Change Management and Organizational Development: A Critical Conceptual Study

Mohammad S. Alhmeidiyeen[1]

[1] Al Zaytoonah University of Jordan

Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to enhance the concept of organizational development (OD) in the mind of the readers, as a field of planned change that aims to enhance organizational effectiveness for the organizations. Also, to review the roots of OD and CM, which one of them is the base for the other, based on numerous similarities and differences, that is clarify the relationship between OD and CM. The conceptual literature shades the light on the historical back ground of OD and CM, that focusing on the emergence of CM as a service provided by some advisory organizations in private sector, where OD has evolved mainly in the public sector. The shift or movement from OD to the new trend CM started in the mid of 1980s.Finally a brief discussion and conclusions were included.

Index terms— organizational development, organizational effectiveness, change management, behavioral science, public sector, and planned change.

1 Introduction

rganizational Development (OD) is a planned change field designed to enhance organizational effectiveness, by meeting human and organizational needs (Bradford and Burke, 2005).Whereas, Harrison (2011) reported that, the goals of organizational development can be achieved through combining individual, group along with the organizational goals (as argued by Mee-Yan, 2011). On the other hand, OD is concerned with using systematic and planned approaches that help in developing more effective organizations. Newly developed organizations work in a turbulent and changing environment. Therefore, managers must continually strive for ways which ensure that their organizations appropriate for these changing environments, by adapting continuous improvement for the activities, and increase the longterm prospects for their organizations which can be achieved through the use of OD (Mulili and Wong, 2011).On the same context, no doubt, that organizations need to learn to deal with these changing environments; this emphasizes the great importance of the learning organization, which uses organizational learning, to achieve the necessary competitive advantage.

Meanwhile, Holland and Salama (2010) pointed out that OD is a process through which organizations can be developed, through the adoption of numerous planned change strategies that ultimately aim to achieve the objectives of the firms and the well-being of members. On the other hand, Alejandro, (2016) concluded his discussion that the successful development of an organization is based on the correct choice of OD tools that will enhance the planned change.

It is agreed upon that change is inherent in any organization. Whether we like it or not, all organizations, both public and private, must change to continue and sustain in the market. Despite of the diversity of definitions, however, everyone agrees that Change Management (CM) refers to a style or an art of leading an organization into introducing new methods or transitioning to a desirable state. On the same context, Kotter (2011) argued that CM is a set of tools that aims to maintain any change activity under control. Meanwhile, Küçüközkan, (2015) stated that CM is an art of making appropriate the firm culture and behavior with the changing world (as cited in Argüden, 2008).Moreover, Küçüközkan, (2015) stated that, it is a collection of strategies and activities that enable the shift to desired situation from the current one (as cited in Karamazarcadik, 2007).

45   After all the study is a critical conceptual review of the literature, that aims to review the roots of OD and
46 CM, which one is the base for the other? The remainder of this study is structured as follows: the next section
47 is historical review of OD, its emergence and stages. Then OD concepts exploring the definitions analysis, the
48 three main components and a brief of their characteristics. Finally, CM and OD an overview of their differences
49 and similarities, and the movement or shift from OD to CM, followed by discussion and conclusions.

2   II.

3   Historical Review of OD

52 OD has been emerging since the late 1950s and early 1960s, in which it goes through mainly five themes or
53 stages; the first one was the evolution of the National Training Laboratories (NTL) and the growth of training
54 groups (T-groups). The second was the prior or past work on action research; where the concept formally
55 emerged in the 1950s, and is generally credited to psychologist Kurt Lewin (Lewin, 1951) (as cited in Child,
56 2005). Where his valuable work laid down the foundations for a number of researchers followed later in 1960s
57 and 1970s.The third theme was the reflection of then or mative view or approach of OD, which suggest the
58 best way to design organizations and run them. The fourth one is the approach which focuses on the firms'
59 productivity and the work life quality for employees. The final theme which is the latest impact on current
60 practice, involves organizations transformation and strategic changes (Cummings and Worley, 2015). On the
61 same context, Marshak (2014) argued that OD till now demonstrating difficulties in explaining what it is, and
62 why it is needed. Well, the answer for that; OD is still an evolving field of practice. Moreover, it requires an
63 integration of several sets of knowledge. Therefore, to understand what OD is, and what it does, we have to
64 understand the dimensions of knowledge, ideas, and values that areas whole produce practices, which can be
65 classified as organization development. Hinckley (2006) pointed out that the expanding field of OD in 1970s,
66 the large number of people working in many development projects was growing very rapidly, due to that, it is
67 difficult to track what was created and when. During this period several themes were evolved in the journey of
68 development of OD, some of these evolved themes are as follows; open systems approaches, globalization, and
69 learning organizations. On the same context, Grieves (2000) argued that by the end of the last century, many
70 of the earlier ideas had been transformed, and new images of OD had emerged. This is due to the emergence of
71 numerous new topics, which have had a significant effect on the field of OD.

4   III.

5   Concept of OD

74 The evolution of the OD emerged as a term for more than five decades ago in organizational terminology, like
75 any social science concept; it has many definitions, components and characteristics:

6   a) Definitions

77 OD can be seen as a process of planned change in the culture of organizations, through optimal use and application
78 of behavioral science techniques, and system theory, as (Jamieson, 2014) argued that. OD pioneers French and
79 Bell (1999) defined OD as a methodological process used for applying behavioral science principles and techniques
80 in an organization in order to increase employees and organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, Beck
81 hard, (1969) shared with the definition of OD as a planned effort at organization level and starts from the top
82 management of an organization, in order to enhance and maximize the effectiveness of the organization, through
83 planned actions in the organizational processes, using behavioral sciences knowledge. Mangiofico (2017) stated
84 that Beck hard believed that the aim of OD was to ask how to improve the organizations, and then finding the
85 best ways to improve it. Qureshi and Afzal (2008) argued that OD is an improvement offered to the organization
86 through developing its human resource using planned change interventions at organization-wide using human
87 behavior approach.
88   Back to the definition of OD by French and Bell above, to take a close look at this definition we can analyze
89 it as follows:
90   ? A methodological process that, ? Using a behavioral science principles, and techniques in organizations, ? To
91 increase and enhance employees, and organizational effectiveness. ? Meanwhile, the same look at the definition
92 of OD by Richard Beck hard, it can be analyzed as follows: ? A planned effort at, ? Organization-wide, ?
93 Top-management control, ? To maximize and enhance effectiveness of the organization , ? Using planned actions
94 in the processes of the organization and the behavioral science knowledge used.

7   b) Components

96 OD programs have many components, these components which focus on various areas of OD operations; mainly
97 it has three basic components agreed upon by many authors (French and Bell, 1999;Singh, 2009), which are as
98 follows;
99   1. Diagnosis (identification): Identifying the subsystem as well as the processes of the organization. 2. Action
100 or intervention: It consists of all planning activities, and evaluating the results of the action plans. 3. Program

management: During the application of behavioral science practices and principles by the practitioners to improve organizational performance; they also apply the same practices and principles, as they manage OD programs.

8   c) Characteristics

Given the variety of definitions available to OD, this is in line with the organization's objectives and business originated in the field of behavioral sciences, long range and ongoing, based on collaboration, and a systems orientation. Therefore, there are many characteristics of OD which can be drawn, but the main are; (Mulili and Wong, 2011;Singh, 2009;McLean, 2005;French and Bell, 1999; **??**eck hard, 1969).

? A planned and long-range strategy or effort for managing change. ? Focuses on an entire organization (organizationwide), all parts of the organization; therefore, it is a collaborative approach to change. ? Top-down management control.

? Maximize problem solving methods in an organization, therefore, it emphasis on improving and enhancing performance and quality. ? Maximize and enhance the organization effectiveness, as it is based on the scientific approaches.

? Experiential learning process, in the traditional approaches, training was provided to the people by lecture and discussion method, in which people talk about only abstract ideas.

9   IV. CM and OD

The evolvement of OD in the middle of the last century, basically in the public organizations, encourages the emergence of the new trend "Change Management" in the private sector. Meanwhile, Holbeche, (2010) pointed out that the CM as a term was originated and founded by Linda A. Anderson in 1968, which emerged and come out as OD subfield, and as an organizational response to environmental imperatives.

On the same context, Oswick et al., (2005) in their discussion that the movement from OD to CM, started two decades ago, when OD texts have replaced with texts on CM. This movement was not only a rename of the process itself.

OD as Lewin (1951) argued, is a bounded process, characterized with beginning and endpoint. In the contrast, CM can be viewed as an ongoing or a continuous process. On this context, we can imagine OD takes the form of ended journey, i.e., it has a beginning and end, while CM can be imagined as a continuous journey (as cited in Inns, 1996).

On the other hand, Worren et al., (1999) stated that over the past decade, there has been an increase in the dissatisfaction with the traditional OD, surfaced and become apparent (as cited in Jelinek and Litterer, 1988), OD has become irrelevant and unwelcomed (as concluded and cited by Quinn, 1993). Meanwhile, Garrow, (2009) argued that it will remain relevant if it can continue to prove and create value. Therefore, the demand and claim for a new better ways of managing change is extremely very high. On the same context, Worren et al., (1999) believed that, the emergence of CM is a significant and important trend, and concluded (1999) that, CM promises to be the discipline that will integrate the thought worlds that separate OD from strategy and technology, thus allowing concerted efforts for strategic change. Also they added that CM is considering as an appropriate OD replacement, as it is satisfy both business and human needs. Mean while, Kezar (2001) argued that OD has an effect on the organizations by changing the employees and the overall performance. Therefore, change becomes the natural OD conceptualization.

After all, OD can be described as a transformational leap into a desirable vision, where strategies and systems are adapted to local culture in innovative and authentic leadership style by using hightechnological tools, this is what reached to. This led to the conclusion that, OD is a transformational process, where the whole systems of the organization in align with the strategies taken by management.

On the other hand, Roth well et al., (2015) argued that, CM is the application of tools and processes to manage the human side of change, from a current status to a new or desirable future status. Therefore, the desired outcomes of the change are achieved (as cited in Hiatt and Creasey, 2012).

Nevertheless, many researchers argued this subject as; an important CM application relates to the OD of units, functions, and organizational processes. Therefore, CM represents the broadest framework for all change programs, including OD (Worren et al., 1999). CM is comprehensive for all programs and projects, organizational culture, new concepts and principles, methods and skills related to change in the organization. Change in the organization's culture, or in the skills of individuals. OD refers to redesign of structures, functions, processes in order to improve organizational effectiveness (the extent to which the company's objectives are achieved). While management of change refers to different dimensions: Strategic (transformational and continuous change), organizational (structures, functions, processes), technology (technology, technical processes, new products, new systems), behavioral (organizational culture, skills, incentives, new methods of work) and any new applications such as: governance, digitalization of organization, green policies, flexible work systems and others (Cummings and Worley, 2015;Haque et al., 2014;Burchell, 2002).

Although, the relationship between OD and CM is very complicated, it is interesting and it is based on many similarities and differences. On this context, Creasey et al., (2015) introduced few difference dimensions, and three significant interferences which provide the basis for similarity between OD and CM. The difference dimensions between OD and CM, which are as follows: application scope, process duration, effort focus, and

engagement level. Moreover, Cummings and Worley (2015) pointed out that OD is more concerned with the transfer of knowledge and skills, whereas CM does not concern with that. These differences and interferences are summarized in table (1). Interferences between OD and CM ? OD and CM acknowledge the human side within the organization. ? Acknowledges that employees are a critical factor in making an organization successful, and therefore focuses on the initiatives, and organization continuous improvement. ? Each focusing on improving the effectiveness of organization, supporting the change initiatives' returns on investment, and enhance alignment of strategic imperatives with staff behavior.

Some important notes can be drawn from the above table **??** ? For OD, the three dimensions of difference focus on the system application, as a holistic, how it is functioning, and designing components. i.e., focus on processes. ? For CM, the three dimensions of difference focus on projects application, catalyzing individuals change, how to catalyze them, and facilitate individual adoption of changes. i.e., focuses on individual's roles during change, and the outcome as a whole. ? The people or human in general are the critical aspect of the organization's success or failure. ? Both OD and CM focus on enhancing the organizational effectiveness. ? Both OD and CM emphasis on planned change effective implementation (Cummings and Worley, 2015). ? OD deals with the humanistic approach to CM (Ferlie et al., 1996).

V.

10   Discussion

Change management represents the new and significant trend of organizational development, which focuses on the role of individual during change process. Moreover, it is focuses on the outcome as a whole, Whereas, OD focuses on processes (French and Bell, 1999;Worren et al., 1999).

The dissatisfaction of the traditional OD has been noted, and the need for a new another better way to manage change is become extremely very high, this is what was reached to by (Quinn, 1993;Worren et al., 1999;Garrow, 2009).This dissatisfaction pave the way for the emergent of the new trend of managing the change which is change management.

There is a question, is OD a fad trend? Although, OD is not a clear instrument or a technique, and it is a combination of procedures, theories, and models. Nevertheless, OD, will not be a fad, because there is a need for improvement method that the organizations and individuals in need for it. All agreed upon, that OD is a planned change which will not disappear, but with the evolution of technology it will remain and evolve at least in public sector. This conclusion agreed with what (Tripon and Dodu, 2005) reached to.

It is obvious that, OD is intended to address long-term change, not for short-term change, as it is clear that one of the characteristics of OD is alongrange strategy for managing change.

11   Conclusions

It can be concluded that no doubt, OD seeks a continuous improvement of the organization effectiveness that is why its timelines tend to be longer (long range), this is compatible with what Beck hard believed (Mangiofico, 2017). Moreover, there is a need for integrated and holistic approaches that minimize the differences between OD and CM. as well as, maximize the similarities between them. Both OD and CM are aimed at improving the performance and efficiency of an organization to attain the required results. Although, OD can be considered as the root for CM, but each one of them has its own shiny field. For instance, OD has its own field, which is grown in i.e., public sector, and it will remain more profitable this field. On the same context, CM is more profitable in private sector, due to the recent evolutions of managing the change process. [1]

1

Dimensions of Differences between OD and CM	OD	CM
Application scope	Whole system application, which is focus on holistic, organization-wide frameworks.	A specific project application (narrower) or a particular change.
Process duration	Doesn't have an end date (continuous improvements)	Have fixed start and ending date
Effort focus	How system function	How to motivate employees in changing how they execute their works, i.e., focus on people.
Engagement level	Designing activities to change higher order organizational Components	Focuses on systematic and frequent methods toease individual espousal of changes in the employee's process.
Knowledge and skills transfer	Concerned with the transfer knowledge and skills	Not necessarily required

Figure 1: Table 1 :

11 CONCLUSIONS

.1 Abbreviations

[Training] , 10.1108/00197851111160513. https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851111160513 *Training* 43 (6) p. .

[Holbeche ()] , L Holbeche . 2010. Oxford: U. K, Routledge: Elsevier. (HR Leadership)

[Child et al. ()] *A Study on Organizational Development*, J Child , J Mackenzie , R Gordon . 2005. 2016. (Working Paper 6, Australian aid)

[Mackenzie and Gordon ()] *A Study on Organizational Development, Working Paper 6, knowledge sector initiative*, J Mackenzie , R Gordon . 2016. Australian Aid.

[Mangiofico (ed.) ()] *Billie Alban: The Inclusive Organizational Development Practitioner and Scholar*, G Mangiofico . 10.1007/978-3-319-52878-6_28. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52878-6_28 Springer Nature (ed.) 2017. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. (The Palgrave Handbook of Organizational Change Thinkers)

[Burke (ed.) ()] *Change management and organization development*, Burke . Tripon, C. & Dodu, M. (ed.) 1992. 2005. New York: University Press.

[Tripon and Dodu ()] *Change management and organization development*, C Tripon , M Dodu . 2005. New York: University Press.

[Kotter ()] 'Change Management vs. Change Leadership-What's the Difference? Available at site www'. J Kotter . *Forbes.com* 2011.

[Karamazarcadik ()] 'Change Management: A Theoretical Framework'. A Karamazarcadik . *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences* Küçüközkan, Y. (ed.) 2007. 2015. 2 (2) p. .

[Argüden ()] 'Change Management: A Theoretical Framework'. Argüden . *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences* Küçüközkan, Y. (ed.) 2008. 2015. 2 (2) p. .

[Küçüközkan ()] 'Change Management: A Theoretical Framework'. Y Küçüközkan . *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences* 2015. 2 (2) p. .

[Haque et al. ()] 'E-Government towards Good Governance: A Framework for Digital Governance'. S Haque , P Pathrannarakul , D Boonan . *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research* 2014. 3 (2) p. .

[Creasey et al. ()] 'Exploring the Relationship between Organization Development and Change Management'. T Creasey , D W Jamieson , W J Roth Well , G Severini . *Practicing Organization Development: 4 th*, Roth Well (ed.) 2015. 2015. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[Hiatt et al. ()] *Exploring the Relationship between Organization Development and Change Management, chapter 22*, & Hiatt , T Creasey ; Creasey , D W Jamieson , W J Rothwell , G Severini , Rothwell . 2012. 2015. 2015. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. p. 333. (Practicing Organization Development: 4 th)

[Jelinek et al. ()] 'From OD to change management: the emergence of a new profession'. M Jelinek , J A Litterer , N Worren , K Ruddle , K Moore . *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 1988. 1999. 35 (3) p. .

[Quinn et al. ()] 'From OD to change management: the emergence of a new profession'. R E Quinn , N Worren , K Ruddle , K Moore . *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 1993. 1999. 35 (3) p. .

[Worren et al. ()] 'From OD to change management: the emergence of a new profession'. N Worren , K Ruddle , K Moore . 10.1177/0021886399353002. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886399353002 *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 1999. 35 (3) p. 273286.

[Alejandro ()] 'History and Fundaments of Organizational Development'. Alejandro , SG . 10.4172/2375-4389.1000222. https://doi./10.4172/2375-4389.1000222 *Journal of Global Economics* 2016. 4 (4) p. 222.

[Holland and Salama ()] 'Industrial and Commercial'. W Holland , A Salama . *Continuous organizational development (COD)*, B M Mulili, P Wong (ed.) 2010. 2011.

[Harrison ()] 'Interview with Linda Holbeche and Mee-Yan Cheung Judge, authors of Organizational Development, Development and Learning in Organizations'. J Harrison . 10.1108/14777281111159447. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777281111159447 *An International Journal* 2011. 25 (5) p. 3942.

[Grieves ()] 'Introduction: the origins of organizational development'. J Grieves . 10.1108/02621710010371865. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710010371865 *Journal of Management Development* 2000. 19 (5) p. .

[Lewin ()] K Lewin . *Field Theory in Social Science*, (New York: USA) 1951. Harper & Row.

[Inns et al. ()] 'Looking forwards: discursive directions in organizational change'. D Inns , C Oswick , D Grant , G Michelson , N Wailes . *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 1996. 2005. 18 (4) p. .

[Oswick et al. ()] 'Looking forwards: discursive directions in organizational change'. C Oswick , D Grant , G Michelson , N Wailes . 10.1108/09534810510607074. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534810510607074 *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 2005. 18 (4) p. .

[Mulili and Wong ()] B M Mulili , P Wong . 10.1108/00197851111160513. https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851111160513 *Continuous organizational development (COD), Industrial and Commercial Training*, 2011. 43 p. .

[Garrow ()] *OD: past, present and future, Institute for Employment Studies, (IES) Working Paper: WP22, University of Sussex Campus*, V Garrow . 2009. U. K..

[Singh ()] *Organization Change and Development*, K Singh . 2009. New Delhi: Excel Books India.

[Cummings and Worley ()] 'Organization Development and Change, 10 th'. T G Cummings , C G Worley . *Australia: Cengage Learning*, 2015.

[Marshak ()] 'Organization Development as an Evolving Field of Practice (chapter one'. R J Marshak . 10.1002/9781118836170. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118836170 *The NTL Handbook of Organization Development and Change*, 2014. John Wiley & Sons.

[Ferlie ()] 'Organization Development in Public Sector: The Case of Pakistan Post'. Ferlie . *AHRD Americas Conference* 1996. 2011. p. 3576.

[Mclean ()] *Organization Development Principles, Processes, Performance, chapter*, G N Mclean . www.bkconnection.com 2005. Koehler Publishers. (Published by Berrett)

[French and Bell (ed.) ()] *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement*, W L French , C H Bell . U.S.A. Prentice Hall (ed.) 1999. New Jersey.

[Jamieson ()] *Panorama of OD (Introductory Course for Doctoral Program)*, D Jamieson . 2014.

[Roth Well et al. (ed.) ()] *Practicing Organization Development: A Guide for Leading Change*, W Roth Well , J Stavros , R Sullivan , Sullivan . A. (ed.) 2010. San Francisco: Pfeiffer. 3.

[Sullivan et al. (ed.) ()] *Practicing Organization Development: A Guide for Leading Change*, R Sullivan , W Roth Well , J Stavros , R Sullivan , Sullivan . A. (ed.) 2010. 2010. San Francisco: Pfeiffer. 3.

[Qureshi and Afzal ()] *Quality Management and Organizational Development Attaining Sustainability from Organizational Excellence to Sustainable Excellence*, A A Qureshi , S Afzal . 2008. 20-22 August. Helsingborg-Sweden. p. . (Applications of Organization Development Techniques in Improving the Quality of Education, the Proceeding of QMOD Conference)

[Bradford, D. L. Burke, W. W. (ed.) ()] *Reinventing organization development: new approaches to change in organizations*, Bradford, D. L. & Burke, W. W. (ed.) 2005. San Francisco: Pfeiffer. 1. (st ed.)

[Burchell ()] *The Evolution of Green Politics: Development and Change With in European Green Parties*, J Burchell . 2002. London: Earth scan Publications.

[Beckhard (ed.) ()] *The NTL Hand book of Organization Development and Change, Principles, Practices, and Perspectives*, R Beckhard . Jones, B. B., & Brazzel, M. (ed.) 1969. 2006. San Francisco: Pfeiffer. (Organization Development as a Profession and a Field)

[Hinckley (ed.) ()] *The NTL Hand book of Organization Development and Change, Principles, Practices, and Perspectives*, S R HinckleyJr . Jones, B. B., & Brazzel, M. (ed.) 2006. San Francisco: Pfeiffer. (A history of Organization Development)

[Budai ()] 'The Significance and History of Organization Development -in Hungary and International Relations'. T Budai . *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics* 2011. 4 (8) p. .

[Kezar ()] *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations*, A J Kezar . 2001. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. 28.