a systematic diagnosis of

organizational readiness to change. There was, in all cases, considerable willingness to explore, adjust, and generally "embark on a journey" of discovery and learning associated with the adoption of SDWTs. This emergent and incremental approach mimic change process associated with appreciative inquiry and action research.

CHAPTER NINE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the study and its findings are presented in this chapter. The researcher also offers conclusions drawn from the research and recommendations for practice and further research.

Summary

Purpose

This study focused on organizational processes used to consider and then to adopt self-directed work teams in three Extension organizations—in the states of Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The research purpose was to describe, analyze, and explain how three state Extension organizations framed and approached the challenges associated with organizational change and innovation. This was accomplished by addressing a single grand tour question and three related sub-questions:

Grand Tour Question

What conditions, strategies and processes characterized the adoption of SDWTs at each study site?

Sub-question #1

What conditions led to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Sub-question #2

What organizational factors were antecedent to the adoption of self-directed teams at each study site?

Sub-question #3

What other factors surfaced at each study site that played a significant role in either facilitating or impeding the adoption self-directed teams?

Methodology

This study is associated with the constructivist research tradition. How and why self-directed work teams were adopted at each study site is seen as a construction that emerged from the perspectives and experiences of participants in a social context.

Open-ended interviews were held with five to seven informants from each study site. E-mail and telephone conversations were used to invite change managers and informants to participate in the study. The researcher's personal familiarity with a number of the study participants established an atmosphere of trust between the researcher and respondents. These interviews, conducted in a relaxed and conversational manner, were used to explore and interpret change managers' perspectives concerning adoption conditions, events, processes, and their relationships to each other.

Data gathering and interpretation occurred simultaneously during interviews. The researcher encouraged participants to describe events as they

understood them and to offer their own perspectives as to why events occurred how and when they did. Through this process, a 'story' emerged from each study site that was subsequently validated by the respective study participants. Next, the researcher analyzed each Extension's organization's adoption story in relationship to concepts and perspectives associated with the literature on change, innovation, and teams.

Conclusions

The conclusions shared here address how changes managers approached self-directed work teams specifically, and organizational change and innovation generally.

SDWTs as a Way to Address Multiple and Interrelated Dilemmas

Change managers saw SDWTs as an effective venue through which they might successfully address a number of critical, interrelated organizational issues. These issues related directly to their desire to improve the capacity of their respective Extension organizations to respond with increased speed and effectiveness to increasingly rigorous constituent demands.

First, they believed that the level and quality of collegiality between state specialists and county-based educators influenced the amount of importance local issues received on campus and, consequently, how prominent these issues were on the research agendas of state specialists. They also understood that some county-based constituencies wanted faster, more expert responses to their

issues, and that teams comprised of both specialists and agents could respond faster and more effectively than either could alone. Teams comprised of state specialists and county educators were seen as a way to improve the quality and quantity of interaction and relationships between these two sets of Extension employees.

Change managers understood that the diversity of team members' perspectives was needed to more effectively frame and respond to field-based issues, and that the inherently diverse membership envisioned for SDWTs ensured that multiple broader perspectives would be brought to bear on applied problems. They believed that the highly relational, empowered environment of SDWTs could facilitate the development of creative and innovative capacity of individuals, and the development of synergy among teams that would be needed to provide highly innovative Extension research and education programs.

A Participatory Approach Generally Valued and Expressed in Different Ways

Extension change managers believed in, valued and practiced, a participatory approach to leadership and management but they did so in different ways. The approach taken by each Extension organization reflected the larger organizational culture and associated leadership paradigm associated with it.

OSU Extension leaders preferred to involve the entire organization is an ongoing dialogue in what was a highly deliberative approach to shared leadership. MSU Extension leaders gave birth to the vision of SDWTs but involved a much larger group of people in the framing of the change approach

and the development of strategy. What emerged was a shared vision and strategy for the adoption of self-directed work teams. UW-Extension/COOP administrative leaders developed the vision for SDWTs but delegated the crafting of an implementation strategy to program areas. At the program area level, a much larger group of stakeholders, including county-based educators and state specialists, were deeply involved in determining how teams would form and work.

Literature Relied on Differently and for Different Reasons

There was considerable variation in the depth and breadth of literature read by change managers across and within the three study Extension organizations. The author attributes this to the different change-based roles played by change managers. Generally, how and how deeply the literature was used tended to reflect the predominant approach to change and innovation at each study site.

In one case, the literature was used to gain knowledge about self-directed teams as a means of understanding how to make organizational systems more team-friendly. In this case, some of the literature on leadership, and on organizational change and development was also accessed as a means of understanding how to make the organization more *change*-friendly so that teams, as a form of change, would meet less resistance once introduced. In another case, knowledge was sought to better understand changes that had emerged. And, in another case, the literature on self-directed teams was used to

both familiarize change managers with the basic concepts of self-directed teams, as well as to help them develop basic implementation strategies.

"Readiness" for SDWTs Was Not Analyzed Systematically

In examining readiness to adopt self-directed teams, change managers relied heavily on their personal knowledge of, and 'feel' for, their respective organizations rather than adopt any systematic approach to readiness assessment. The author believes that this approach was driven by both a basic level of unfamiliarity among change managers with systematic approaches to determining readiness, as well as by their compelling intuitive attraction to teams. In effect, organizational readiness to adopt teams unfolded as a set of questions used to formulate strategy rather than as questions used to determine whether or not teams should be adopted at all. Without exception, change managers considered teams to be the right innovation at the right time to address their most troubling organizational problems. Consequently, any decision to pursue a systematic approach to determining whether or not teams were an appropriate change to introduce would have been counterintuitive given change manager's theories-in-use about how organizations work best. In effect, these theories-in-use were the driving force in determining change managers' views about the relative appropriateness of teams, and effectively replaced any systematic approach that might otherwise have been employed.

Focus of Action On Systems Change With Recognition of Culture Change

Change managers took the view that a full spectrum of unique organizational conditions, ranging from the nature of the issues they were facing and how teams seemed to fit these issues, to the paradigmatic alignment that characterized their operating environments, compelled them to introduce teams. They also considered cultural change to be a far more difficult and lengthy challenge than systems change in preparing their organizations for self-directed teams. Consequently, they tended to concentrate on systems changes, such as reward systems and various mechanisms to support teams, that they could more easily control.

Theories-In-Use of Change Managers Was a Critical Variable.

Change managers' theories-in-use influenced their thinking and action far more than did any other variable in their planning to adopt self-directed teams. These theories were very broad, addressing virtually every dimension of change strategy. Change managers' views concerning organizational readiness for teams, fit, congruence, benefits associated with teams and how they would unfold within their respective organizations, the challenges that adopting teams would present, and which literature they would examine, and why, were all functions of their theories-in-use.

Change managers generally related to their organizations and defined their roles and approaches to them through the lens of their theories-in-use. Yet, they did not appear to relate to these theories in a conscious way. There was no

evidence that change managers reflected upon their theories-in-use, challenged them, discussed them with others, or were even aware of them and how they were guiding their own thoughts and actions.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion of this research is that reflecting upon and working with one's theories-in-use should be the beginning point of any change effort. By reflecting upon, articulating and remaining aware of their theories-in-use, change managers could identify and consider a wider range of frames, problems, solutions, constraints and opportunities. Both the problem space and the solution space could be greatly expanded by understanding that the approach taken to an organizational issue reflects a constrained view of reality. Acknowledging that constraint represents a significant step in a more holistic approach to thought and action.

Recommendations

Practice Recommendations

Successfully adopting SDWTs depends upon the willingness of organizational members to support team concepts. A number of helpful strategies with which to proceed include:

1. Change managers should explore the literature on organizational change, innovation, and self-directed work teams. Doing so will provide change managers with a sound theoretical foundation upon which to consider and evaluate alternative adoption strategies.

2. Change managers should perform a deliberate and comprehensive diagnosis of organizational culture to determine the degree of fit between values associated with self-directed work teams and those that predominate in an organization. The degree of fit between the two can inform a decision on whether self-directed work teams are appropriate, and/or what cultural changes must be employed to prepare an organization for teams.

3. Change managers should carefully consider the experiences of other organizations when considering self-directed work teams as an option. Embedded within these experiences are valuable lessons. But, when doing so, managers must resist the temptation to move too quickly. The assumption, sometimes false, is that what works in one Extension organization will automatically work in another.

4. Self-directed work teams require an organizational culture and structure that empowers employees. Change managers need to think and act in ways consistent with an empowerment model if they expect employees to do the same.

5. A self-directed work team is an organizational tool that has been linked in the private sector to projects with finite life spans. There is no evidence to suggest that they will succeed as a framework around which to structure an

entire organization, private or public, over time. Because of that, change managers are encouraged to use caution before committing broadly.

6. Self-directed work teams as they have been deployed in Extension organizations require dedicated coaching from colleagues who embrace and are skilled at practicing a facilitative leadership style.

7. Leaders of self-directed teams should employ a facilitative approach to leadership. This approach to leadership encourages team members to hold themselves accountable to the team rather than to one or two team leaders.

8. Used as organizational tools, and deployed in ways that are consistent with an organization's culture and systems, self-directed work teams can produce tremendous organizational benefits. When they are overlaid upon an organization possessing a team-unfriendly culture or introduced when an organization is not ready for the cultural changes teams require, the potential to improve employee performance may be lost.

9. Change managers need to consider whether or not teams make sense given a number of fundamental challenges associated with the successful introduction of teams. These challenges fall into one of two basic categories - organizational support and team authenticity or quality. Hitchcock and Willard (1995) address the former by challenging change managers to

consider six questions in what they call a "red flag assessment (p. 7) when considering whether or not teams are an appropriate innovation to introduce. These include:

1. Support from the Top - Is top management committed to involving employees?
2. Change in Leadership - Will top management be around long enough to see the implementation through?
3. Interdependence - Are the employees interdependent? Do they need to work together to complete a process, product, or project or to provide a service?
4. Priority - Are self-directed teams a high enough priority that they will get the time and resources necessary to make them successful?
5. Time - Does the work or work schedule allow employees time to think, meet, and discuss ideas?
6. Technical Assistance - Are the employees technically competent in their work?

Katzenbach and Smith (1993) address the latter by challenging change managers to ensure that the teams they introduce are what they refer to as "real teams" (p. 44), which consistently demonstrate high performance. They posit that "real teams":

1. are small in number;

2. have members that, together, possess adequate levels of complimentary skills'
3. adopt a genuinely meaningful purpose;
4. adopt a specific goal or goals;
5. demonstrate a clear approach to accomplishing work together;
6. Demonstrate a sense of mutual accountability among team members.

A non-team approach should be considered if an organization can not meet Hitchcock and Willard's red flag assessment or Katzenbach's six key team basic questions. Finally, the choice between a real team or a non-team approach, such as a single leader working group, is not a one time decision and should be made on the basis of each performance challenge.

Recommendations For Research

1. Explicating Change Managers' Theories-In-Use - This study revealed that the unexplicated nature of theories-in-use serves as an inhibitor to a more reflective, deliberate approach to organizational change. Research focusing on strategies and approaches that organizations might take to illuminate and respond to their change managers' theories-in-use would increase our understanding of organizational change processes.

2. Undertaking a Standard OD Study of Organizational Readiness - The researcher found the literature focusing on organizational readiness to lack

both depth and breadth. Research focusing on the identification of variables associated with organizational readiness to change and innovate would generate valuable knowledge concerning the relationship between where an organization is and where it needs to be to successfully engage in change efforts.

3. Addressing More Intentionally the Barriers in the Broader Cultural Context
Culture exists as a formidable force in determining the direction, pace and potential for success of change. Research that examines the relationships between organizational culture and change readiness, for example, would generate knowledge that would be useful to change managers in determining pre-change organizational development strategies.

4. Being Strategic and Adaptive & Knowing When to Be One Versus the Other
Some successful organizations seem to be able to weave an adaptive quality into the development and execution of strategy. What enables them to do so? Research focusing on the processes and dynamics associated with this question would help us to better understand how and why this capacity is demonstrated by some organizations and not well or at all others.

5. Building on the 'Naturalness' of the Innovation - Some of the essential qualities inherent in self-directed work teams including empowerment, creativity, self-expression, collegiality and others seem to resonate with some

people more than others. Is it because these qualities represent a set of natural 'leverage points' that permit the freeing of human potential? Research focusing on this question would add to our understand of the relationships between the essential qualities of self-direction elements of SDWTs and human productivity.

APPENDIX A

E-MAIL LETTER COMMUNICATIONS TO INDIVIDUALS WHOM HE SOUGHT TO INCLUDE AS STUDY PARTICIPANTS

The purpose of this correspondence is to request your participation in my doctoral study on a topic concerning the adoption of self-directed work teams within Extension organizations. As I believe you know, I'm in the process of writing my dissertation in the MSU Department of Resource Development. My study is entitled: "Readiness for Adopting Self-directed Work Teams in the Public Sector: A Comparative Analysis of Three State Cooperative Extension Systems." My study will cover MSU Extension, Ohio State University Extension and the University of Wisconsin-Extension/Cooperative Extension. During the week of XXX, I will be in XXX to conduct in-person interviews with individuals who have been identified as having significant, personal involvement in the early developmental stages of self-directed work teams at MSU Extension. You have been identified as one of these individuals. Your participation would be limited to a 1.5 to 2-hour interview which I will conduct, and possibly a shorter follow-up interview which could be conducted over the telephone.

Please respond to this email with any available time slots you have next week. Please feel free to include early mornings and evenings as I want to be as flexible and accommodating in scheduling an interview as possible.

You may also feel free to contact me by telephone at (608) 236-9241. In addition to this email, I will continue to try to reach you by telephone.

I certainly hope you will be able to participate in this study. When completed later this spring, it should hold considerable value for Extension faculty, staff, administrators and organizations interested or involved in self-directed work teams specifically, and in public sector innovation, generally.

Best regards, Bill Rizzo

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT FORM
FOR DISSERTATION RESEARCH BY WILLIAM S. RIZZO
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ENTITLED:

"READINESS FOR ADOPTING SELF-DIRECTED WORK TEAMS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR:
a Comparative analysis of state cooperative extension systems"

Dear Extension Leader:

I would like to invite your participation in a study to expand our understanding of how state Extension systems innovate. I am conducting this study as dissertation level research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree at Michigan State University, in the Department of Resource Development.

The goal of my study is to expand our knowledge about how state Extension systems approach the adoption of administrative innovation, generally, and the adoption of one kind of administrative innovation, the self-directed work team, specifically. You have been identified as an individual possessing broad insight and experience concerning the adoption of self-directed work teams at Ohio State University Extension. Your role in this study will consist of participating in up to two interviews for which I will serve as the sole interviewer. During the interviews, you will be encouraged to be broad and expansive in your responses, and to raise and respond to questions and issues not necessarily asked by the interviewer so that the full breadth and range of your experience with the adoption of self-directed work teams at Ohio State University Extension is captured.

Prior to conducting an interview, I would like to emphasize that, as a participant in this study, you have specific rights as follows:

1. Your role as a participant consists of up to two separate interview session lasting no more than 1.5 hours each.
2. Your participation in this study is purely voluntary. You may refuse to participate in the study, to answer specific questions, and to end your participation at any time.
3. All interviews in which you participate will be tape recorded by myself. Any transcripts produced from these interviews will he completely confidential. The only individual possessing access to them will be me. As an additional measure of protection, any transcripts of these interviews will be identified by a code number. Any other characteristics that could potentially be used to identify you as a focus group participant will be deleted.

4. Portions of these interviews may be included in the final research report, and in publications stemming from it . However, in no cases, will your name or any other identifying characteristics be associated with excerpts from these interviews, or included in any report or other publication stemming from this research.

If you agree to participate in this study, please print and sign your name, and date below.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this very important study. The knowledge gained through this research will advance our knowledge of how Extension systems innovate. As such, it should be of interest to a broad and growing audience.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have relating to this study. I may be reached at the address, telephone number and email address listed below.

William S. Rizzo
510 Togstad Glen
Madison, WI 53711
(608) 236-9241
Email: wsrizzo@facstaff.wisc.edu

I understand the research described above and the procedures and conditions under which I will participate, and agree to participate in this study.

_____
PRINT NAME

_____
SIGNATURE DATE

APPENDIX C

E-MAIL COMMUNICATION TO THE DIRECTOR OF OSU EXTENSION EXPLAINING THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND REQUESTING A LIST OF POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Dear xxx;

Earlier this month, I met with my dissertation committee at Michigan State to discuss my research proposal. One of the major decisions made during that meeting was that I would proceed to conduct a focus group meeting at each study site prior to a full-scale data collection visit, the purpose of which would be to better understand each site and how it approaches teams. To this end, I am in need of your help in two critical areas:

1) I need to identify a group of from 8 to 10 participants for the focus group who, together and alone, can describe the historical development of self-directed work teams at Ohio State University Extension. It is important that one or two of these participants be external to OSU Extension/OSU assuming that non-University/non-Extension individuals serve(d) on or have, in some capacity, participated in the development of SDWTs at OSU Extension. I would also need your help in scheduling one 2-hour focus group session with these individuals during the first half of January 2000, including a facility for doing so.

2) I'll also need your assistance in identifying a group of from eight to ten individuals who would be willing to be participate in the primary data collection portion of my study - individual key informant interviews that I anticipate would take about two hours each with a potential need for some follow-up interviewing. This group would need to have broad knowledge, over time, about why SDWTs were employed, how. I would like to conduct these interviews during the third week of January, but no later than the end of January.

Please drop me an email to let me know how 'do-able' you think this schedule is and whether you'll be able to help in identifying individuals for the focus group and the individual interviews. It would be helpful for us to have a telephone conversation about both groups of participants. Please let me know when I might call you, as well as a telephone number for doing so IF it is different than your office phone. Feel free also to call me at (608) 236-9241.

I look forward to your reply as soon as you can provide it. Please accept my best wishes for a happy Holiday season.

Sincerely, Bill Rizzo

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please describe the **in**ternal organizational environmental conditions that, in your view, contributed to or may have prompted, in some way or combination, the introduction of self- directed work teams here. These may include the internal finances, internal politics, predominant patterns of thought and action (dominant paradigms), strategic plans and priorities, general or specific organizational behaviors, and/or any other external conditions or circumstances (to Extension) you consider to be significant in relation to the introduction of self-directed work teams.

2. Please describe the **ex**ternal organizational environmental conditions that, in your view, contributed to or may have prompted, in some way or combination, the introduction of self-directed work teams here. These may include external funding conditions, external political pressures and realities, external stakeholder, program needs and/or any other external conditions or circumstances (to Extension) you consider to be significant in relation to the introduction of self-directed work teams.

3a. Please identify and describe the degree to which various organizational systems and processes within Extension did or did not fit, or were or were not congruent with SDWTs at the time SDWTs were introduced. Please describe if and how Extension organizational systems may have changed to increase their 'fit' with SDWTs as they developed. Examples of organizational systems and process would include those relating to: employee evaluation, compensation and rewards; reporting; resource allocation; professional development; planning; research; organizational learning; etc.

3b. What internal organizational conditions were, in your view, tended to support the employment of self-directed work teams?

4. What external (to Extension) condition, in your view, tended to support the employment of self-directed work teams?

5. Why do you believe self-directed work teams were introduced at the time they were instead of at some previous or future time?

6. How would you describe the various **in**ternal reactions to the organization's decision to introduce self-directed work teams?

7. How would you describe the various **ex**ternal (to Extension) reactions to the organization's decision to introduce self-directed work teams?

8. What, in your view, have been the successes or advantages associated with self-directed work teams since their introduction?

9. What, in your view, have been the failures or difficulties associated with self-directed work teams since their introduction?

10. If time could be rolled back, what do you believe should be done differently in considering and employing self-directed work teams?

11. Please describe the range of employee and other stakeholder responses to the deployment of SDWTs. Please consider and include booth positive and negative responses.

APPENDIX E

PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR OSU EXTENSION

1. In general terms, how would you describe how self-directed teams work at OSU Extension?

2. Why was the decision made to adopt self directed work teams here?

3. How was the decision to adopt self directed work teams made?

4. Who was involved in making the decision to adopt self directed work teams, and how were they involved?

APPENDIX F

SUPPLEMENTARY SOURCES OF DATA

Michigan State University Extension

1. December 6, 1994 Memo from MSUE Administrative Team to All County Extension Directors containing the following enclosures:
   a. Key points to consider in the AoE Team design
   b. The final AoE Committee report
   c. Suggested Implementation Steps for new AoE Agents
   d. Potential Strategies: Presentations to Advisory Groups and Officials
   e. Area of Expertise maps

2. Developing a Curriculum (DACUM) document

3. Mode of Operation for MSU Extension Dairy Extension Programming Team

4. A paper entitled "Area Of Expertise Teams: The Michigan Approach to Applied Research and Extension." This paper was authored by:
   ~ Arlen Leholm, Associate Vice Provost and MSUE Director
   ~ Larry Hamm, Chairperson and Professor, Dept. of Agriculture Economics
   ~ Murari Suvedi, Associate Professor, Program Evaluation
   ~ Ian Gray, Associate Vice Provost and MAES Direct or
   ~ Fred Poston, Vice Provost and Dean, College of Agriculture & Nat. Resources

5. A Paper Entitled "How to Serve as an AoE Team Coach" by Dr. Ray Vlasin, Professor, MSU Dept. of Resource Development and Coordinator of Extension Community and Economic Development Programs

6. Team Approach
   (http://www.msue.msu.edu/aoe/)
   a. Explanation of Area of Expertise (AoE) teams
   b. Institutional definition of Self Directed Work Teams (SDWTs)
   c. Membership Criteria for SDWTs

7. Employee Development System Awards
   (http://www.msue.msu.edu/msue/docs/empdevsysaward.pdf

8. History - Aligning MSUE for the 21st Century"
   (http://www.msue.msu.edu/msue/docs/b_p.html)

OSU Extension/ College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

1. Cultural Change" statement from the Vice President (http://cfaes.ohio-state.edu/reinvent/culture.html)

2. "Steps to Positive Change" (http://cfaes.ohio-state.edu/reinvent/culture/steps.html)

3. "Vision Challenge Teams" statements describing:
   a. Programmatic Focus
   b. Organizational Structure and Processes
   c. Reward System
   d. Communication and Marketing

4. College Vision Statement (http://cfaes.ohio-state.edu/reinvent/vision.html)

University of Wisconsin-Extension/Cooperative Extension

1. Self-Directed Teams and Their Missions (Systems Teams and Issue Teams) (http://www.uwex.edu/ces/ag/Teams/index.html)

2. UWEX Trends analysis (1999) (http://bluto.uwex.edu/ces/luag/trends.html)

3. ANR Guide for Writing Plans and Reports (http://bluto.uwex.edu/ces/admin/aabplan.pdf)

4. Press Release (12/1998) Entitled: "Extension Ag Teams to Focus on State Issues and Production" (http://bluto.uwex.edu/ces/news/releases/ag9812ff.htm)

5. Statewide Committee on Program Planning Meeting Minutes (7/1/1999) (http://bluto.uwex.edu:80/ces/plan/july1.htm)

6. On-line Brochure - "Cooperative Extension in Wisconsin" (http://extremist.uwex.edu/ces/about/partners.pdf)

REFERENCES

Ackerman, C. and J. Harrop. "The management of technological innovation in the machine tool industry: a cross-national regional survey of Britain and Switzerland." R&D Management 15 (1985) 207-218.

Aiken, M. and R. Alford. "Community structure and innovation: the case of urban renewal." American Sociological Review 35 (1970) 650-665.

Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schön. Theory in practice: increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schön. Organizational learning : a theory of action perspective. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Bass, Bernard M. and Bruce J. Avolio. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994.

Bacharach, Samuel B., Peter Bamberger and William J. Sonnenstuhl. Member assistance programs in the workplace: the role of labor in the prevention and treatment of substance abuse. Ithaca: ILR Press, 1994.

Baldridge, J.V. "Organizational Change: Institutional Sagas, External Challenges, and Internal Politics." In J.V. Baldridge and T.E. Deal, Managing Change in Educational Organizations. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Bass, Bernard M. Leadership and performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press, 1985.

Bass, Bernard M. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994.

Bedian, A.G. Organizations: Theory and Analysis. Illinois: Dryden Press, 1980.

Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal. Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal. Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Bouwen, René, Jan De Visch and Chris Steyaert. Innovation projects in organizations: complementing the dominant logic by organizational learning. In Dian Marie Hosking and Neil Anderson (Eds.), Organizational

Change and Innovation: Psychological perspectives and practices in Europe. London: Routledge, 1992.

Bower, M. Nurturing innovation in an organization. In G.A. Steiner (Ed.), The Creative Organization. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1965.

Bruce, Raymon and Sherman Wyman. Changing Organizations: Practicing Action Training and Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998.

Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Burns, Tom and G. M. Stalker. The management of innovation. London: Tavistock, 1961.

Bryson, John M. Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Buchholz, Steve and Thomas Roth. Creating the High-Performance Team. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1987.

Caplow, Theodore. Principles of organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Carlson, R.O. "Summary and critique of educational diffusion research. Research Implications for Educational Diffusion," Michigan Department of Education, 1968.

Coch, L. and J. R. P French. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-533.

Coleman, J. Medical Innovation: A diffusion Study. New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1966.

Covey, Stephen R. Principle-Centered Leadership. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990.

Covey, Stephen R. Principle-centered leadership. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Creswell, John W. Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994.

Cummings, Thomas G. and Christopher G. Worley. Organization Development & Change. 6th ed. Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing, 1997.

Cyert, Richard Michael and James G. March. A behavioral theory of the firm. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Daft, R.L. "A dual-core model of organizational innovation." Academy of Management Journal 21 (1978): 193-210.

Damanpour, F. and W.M. Evan. "Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of 'organizational lag'." Administrative Science Quarterly 29 (1984): 392-409.

Deeprose, Donna. The Team Coach: Vital New Skills for Supervisors & Managers in a Team Environment. New York: American Management Association, 1995.

Duncan, Robert B. "Characteristics of Organizational Environments and Perceived Environmental Uncertainty." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 (1972):313-27.

Fisher, Kimbal. Leading Self-Directed Work Teams: A Guide to Developing New Team Leadership Skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

Foster, R. Innovation: The Attacker's Advantage. New York: Mcamillan, 1986.

French, Wendell L. and Cecil H. Bell, Jr. Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Green, Thad B. and Raymond T. Butkus. Motivation, Beliefs, and Organizational Transformation. Westport: Quorum Books, 1999.

Gross, N., J.B. Giacquinta and M. Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Egon Guba. Naturalistic Inquiry. Newbury Park: Sage, 1985.

Hage J. and Aiken, M. "Program change and organizational properties: a comparative analysis." American Journal of Sociology 72 (1967):, 503-519.

Hage, Jerald and Michael Aiken. Social change in complex organizations. New York: Random House, 1970.

Hage, Jerald, ed. Futures of Organizations: Innovating to Adapt Strategy and Human Resources to Rapid Technological Change. New York: Lexington Books, 1988.

Handy, C. Understanding Organizations. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Harrison, Michael I. Diagnosing Organizations: Methods, Models, and Processes. Newbury Park: Sage, 1987.

Harrington-Mackin, Deborah, The Team Building Tool Kit: Tips, Tactics, and Rules for Effective Workplace Teams. New York: American management Association, 1994.

Harrison, Michael I. Diagnosing Organizations: Methods, Models, and Processes. Newbury Park: Sage, 1987.

Harvey, E. and R. Mills. Patterns of organizational adaptation: a political perspective. In M.N. Zald (Ed.), Power in Organizations. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

Hosking, Dian Marie and Neil Anderson, eds. Organizational Change and Innovation: Psychological perspectives and practices in Europe. London: Routledge, 1992.

Kaluzny, A., J. Veney and J. Gentry. "Innovation of health services: a comparative study of hospitals and health departments." Health and Society 15 (1974): 22-33.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. The change masters : innovations for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Katzenbach, Jon R. and Douglas K. Smith. The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization. New York: Harper Business, 1993.

Kimberly, J.R. "Organizational size and the structuralist perspective: A review, critique, and proposal." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (1978): 571-597.

Kimberly, J.R. Managerial innovation. In P.C. Nystrom and W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of Organizational Design. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Kimberly, J.R. and Evanisko, M.J. "Organizational innovation: the influence of individual, organizational and contextual factors on hospital adoption of technological and administrative innovations." Academy of Management Journal 24 (1981): 689-713.

King, Nigel. Innovation at work: the research literature. In Michael A. West and James L. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and Creativity at Work. Chichester: John Wiiley & Sons, 1990.

Kriegel, Robert and David Brandt. Sacred Cows Make the Best Burgers; Paradigm-Busting Strategies for Developing Change-Ready People and Organizations. New York: Warner Books, 1996.

Lewin, K. Field theory in social sciences: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper, 1951.

Light, Paul C. Sustaining Innovation: Creating Nonprofit and Government Organizations That Innovate Naturally. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Marks, Mitchell Lee, and Robert B. Shaw. "Sustaining Change: Creating the Resilient Organization." Discontinuous Change: Leading Organizational Transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Marrow, Alfred J., David G. Bowers, and Stanley E. Seashore. Management by participation; creating a climate for personal and organizational development. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Marshall, Edward M. Transforming the Way We Work: The Power of the Collaborative Workplace. New York: American Management Association, 1995.

Merriam, S.B. Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Meyer, A.D. "Adapting to environmental jolts." Administrative Science Quarterly 27n (1982): 515-537.

Mohr, L.B. "Determinants of innovation in organizations." American Political Science Review 63 (1969): 111-126.

Morgan, Gareth. Images of Organization. Newbury park: Sage, 1986.

Morris, Kathleen F. and Charles S. Raben. "The Fundamentals of Change Management." Discontinuous Change: Leading Organizational Transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Myers, S. and D.G. Marquis. "Successful Industrial Innovations." National Science Foundation, NSF, 69-17.

Mytinger, R.D. "Innovation in Local Health Services." Arlington, Virginia: Public Health Service, Division of Medical Care Administration, US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

Nadler, David et al. Discontinuous Change: Leading Organizational Transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Nadler, David A. and Michael L. Tushman. "The Challenge of Discontinuous Change." Discontinuous Change: Leading Organizational Transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Neal, R. and M. Radnor. "The relationship between formal procedures for pursuing OR/MS activities and OR/OM group success." paper presented at b40th National Conference of the Operations Research Society of America, at Anaheim, California, October, 1971.

Nicholson, N. Organizational culture, ideology, and management. In J.G. Hunt, D.M. Hosking, C.A. Schriesheim and R. Stewart (Eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1984.

Normann, R. "Organizational innovativeness: product variation and reorientation." Administrative Science Quarterly 16 (1971): 203-215.

Orsburn, Jack D. et al. Self-Directed Work Teams: The New American Challenge. Burr Ridge: Irwin Professional Publishing, 1990.

Patti, R.J. "Organizational resistance and change: the view from below." Social Science Review 49 (1974): 367-383.

Pelz, Donald Campbell and Frank M. Andrews. "Scientists in organizations : productive climates for research and development." Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1976.

Pelz, D.C. and F.C. Munson. "Originality level and the innovating process in organizations." Human Systems Management 3 (1982): 173-187.

Pierce, J.L. and A. Delbecq. "Organizational structure, individual attitude and innovation." Academy of Management Review 1977, pp. 27-33.

Porras, Jerry I. Stream Analysis: A Powerful Way to Diagnose and Manage Organizational Change. Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley, 1987.

Quick, Thomas L. Successful Team Building. New York: American Management Association, 1992.

Quinn, Robert E. Deep Change: Discovering the Leader Within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Recardo, Ronald. "Conducting a Readiness Assessment: A Foundation for Solid Teamwork." National Productivity Review Spring (1999): 29-34.

Redding, John C. and Ralph F. Catalanello. Strategic Readiness: The Making of the Learning Organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Rogers, E.M. Diffusion of Innovations, 3rd edn. New York: Free Press, 1983.

Rogers, E.M. and R. Agarwala-Rogers. (Eds.) Communications in Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Schein, E.H. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Schön, D.A. Beyond the Stable State. New York: Random House, 1971.

Schön, Donald A. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Senge, Pater M. The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization. New York: Currency Doubleday, 1990.

Shaffer, Carolyn R. and Kristin Anundsen. Creating Community Anywhere: Finding Support and Connection in a Fragmented World. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Perigee, 1993.

Shephard, H.A. "Innovation-resisting and innovation-producing organizations." Journal of Business 40 (1967): 470-477.

Strebel, Paul. Breakpoints: How Managers Exploit Radical Business Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1992.

Trist, E.L. and K.L. Bamforth "Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Long-Wall Method of Goal-Setting." Human Relations, 1951, 4, 3-38.

Tushman, Michael L. and Charles A. O'Reilly III. Winning through Innovation: A Practical Guide to Leading Organizational Change and Renewal. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1997.

Tushman, Michael and Charles A. O'Reilly. Winning through innovation: a practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1997.

Van de Ven, A. "Central problems in the management of innovation." Management Science 32 (1986): 590-607.

Van de Ven, Andrew H., Harold L. Angles and Marshall Scott Poole (Eds.). Research on the management of innovation: the Minnesota studies. New York: Harper & Row, 1989.

Walton, R.E. Innovating to compete: Lessons for Diffusing and Managing Change in the Workplace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Walton, A. Elise. "Transformative Culture: Shaping the Informal Organization." Discontinuous Change: Leading Organizational Transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Watkins, Karen E. and Victoria J. Marsick. Sculpting the learning organization: lessons in the art and science of systemic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993

Watson, G. Resistance to change. In G. Zaltman (Ed.), Processes and Phenomena of Social Change. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Wellins, Richard S., William C. Byham, and Jeanne M. Wilson. Empowered Teams: Creating Self-Directed Work Groups That Improve Quality, Productivity, and Participation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

West, Michael A. and James L. Farr, eds. Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1990.

Yin, R.K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994.

Zaltman, Gerald and Robert Duncan. Strategies for planned change. New York: Wiley, 1977.

Zaltman, Gerald et al. Processes and phenomena of social change. New York: Wiley, 1973.

MICHIGAN STATE LIBRARIES
3 1293 02177 7705