**Managing a Transformational Change Initiative
Within the Canadian Federal Government:
The Case of Government Online (GOL)**

**By
Joann Shields**

**A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
In partial fulfillment of
The requirements for the degree of**

Master of Business Administration

**Ottawa, Ontario
2003**

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89865-2

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89865-2

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Public sector organizations are continually searching for ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their service delivery. The management of change is a key requirement for success in these endeavors. Most change management research however has been done specifically in the private sector. In the literature review for this thesis, no empirical study of change management success factors specific to the public sector was found. The objectives of this research are therefore to explore what elements associated with successful change in the private sector apply in the public sector and to identify any factors for successful change management unique to the public sector.

From the private sector research, seven factors were identified as key to successful change in the public sector. These factors are: motivating change (creating a sense of urgency), creating a shared vision, communicating change to stakeholders, empowerment, achieving short-term wins, institutionalizing the change and leadership (transformational, charismatic and instrumental).

To research these factors, a case study approach was used to examine key success factors for change management in the Canadian federal government's Government Online initiative. Thirty surveys were collected and 28 in-depth interviews conducted. The survey and interview response frequencies were counted and the answers were analyzed to determine whether change management success factors noted in the private sector were applicable in a public sector setting and if there were additional key success factors specific to the public sector.

The results suggest that there are significant differences in the organizational characteristics between the public and private sectors and that while all of the seven key success factors overlap in the two sectors, they hold different emphasis and applicability in the public sector. Additionally, it was found that there are supplementary conditions under which the public sector must manage change in order to achieve success. The most critical of these were managing the political process and accounting for public sector ministerial subcultures.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, mentor and friend, Dr. Linda Duxbury for her wisdom, generosity and patience in helping me through not only the process of completing this thesis but also for encouraging me to enter Graduate School.

I would also like to acknowledge the members of my thesis committee: Dr. Siva Pal, Dr. Ole Instrup, Dr. Gerald Grant and Dr. Catherine Hajnal for taking the time to read and evaluate this document.

Finally, I would like to recognize my parents, husband, family and friends for their support and encouragement throughout the MBA program.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	8
1 Introduction.....	10
1.1 Objective	11
2 Literature Review.....	13
2.1 The Public Sector Culture	14
2.2 Comparisons of the Public Sector and the Private Sector.....	18
2.3 Change Management Success Factors	25
3 The Research	40
3.1 The Research Model.....	40
3.2 The Research Questions	41
4 Methodology	43
4.1 Case Study Research	43
4.2 Qualitative / Quantitative Research.....	45
4.3 The Case to be Examined: The Government Online (GOL) Initiative	46
4.4 The Sample.....	51
4.5 Data Collection Methodology	53
4.6 Data Analysis	58
5 Discussion of Results	60
5.1 Comparisons of public versus private sector.....	61
5.2 The history of change in the federal government.....	73
5.3 Change management in Government Online (GOL).....	100
5.4 Change management success factors in the Federal Government	117
5.5 Summary questions	151
6 Conclusions	170
6.1 Change Management In The Public Sector	170
6.2 The State of Government Online	173
6.3 A Model For Successful Change Management In The Public Sector.....	174
6.4 Strengths and Limitations of the Research	181
6.5 Benefits of the Research.....	183
6.6 Suggestions For Further Research	184

7	Bibliography.....	186
8	Appendices.....	192
8.1	Appendix A – Initial Contact Email	193
8.2	Appendix B – Change Management Survey	195
8.3	Appendix C – The Interview Framework	198

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Research Model	41
Figure 2 - Comparisons of Public Vs. Private Sector Organizational Culture.....	63
Figure 3 - Comparisons of Public Vs. Private Sector Change Management.....	65
Figure 4 - Level of Difficulty In Managing Change in the Sectors	69
Figure 5 - Grade for Change Management - Federal Government.....	84
Figure 6 - Grade for Change Management - Department	91
Figure 7 - Grade for Change Management – Federal Government versus Departments.....	92
Figure 8 - Grade for GOL Change Management - Federal Government	102
Figure 9 – Grade for Change Management – Federal Government (In General vs. GOL)	103
Figure 10 - Grade for GOL Change Management - Department.....	110
Figure 11 – Grade for Departmental Change Management – In General versus GOL.....	111
Figure 12 - An Exploratory Model for Change Management in the Public Sector	179

List of Tables

Table 1 - Level of Difficulty In Managing Change in the Sectors.....	70
Table 2 - Successful Public Sector Change Initiatives.....	75
Table 3 - Rationale for Success in Public Sector Change Initiatives.....	76
Table 4 - Unsuccessful Public Sector Change Initiatives.....	79
Table 5 - Rationale for Failure in Public Sector Change Initiatives	81
Table 6 - Federal Government Change Management - Positive Response.....	85
Table 7 - Federal Government Change Management - Negative Response	86
Table 8 - Improvement of Federal Government Change Management.....	88
Table 9 - Department Management of Change - Positive Response.....	93
Table 10 - Department Management of Change - Negative Response	95
Table 11 - Improvement of Departmental Change Management.....	97
Table 12 - Federal Government Management of GOL - Positive Response.....	104
Table 13 - Federal Government Management of GOL - Negative Response ...	105
Table 14 - Improvement of Federal Government Management of GOL.....	108
Table 15 - Department Management of GOL - Positive Response.....	112
Table 16 - Department Management of GOL - Negative Response	113
Table 17 - Improvement of Departmental Management of GOL.....	115
Table 18 – Summary of Survey Ratings and Rankings	119
Table 19 - Sense of Urgency Rating – Why Important.....	121
Table 20 - Sense of Urgency – Why Not Important	121
Table 21 - Clear Picture of Future State – Why Important	123
Table 22 - Clear Picture of Future State – Why Not Important.....	124
Table 23 - Communication to Executives Rating – Why Important	125
Table 24 - Communication to Executives Rating – Why Not Important	127
Table 25 - Communicating to Middle Managers – Why Important	128
Table 26 - Communicating to Employees – Why Important.....	131
Table 27 - Communicating to Employees – Why Not Important	132
Table 28 - Empowering Executives Rating – Why Important	133
Table 29 - Empowering Executives Rating – Why Not Important	134

Table 30 - Empowering Middle Managers – Why Important	135
Table 31 - Empowering Middle Managers – Why Not Important.....	136
Table 32 - Empowering Employees Rating – Why Important.....	137
Table 33 - Empowering Employees Rating – Why Not Important.....	138
Table 34 - Using Short Term Wins Rating – Why Important	139
Table 35 - Using Short Term Wins Rating – Why Not Important.....	141
Table 36 - Ensuring Change is Institutionalized Rating – Why Important	142
Table 37 - Ensuring Change is Institutionalized Rating – Why Not Important...	143
Table 38 - Transformational Leadership Rating – Why Important.....	145
Table 39 - Charismatic Leadership Rating – Why Important	147
Table 40 - Charismatic Leadership Rating – Why Not Important.....	147
Table 41 - Instrumental Leadership Rating – Why Important.....	149
Table 42 - Instrumental Leadership Rating – Why Not Important	150
Table 43 - Other Factors For Successful Public Sector Change.....	152
Table 44 - Successful Implementation of GOL by 2005 – Why Successful	159
Table 45 - Successful Implementation of GOL by 2005 – Why Failure.....	160
Table 46 - Increasing Chance of Successful Implementation of GOL.....	163
Table 47 - Advice To Clerk of Privy Council	165
Table 48 - GOL A Good Case Study for Change Management.....	167
Table 49 - How GOL is the same as other change initiatives	168
Table 50 - How GOL is different from other change initiatives.....	168
Table 51 - Key Success Factor Importance In The Public Sector.....	175

1 Introduction

Organizations are continually searching for ways to improve service delivery to their clients, improve internal operations and function more effectively. Often, however, the success of such initiatives depends on how changes are introduced and managed. The desire to successfully manage change has spawned a body of research and literature which focuses on interventions associated with successful change. It should be recognized though that managing change differs across situations and what is feasible for some organizations may not be practical for others. Unfortunately, most research in the field of change management has taken place in the private sector where the changes were motivated by a desire to help businesses be more competitive, reduce costs and survive. Such literature may not, therefore apply within a public sector context where there is no competition and creating change can be a much more ominous task. Change in government is “complex, occasionally contradictory, often far beyond existing public management theory, and sometimes in advance of anything written down” (Kettl, 1995, p.32-33). Change in the public sector may also be unique because of its bureaucratic structure.

The aim of this research was to explore how management of change initiatives in the public sector differ from and are similar to those based in the private sector. This study also attempted to identify whether the success factors for managing change in the private sector are similar to those in the public sector and identify if there are unique success factors for change management in the public sector. The outcome of this research should benefit both academics and

practitioners by increasing our understanding of change management in public sector organizations (specifically the Canadian federal government). Given the history of failure in implementing successful change and the essential need for change in the public sector, this research should also be valuable in providing government a basis to formulate successful change strategies. It should be noted, however, that the focus in this thesis is on people's opinions which may or may not accurately reflect what is actually going on in the organization.

1.1 Objective

The objective of this thesis is to get an in-depth understanding of how the public sector culture and organizational structure affects the perceived probability that change will be successfully managed. Specifically, using a case study approach, this thesis addresses the following questions:

- To what extent do the elements associated with successful change in the private sector overlap the set required in the public sector given two completely different sets of environmental and cultural factors? and
- Can we identify any factors or conditions associated with successful transformational change which are unique to the public sector?

This thesis begins in chapter two with a three-part literature review. Part one of this reviews the public sector culture, part two examines the organizational differences between the public sector and the private sector and part three reviews the literature surrounding the most frequently noted private sector change management success factors. Chapter three presents the research model used in this thesis and the research questions to be addressed. Chapter

four outlines the methodology to be used in the thesis. Results are discussed in Chapter five while conclusions are drawn in Chapter six. Also included in this chapter is a consideration of the benefits and limitations of the research.

2 Literature Review

This thesis explores transformational change in a public sector organization (i.e. the Canadian federal government), and examines how the processes required to implement such change are similar to or differ from change management success factors commonly accepted in the private sector. It also provides an overview of how the public sector culture affects change management practices, specifically where horizontal coordination across multiple departments is required. Current studies and literature in this area are very limited. It has, however, been noted that:

“E-government boosters tend to overstate the transformative capacity of information technology and to underestimate the numerous obstacles, including the endemic structure features of the political system, entrenched habits of government secrecy and public policy and public sector restructuring”
(Longford, 2002, p.17).

The literature review is divided into three sections. Section one of the literature review will outline what is known about the culture of organizations with a bureaucratic structure, such as the federal government. Section two will investigate organizational characteristics of the private sector compared to those of the public sector and explore how these differences may affect change management success factors. Section three of this chapter will review the set of change management success factors to be studied within the scope of this thesis.

2.1 The Public Sector Culture

The meaning of organizational culture is, despite a vast amount of research in the area, still not clearly and distinctively defined. The label 'culture' has been used to describe everything from basic common behaviour to corporate values creating little agreement about what the concept means, how it should be observed and measured, how it relates to theories and how it should be used in organizational study (Schein, 2000). As the term 'culture' is used in many disciplines, confusion can also result as each researcher develops explicit or implicit paradigms that bias not only the definition of key concepts but the whole approach to the study of the phenomenon (Schein, 2000). In general, however, it can be stated that the leadership style of top management and the norms, values and beliefs of the organization's members combine to form the corporate culture (Harvey and Brown, 1996).

According to Cummings and Huse, corporate culture is:

"the pattern of basic assumptions, values, norms and artifacts shared by organization members" and is "generally taken for granted and serve to guide members perceptions, thoughts and actions" (Cummings and Huse, 1989, p.421, 71).

The functional definition for the purposes of this thesis will be from Schein.

He states that:

"culture can now be defined as (a) a pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f) correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems." (Schein, 1990, p.111)

Norms and beliefs arise around the ways members respond to critical incidents. With each incident, there is potential for culture to form. The norm may eventually become a belief and then an assumption if the same pattern reoccurs (Schein, 2000). As increasing numbers of members in an organization come to share the same assumptions, the culture will become stronger and more difficult to change. Strong cultures exist where beliefs are intensely held and widely shared (Harvey and Brown, 1996). "Cultural inertia" comes from age and success; the more ingrained culture becomes in an organization, the greater the barrier it will become in a period of change (Tushman and O'Reilly, 1996). Lewin saw strength and rigidity of culture and strongly held beliefs as a few of the primary restraining forces against change (Lewin, 1951). Setting aside the probable sub-cultures existing within individual departments, the federal government is believed to have a strong overall culture because of its age and size.

For the purpose of this thesis, a bureaucratic culture will be defined as the common cultural elements that have been recognized to be generally evident where a bureaucratic structure is present. The bureaucratic structure was originally a private sector initiative designed to maximize productivity and efficiency (Lowe, 2001, p.6). Max Weber provided the first structural definition and analysis of bureaucratic administration. Bureaucracies were process-oriented and rules based organizations. In bureaucracies, the hierarchy maintained power and directed control through a top-down chain of command, while work was broken down into specialized tasks and routinized (Shafritz and

Ott, 1996, p.35). In previous eras, such as the industrial age, where educated workers were less available, this structure allowed for high productivity and efficiencies. In government today, however, the knowledge workforce is rapidly expanding and bureaucracies have become restrictive. Further, the bureaucratic administration limits the ability to initiate and implement change in government (Teofilovic, 2001).

The organizational structure of government, while once praised for its ability to create equitable systems and efficiencies, has more recently become a major factor in creating organizations where change is not only difficult but often, seemingly impossible. The impulse to control is embedded in virtually every set of rules by which government operates. While every rule was originally laid down with the best of intentions, the cumulative effect has been gridlock (Osbourne and Gaebler, 1993). Governments are inefficient because they are hierarchical, over-centralized and routinized and this routinization diverts attention from end-results to process (Osbourne and Gaebler, 1993). This has led government into a focus of internal processes and hindered its ability to react to changing requirements of citizens and government responsibilities.

The cultural effect of this type of management is organization members, who respect rules, do not take risks and feel unable to create change. Routinization demands compliance with a comprehensive set of rules, which limits decision-making for managers (Altshuler, 1997, p.1). Similarly, this culture does not involve its employees in decision making. "Canada's principle of ministerial accountability contain a strong bias toward vertical hierarchies of

decision-making power and authority that often marginalize all but a few key players in the policymaking process” (Longford, 2002, p.17). This behaviour has also led public servants to accept a passive role in organizational change where for the most part, nothing happens until a mandate is given and employees feel they must achieve their goals within the constraints of the existing rules. In this command and control management culture, delegation is usually understood to involve handing over tasks to employees who follow guidelines, avoid taking risks and who carry out duties in traditional, sanctioned ways (Kernaghan and Siegal, 1999, p.111)

While this culture mostly abides by the hierarchy, difficulty with the use of political institutions to effect change comes from an overestimation of political action to effect changes in practice (Chin and Benne, 2000). While mandates for change will come down from parliament, the history of the federal government in experiencing any significant cultural change has been negligible. The process of participation and buy-in are often ignored, as the cultural norm is to follow the rules.

Another cultural aspect of a bureaucratic environment is its aversion to risk taking. Fear of negative media attention and public scrutiny has created a bias toward risk-aversion within government and this is exacerbated as failures are politically difficult to justify (Teofilovic, 2001, p.10). In the recent Federal Public Service Employee Survey (1999) less than half of public servants felt that they were encouraged to be innovative, take initiative or have a say in decisions and actions that impact their work (Lowe, 2001 pp.41-42).

In over organized situations such as bureaucratic organizations various dimensions such as leadership style, structure, policies and procedures are overly designed for effective task performance (Cummings and Worley, 1997). In the context of the public sector, the world has changed dramatically over the past half century and government has changed remarkably little. Bureaucratic models where elites provided and decided types of service for mass publics is becoming less effective and relevant (Jones and Crowe, 2001).

This may also be due to the fact that a bureaucratic administration relies less on individual managers and more on “habitual ways of doing things and the results of past actions” (Shafritz and Ott, 1996, p.367). In efforts to make changes in such an environment, an organization’s past experiences with strategic change have an influence on subsequent tendencies to change strategic direction (Armenakis and Bedeian, 1999). In long standing bureaucratic organizations, patterns of organizing work have been so ingrained, that despite their serious drawbacks, its hard to conceive of doing the work any other way (Hammer, 1990).

2.2 Comparisons of the Public Sector and the Private Sector

The public sector, as an example of a bureaucratic organization, can be distinguished from the private sector in many respects. It is not the intention of this thesis however to propose a comprehensive analysis of these differences. The aim of this work is only to identify the primary factors lending credibility to the notion that these variances may account for the requirement of an altered

methodology for managing transformative change in the public sector. The primary differences to be discussed in this section are:

- Level of Competition,
- Product Offerings And Delivery,
- Customer Relationships,
- Accountability,
- Measurements for Success, and
- Organizational Structure.

2.2.1 Level of Competition

The most apparent difference between government and private sector companies is the level of competition each sector faces. By nature, the private sector competes for market share with other companies in their industry and their success or failure is highly dependent on how competitive they are at their business. If a company offers a poor product or service, the customer has for the most part easy mobility to find another supplier of goods. The government, on the other hand, faces little direct competition (Light, 1998, p.7). Citizens have very little choice (or no choice at all) in where they can receive government services. Because the administrative arm of government does not have to deal with competition, the motivation or pressure to change is reduced, as their survival is not at stake. Even in the case of a new government coming to power, the administration may alter priorities but will always have 'customers' to serve and tax payers to fund their initiatives.

2.2.2 Product Offerings & Delivery

While the absence of competition on government may provide them a monopoly on their citizens, this distinction also gives government further complications with the range of products and services that are offered. Citizens in general are not as succinctly definable in their requirements from government. Governments are responsible for providing a wide range of services for individuals, businesses and international clients. These services can further vary depending on things such as the citizen's age, interests and location in the country. Alternatively, the private sector can be more specialized in their products and services making priorities and customer relationships more defined.

Service delivery can also be different in the public and private sectors. In the political arena, priorities can shift easily depending on international forces, societal events and political cycles. This leaves the administration of government simultaneously dealing with multiple high priorities and limited resources. In political and rigidly structured organizations such as the federal government there is additional strain caused with each change initiative by the long time periods required to attain resources, develop strategic plans and have them endorsed by ministerial authorities. Private sector companies, however, are able to focus and move attention and resources where they determine appropriate more efficiently as their principle line of business generally remains consistent and focused.

2.2.3 Customer Relationships

In maintaining relationships with their consumers, private companies are able to target their consumer's needs more precisely as they have a defined set

of products for a known market. This gives private companies a more detailed view of their consumers and a profile can be more easily established.

Government is influenced by citizens more sporadically as citizens elect their government officials based on broad platforms at election time and are left feeling uninvolved in the interim. Furthermore, expectations from clients in the two sectors differ. In the private sector, consumers generally expect companies to provide a quality product with good service at a reasonable price and to operate within ethical and legal boundaries. Citizen expectations for government include these elements. Citizens also, however expect government to have control over economic, technological and social forces even though this is beyond anyone's complete control (Thomas, 2000, p.25). The treatment of a private sector customer and a government citizen also have different requirements. "Citizens, unlike customers, have common purposes and rights and among these are the right to be treated equitably" (Ingstrup, 1995). Furthermore, the public is becoming increasingly disillusioned with government. Government has often over-promised what they can deliver producing a lack of credibility for both politicians and the administration. This has created an anti-government view within the public putting government efforts under more scrutiny than the private sector has to face (Thomas, 2000). What matters to a private firm is bringing profitable ideas to market whereas in government there is "a culture of fear and resignation" (Light, 1998, p.8).

2.2.4 Accountability

Despite the difficulties in gaining an in-depth understanding of a broad range of citizen requirements, governments are similar to the private sector in that they are all accountable to the public. Within the accountability, however, there are fundamental distinctions. While the private sector may be generally responsible to the public within the bounds of government-set legislation relating to the sale of their products, they are directly and primarily responsible to their shareholders whose principal concerns are growth and profitability.

Governments, however, have more varied accountability including “to the government, citizens, outside agencies and employees” (Ingstrup, 1998). Of key importance, governments receive their funding from citizens mostly in the form of taxes and are bound to the principle of responsible spending. Citizens, (both individually and in organizations), and the media are constantly scrutinizing how these funds are spent and “there is nothing that people in government fear more than newsworthy failure” (Light, 1998, p.7). This further contributes to a risk-averse public sector. Fundamental change is by nature a risky proposition and is therefore difficult in this type of environment. The private sector, alternatively, is less likely to be risk averse and understands that in order to attain fundamental change, risk is a required element.

2.2.5 Measurements for Success

The public and private sectors are also distinct in their measures of success. In the private sector, companies are profit and growth oriented. The government, on the other hand faces “no analogue of profitability as a

consensual criterion for appraising public sector innovations” (Light, 1998, p.7).

So while the purpose of the private sector is to earn profits, “the public sector is there primarily to spend money – but to spend it wisely” (Ingstrup, 1995).

Government can only be somewhat gauged by public opinion, which is difficult to measure on an overall scale due to the nature of the many facets on which government operates. Furthermore, even if public opinion of the government is poor, the public service will still be funded and operations will generally continue. While companies need profits to survive and what they are able to execute each year is largely dependent on the amount of profits they gain, governments have the same source and approximately the same amount of funds from year to year regardless of performance. The above discussion suggests that profit is a strong motivator for change in the private sector. In government, however, this motivator has little to no impact.

2.2.6 Organizational Structure

Finally, governments differ from private companies due to their political structure. Private company structures range from a sole proprietor to a board of directors. Still companies are not bound by the legislation and ministerial authority faced by government. The political aspects alone make government unable to respond to change as quickly as their private sector peers as laws are more difficult to change than private sector administrative decisions (Bozeman, 1987, p.26).

The political arena is also “characterized by high conflict” making government “a hostile context in which to innovate” (Light, 1998, p.7). The

required role of political parties to question government on its actions can lead to downplaying major transformation. Alternatively, if transformation is planned, each individual action is examined, criticized and portrayed as a foretelling of failure even before an effort is underway. Very rarely would elected government officials receive public acclaim or be encouraged for a good idea for change. The private sector alternatively promotes working together, risk taking, resolving issues and developing solutions in a team environment. At the operational level, the government is also highly skilled in these practices. They must still, however, deal with the bureaucracy required by a risk-averse culture.

Further to this, employee rewards differ in the private sector and public sector (Bozeman, 1987). Employees in the private sector are recognized, compensated and promoted based on performance. In the public sector on the other hand, pay scales are set and job classifications and security are almost guaranteed regardless of performance.

Delegation of authority is also more complicated in the public sector. In the private sector decisions are more often made at a level where the information around the decision lies. In the public sector, because policy interests take precedence over managerial or operating interests, decisions tend to rise several levels above where the information resides (Bozeman, 1987, p.21). Government and political executives focus their scarce time and energy on operational tasks rather than setting broad policy objectives. This leads to senior executives doing more “rowing” than “steering” in the organization (Osbourne and Gaebler, 1993). With each level a decision rises, decision-making information is lost, there are

time delays in affecting change and valuable resources at the officer level are wasted.

Given these many distinct qualities between the public and private sectors, it is not unreasonable to question whether practices to cause successful transformational change may also differ. The next section will discuss change management success factors generally endorsed in the private sector. This discussion will set the stage for the primary research question addressed in this thesis: how transferable these practices are in a public sector organization.

2.3 Change Management Success Factors

Change is an elusive and intangible concept. For the purposes of this thesis, it will be defined as the “crystallization of new action possibilities (new policies, new behaviours, new patterns, new methodologies, new products, or new market ideas) based on reconceptualized patterns in the organization” (Kanter, 1983, p.488). There are many aspects to successful change management with countless academics and practitioners providing research and advice on the subject. Consequently, the literature in the area of change management is too vast a topic to cover all aspects in the scope of this thesis. As a result, this thesis will highlight the most adhered to and repetitive findings with respect to success factors in change management.

Kotter (1995) recommended eight steps for successful change including establishing a sense of urgency, forming a powerful guiding coalition, creating a vision, communicating the vision, empowering others to act on the vision,

planning for and creating short-term wins, consolidating improvement and producing still more change and institutionalizing new approaches. Porras and Hoffer (1996) identified common behavioral changes in successful organizational development to include communication, vision, participation, empowerment, and leadership. Kanter also outlines elements to building commitment to change including generating a clear picture of the change, participation and empowerment, information sharing, leadership and short-term wins (Kanter, 1985). Recardo (1995) further suggests key strategies for managing resistance to change are vision, executive leadership, communications, quick successes, and fostering cascading commitment (empowerment).

In consolidating the direction of these academics, the seven aspects of change management to be studied in this thesis will consist of motivating change, creating a shared vision, communicating the change to stakeholders, empowerment, achieving short terms wins, institutionalizing the change and leadership. It should be noted that there are many other aspects of change management relevant to successful change. For the purpose of this thesis, however, only these areas will be researched. The following sections will review literature specific to each topic to show their relationship and relevance in the study of implementing successful change.

2.3.1 Motivating Change

In order to motivate change, members of an organization must first feel the need to change. Without a crisis in the organization, this is a difficult but essential element. One of the key executive challenges is to create a sense of

urgency for the change despite the lack of an obvious crisis (Nadler and Tushman, 1995). Those responsible for making the change happen can either create dissatisfaction with the status quo or mandate change. Dissatisfaction with the current state has been shown to further change efforts while mandating dissatisfaction seems to create more compliance than commitment (Spector, 1989). In the case of the public sector, motivation may be difficult, as the survival of the organization is not threatened. Rather, public sector initiatives are usually mandated from parliament.

People are also generally resistant to change simply because it is unknown and unpredictable. If people do not see a significant need to change they will not leave their comfort zone and change what they are doing (Harper, 1998). In order to create motivation for change, people must believe that the change is necessary, justified and will make a difference. Evidence indicates that people accept and are willing to change only when there are compelling reasons to do so (Cummings and Worley, 1997). When change is attempted without creating sufficient dissonance and constructive contention with the current state, complacency and stagnation will increase the organizations adaptive capabilities (Kiernan, 1993). The more adaptive an organization becomes, the less able it will be experience significant change.

While the change needs to be presented as significant in order to overcome inertia, it must also be tied to valued aspects of organizational identity (Reger et.al., 1994). Where there is a fundamental redefinition of the organizations vision, strategy and values, a lack of crisis and time allowed for

gradual change, a sense of urgency is more difficult to create (Nadler and Tushman, 1995).

In the Canadian federal government, dramatic change has been historically slow if not impossible to implement. Transformational change in an organization as extensive as the federal government is a long-term commitment. Executives need to appreciate the magnitude of the change and provide employees the necessary time and resources to demonstrate not only the urgency around the change but also the priority it holds within the whole of government. From an employee perspective, senior officials and parliamentarians seem to be continuously announcing new projects with high precedence. This may cause confusion among employees as to what priorities should receive the most focus. It also hinders their ability to give serious long-term attention to an initiative, only considering it the change 'du jour'. In order for public sector initiatives to gain support and motivate employees to buy-in to the change, change agents must not only create urgency around the change but also maintain the urgency so employees will not lose interest or be pulled away by competing priorities.

In the private sector, research has suggested that a sense of urgency is critical to any successful change (Kotter, 1995). The question to be answered by this thesis will then be whether or not a sense of urgency is also important in the public sector and whether the public sector's ability (or lack thereof) to instill this motivation has hindered its ability to implement change?

2.3.2 Vision

“Visioning is the process for achieving agreement on the kind of future an organization wants to create for itself and a shared commitment to creating that future” (Osbourne and Plastrik, 2000, p.26). By creating shared mental models and vocabularies, people initiating change can give an initiative a working culture and ensure that everyone is working towards the same goals (Hopkins, et.al., 2001). A common framework also provides clarity about shared goals and results as well as roles and responsibilities and can provide effective accountability (Hopkins, et.al., 2001).

In order for a vision to be shared, its development should not always come from the top of the organization. Executives need to alter their leadership paradigms to one in which leaders help the organization develop collective visions that members find relevant and be committed to rather than one where the leader thinks that it is their job to define the vision (Osbourne and Plastrik, 2000). If the vision is not shared and compelling, it will not encourage people to give their best efforts (Harper, 1988). In managing complex change in large organizations, it is important to have a critical mass of people who believe in the vision. The best visions are inspirational, value adding, significant for key people, challenging but reachable, and energy releasing (Nutt and Backoff, 2000).

A vision can provide the direction for designing, implementing and assessing organizational changes and gives members common goals and challenges (Cummings and Worley, 1997). The vision in this sense serves not only the

purpose of clarifying common goals and creating buy-in but also operates as the baseline for creating the direction to achieve objectives and presents an actionable picture of the organization of the future (Ostroff, 1999). The vision should not, however be a step by step process to reach the target. Executives should be wary of “how to” approaches as this is only one part of the vision process and organizations would be better served with guiding principles to help others understand the situation rather than concrete directions on how the change should be done. (Kanter, 1983)

The vision should, however, provide organization members with enough details to distinguish between the current state and the desired state. Models can show both where the organization is headed and how great a gap exists between the goal and the current state (Spector, 1989). Creating a shared vision will also help to coordinate the flow of information and help people see their new roles and responsibilities which may help to reduce resistance (Beer, et.al 1990). Broadening the vision to include the interests of a more diverse set of stakeholders also makes the vision more comprehensive (Nutt and Backoff, 2000). A broad vision should be able to attract attention from a wider community potentially providing more support and a better set of requirements for the future state.

In the federal government there are over 100 departments of various sizes and mandates working independently to provide services to Canadians. These departments to date have a history of working in silos within their own ministerial accountability and have little experience in crossing these boundaries. In

horizontal change initiatives, it is the intention that these departmental lines will be transparent. This will require departments to form partnerships and work across department lines. A common vision will be critical in illustrating common goals and cross-departmental requirements of the future state to departments. As we have demonstrated, the private sector places a great deal of emphasis on creating a shared vision in change management initiatives. This thesis will explore whether government also values and employs visioning as a change management success factor.

2.3.3 Communication

Communication is the link between senior management and employees and employees with each other in an organization. It has also been shown to be a key factor in determining the means by which change initiatives will foster or stagnate (Kotter, 1995). Research has also shown that in order for change to be successful, messages regarding change in the form of meetings, emails, memos or informal channels must be propagated throughout the organization (Hall, et.al., 1993). By communicating openly, executives will encourage commitment, ensure a common vision, foster member involvement, reinforce accomplishments and begin to create new values based on continuous improvement (Hall, et.al., 1993). Communication must involve messages about change drivers, new values and objectives as well as providing insight into the design process (Shaw and Maletz, 1995). It should also be done on an in-depth and sustained level of engagement throughout the change effort with attention focused on soliciting feedback and enabling participation and dialogue (Shaw and Maletz, 1995).

Communication helps people see the need for and the logic of a change and can be ideal when resistance is based on inadequate or inaccurate information (Kotter and Schlesinger, 1979). Communication may be especially important where change requires horizontal management as in the federal government where one large organization is separated into multiple departments across a large geographical area. As messages often do not reach all members without dedicated efforts, horizontal change initiatives should especially encourage communication (Ostroff, 1999). Communication is also a requirement in breaking across traditional departmental silos. The Deputy Ministers Task Forces recognized this in their final reports saying that senior management and central agencies should ensure that support for interdepartmental collaboration and teamwork is consistently part of their communications and is reinforced in planning and decision making (Deputy Minister Task Forces, 1996). In public sector organizations however, communication between management and employees is typically suppressed, conflicts are avoided and employees are apathetic (Cummings and Worley, 1997).

It would appear from this literature that both the private sector and the public sector recognize the need for communication in managing change. This thesis will help determine the relative importance in each sector as well as explore whether providing effective communication can be considered more difficult in one sector than the other or if communication is a common challenge. The research will also seek to identify the difficulties in successful communication in large organizations such as the federal government.

2.3.4 Empowerment

Empowerment is defined as seeking to increase members input to decisions that affect organization performance and employee well-being (Cummings and Worley, 1997). Harvey and Brown (1996) define empowerment as the process of giving employees power to make decisions about their work. Research has shown that by empowering organizational members to become involved in change initiatives, executives will create buy-in, broaden the skill base for innovative solutions and increase employee performance networks (Cummings and Worley, 1997). Empowering members of the organization increases support and can contribute to individual power by providing access to information and resource networks (Cummings and Worley, 1997). Empowerment also provides everyone with the responsibility and resources to display leadership in their own areas while further contributing to the organizations goals (Kiernan, 1993). Furthermore, research has found that empowerment reduces resistance to organizational change (Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder, 2000).

In large organizations requiring horizontal management, research has shown that empowering people by giving them the tools, skills, motivation and authority to make decisions essential to the teams performance is a key principle in managing change (Ostroff, 1999). By giving managers decision making power and making them accountable, their focus should change from compliance to results based performance (Osbourne and Plastrik, 2000) and they may be more able to use strategically important knowledge to develop core capabilities and

become innovative champions and facilitators of change (Floyd and Woodridge, 1994). Further, middle managers are already placed in critical roles in the organization (i.e. disseminator, disturbance handler and negotiator) that are central to the effective management of change (Mintzberg, 1973). By empowering middle managers and employees, executives should create an environment where experimentation and creativity will increase as opposed to an environment where people in the organization are so afraid to make a mistake that they don't try to innovate at all. This could potentially result in more successful change initiatives and encourage innovative thinking.

In the context of the public sector, both federal government executives and middle managers are in a position to play a key role in change acting as strategy, change and information conduits (Fredrikson and Johnston, 1999). Governments need to create the learning and evaluation systems to foster a "culture of experimentation" to replace the existing "culture of blame" (Jones and Crow, 2001). However, the basic "machine bureaucracy" followed by government, based on the concepts of Taylor and Weber, was designed to create stability, not empowerment (Nadler and Tushman, 1990). This thesis will investigate how aligned the public sector still is with the "machine bureaucracy" model and whether empowerment is a factor for successful transformative change in government. In addition, the research will also determine the differences between public and private sector empowerment practices and what organizational aspects contribute to these differences.

2.3.5 Short-term Wins

Short-term wins are smaller pilot projects or initiatives that can be implemented quickly and successfully. Such projects facilitate, motivate and encourage change by demonstrating the viability of the change and motivating partners (Hopkins, et.al., 2001). Attempting radical change in one movement can be discouraging, increase risks and be so time consuming that motivation is hard to maintain. While motivating people towards change, short term wins also help to reduce resistance to change by providing proof that the concept of the change is feasible and beneficial. Also referred to as “low hanging fruit” or “quick hits”, short term wins reveal benefits in a short period of time and show people merit in their efforts. This helps them begin to see that a new way is better while also refuting reasons for resistance (Harper, 1998).

By achieving smaller and quicker successes, organizations are continually moving towards their larger goals. Further, large-scale change is often reflective of a number of smaller changes that together provide a building block for the future state (Kanter, 1983). Short-term wins are also useful as a learning tool. Executives should establish informal policies about quick hits so teams and the rest of the organization knows how to handle change ideas (Shaw and Maletz, 1995).

The research clearly indicates that short-term wins are a key element to change in the private sector and it is expected that this may also be true in the public sector. As the federal government has had little experience with cross-departmental transformational change in the past, short-term wins may be

especially useful in dividing the work into more manageable pieces, building small successes towards the larger goal and proving that the concept of cross-departmental initiatives is viable and effective. Short-term wins may also help to alleviate the negative view of government held by the public and create support for further such endeavors. As the federal government has so many competing priorities, however, they will also need to beware that the reaction to short-term wins does not send a message that the change has been completed and that priority can be reduced. This thesis will explore how important and viable short-term wins are in the public sector.

2.3.6 Institutionalizing the Change

Once a change initiative has begun, in order to ingrain new norms, behavior and eventually culture in the organization, the change must be institutionalized. A strong tendency exists among organization members to return to what is well known and learned unless they receive sustained support and reinforcement for carrying the changes through to completion (Cummings and Worley, 1997). This can be done by “legitimizing” the change with policies and reward structures (Denton, 1991). Other methods may be to provide resources, build a support system for change and develop new competencies and skills within the organization (Cummings and Worley, 1997). Institutionalizing must also be integrated with other aspects of the organization to support the central change (Kanter, 1983). For example, when the structure surrounding a change also changes to support it then a change is institutionalized (Kanter, 1983).

This is especially true in the case of government where its rigid design often causes people in functional areas to think only of departmental goals and performance measures rather than what is best for the organization as a whole (Ostroff, 1999). In order to prevent government departments from reverting back to their traditional ways of operating, change agents will need to move departments from their well-established practices and culture of departmental silos and continually support and reward new structures and practices that support the change. In the context of the public sector, change initiatives will not make much overall or long-term difference without large scale organizational change to wider structures of government (Jones and Crowe, 2001). Institutionalizing changes are undoubtedly requirements for both the private and public sectors in order to move organizations towards new behaviours and norms and reap the benefits of the change. The question of how the public sector differs from the private sector with respect to the institutionalization of change will be examined as part of this thesis.

2.3.7 Leadership

While the factors discussed to this point are important, all depend on the presence of capable executives and leaders in the organization who are able to execute them. In fact, the research done to date shows that executive leadership is the critical factor in the initiation and implementation of large-system organization change with both charismatic and instrumental leadership required (Nadler and Tushman, 1990). Research in the public sector context has, for example, shown that leadership and management competencies are “essential to

effective governance, particularly during a period of fundamental change in governments structure and operations” (Sanders, 1994, p.234-35). Leading change cannot, however, be commanded but requires commitment from all involved (Harper, 1998). Executives must show strong proof that they and upper management are doing more than “paying lip service” to the concept. They need to show actions to support their words (Denton, 1991). Leaders also need to communicate strategic decisions forcefully and often enough to make their intentions clear to prevent subordinates from proceeding in the wrong direction (Kanter, 1983).

Leaders are not however, only responsible for executing change but also for developing the organizations culture through the evolution required to manage in its continually changing environment. According to Schein (1895), organizational cultures are created by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership may well be the creation, management and if necessary, the destruction of culture.

As outlined above, private sector research in organizational development sites strong leadership as a key aspect in managing organizations and this is proven to be especially true in a period of transformational change. It would seem evident as well, that proficient leadership, as a key element in managing change would be transferable to the public sector. In a survey regarding perceived leadership in the federal public service, however, only 51% of respondents reported that their most senior officers demonstrated leadership to a great or very great extent. The comparable figure for the private sector was 80%

(Kernaghan and Siegel, 1999, p.114). This thesis will therefore investigate the differences between private and public sector leadership with respect to the successful management of change.

3 The Research

The thesis was designed to address the following general areas:

1. To what extent do the elements associated with successful change in the private sector overlap the set required in the public sector given two completely different sets of environmental and cultural factors?
2. Are there any factors or conditions associated with successful transformational change unique to the public service?

Section one of this chapter will illustrate a model for understanding the research questions and section two will outline the specific questions to be analyzed.

3.1 The Research Model

Public sector organizations are continually moving towards change and increasingly promoting innovation to provide better service and efficiencies in their operations. The public sector, without question, understands the need for change and is creating strategies and practices to implement change. These practices, however, are based on private sector research and as discussed earlier, there are many fundamental differences in the cultures, operations and structures of these two sectors. "Many of the available models of organizational change are derived from private sector experience and do not recognize sufficiently the additional complication involved with managing change in the public sector" (Thomas, 2000, p.21).

Figure 1 - Research Model**Factors Affecting Change: Public Sector versus Private Sector**

A review of the literature led to the development of the model shown in Figure 1. On the left hand side is a description of some of the aspects, which shape the "Public Sector Culture". On the right hand side is a list of some of the factors that shape the "Private Sector Culture". New public management theory is based on the assumption that private sector approaches to management are superior to traditional public sector techniques (Thomas, 2000. p.15). However, no credible or methodical research could be found to prove or discredit this theory. This thesis is an attempt to find such evidence with respect to change management.

3.2 The Research Questions

The research questions were derived to address the commonly identified set of change management success factors identified in the Literature Review. The

scope of this thesis is to analyze the applicability of these private sector success factors in a public sector setting. The following eight specific research questions will be examined in this thesis:

1. To what extent does “motivating change” (i.e. creating a sense of urgency) affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
2. To what extent does “creating a vision” of the change affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
3. To what extent does “communication” affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
4. To what extent does “empowerment” (including employees, middle managers and executives) affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
5. To what extent do “short terms wins” affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
6. To what extent does “institutionalizing the change” affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
7. To what extent do “leadership priorities” affect the perceived chance of change management success in a public sector organization?
8. What other change management practices are important to successful change in the public sector?

4 Methodology

This study can be considered to be exploratory as there is not yet a clear indication of the problems that may be met during the study or enough theory from which to posit a hypothesis (Cooper and Schindler, 1998). Consequently, the research questions are addressed through a case study of a major Canadian federal government initiative, the Government Online (GOL) project. Qualitative and quantitative methodologies using a combination of surveys and in-depth interviews were used to collect data. Qualitative and case study techniques are considered to be most appropriate when a study is exploratory in nature.

This chapter will detail the research design used in this thesis. The rationale for case study research will be discussed in section one and the reasoning for qualitative research will be explained in section two. The GOL initiative will be described in section three including its transformational and horizontal aspects. The sample of respondents will be described in section four and details on the data collection process will be outlined in section five. Finally, section 6 will outline the data analysis techniques.

4.1 Case Study Research

This research focuses on the Canadian federal public service's Government Online (GOL) initiative. Case studies are considered useful in qualitative research as they are suited to determining patterns and relationships within variables where the environment is not controlled (Stake, 1995). This study involves the examination of the organization in its natural setting. Real world examples of change management practices in the public sector will be

gathered for analysis. By analyzing respondents descriptions of actual events, we hope to determine how elements of the public sector culture affect change management. Case studies may also be useful in developing new hypotheses and constructs (Cooper and Schindler, 1998). As it will be explained in Section 4.3, GOL can be considered a transformational change and as such, a study of how this particular change is being managed should have relevance to the management of other large-scale transformative public sector changes. Also, by studying the GOL initiative, we hope to develop a model for further research on change management in a public sector environment.

The power of statistical sampling in qualitative methods depends on selecting a truly random and representative sample, which will permit generalization from the sample to the larger population (Patton, 1987). A small sample of great diversity will provide high-quality, detailed descriptions useful for documenting uniqueness and important shared patterns (Patton, 1987).

The case study for this thesis will be the Canadian federal government's GOL project. GOL Project Managers from the departments and agencies implementing highly transformational and horizontal online services as part of the GOL initiative were selected to be interviewed for this thesis as they know the most about the change. While respondents were solicited from a variety of departments with subcultures of their own, the case study will focus on a corporate wide initiative and the overall public sector culture. By categorizing similarities in responses to interview questions, the intention was to be able to

define qualities of the overall federal government culture and its ability to manage horizontal change.

4.2 *Qualitative / Quantitative Research*

The research methodology for this thesis is a mix of both quantitative and qualitative techniques. A survey instrument provides limited quantitative data as well as partially providing context for the in-depth interview and the in-depth interview supplying the bulk of the research findings is analyzed using qualitative methodologies.

This exploratory study relies on understanding the link between the public service culture and change. Such factors are difficult to quantify using a survey instrument. Exploration also relies more heavily on qualitative techniques, as sufficient information is not available to permit quantitative analysis (Cooper and Schindler, 1998 and Patton, 1987). Such is the case in this research as key variables have not yet been identified and the research model is not clearly detailed. Further, in the preliminary literature review for this proposal, no previous empirical studies were found that focus on change management success factors where horizontal management is required in a public sector environment. The purpose of the study is therefore to understand, as opposed to explain, complex interrelationships affecting change management success. An exploratory research design will help to get a better understanding of the problems and key variables where a model has not yet been developed (Patton, 1987).

By using qualitative methods, the research is also not constrained by predetermined categories thereby allowing the researcher to study the diverse opinions and experience of respondents (Patton, 1987). This type of research is practical in the study of organizations as it permits the researcher to question respondents about the norms, beliefs and assumptions in the organization without presupposing what those elements may be. "There is no way of knowing whether the dimensions one is asking about are relevant or salient in that culture until one has examined the deeper levels of the culture" (Schein, 2000, p.129).

Exploration is also a useful tool in this context to inform action, enhance decision-making and apply knowledge to solve human and societal problems (Patton, 1990). Qualitative data collected in this thesis should provide decision makers with deeper insight into the issues faced by the public sector in implementing broad cross-departmental change. It should also provide practical advice to decision-makers and others with a stake in the success of GOL.

4.3 The Case to be Examined: The Government Online (GOL) Initiative

In the 1999 Speech from the Throne, the Canadian federal government resolved to become a "model user of technology and the Internet" by 2004. This deadline was extended to 2005 in the December 2001 Budget Speech. The goal was to allow Canadians access to all government information and services online "at the time and place of their choosing" (Longford, 2002, p.3). The initiative is guided by the principles of citizen-centered, integrated services that reflect public needs and expectations, and building partnerships to work collaboratively with departments and agencies in the public, private and voluntary sectors.

While each department has its own internal goals for GOL, the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) is the department who has been designated with the overall mandate to implement GOL. GOL is to be implemented in three "Tiers": Tier 1 is online access to standard forms and information on departmental programs and services; Tier 2 is to secure on-line transactions for key services by the end of 2004 and Tier 3 is the development of partnerships within the federal government and with other jurisdictions. Both Tiers 2 and 3 require cross-departmental change initiatives and change management in order to be successful (Longford, 2002).

The GOL initiative was developed in response to external challenges including closer international relations, new and widespread technology, changing societal values and increased ethnic diversity demanding a refocus of government responsibilities (Kernaghan and Siegel, 1999). Specifically, the public wanted a government that was organized around their needs and available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week (Dawes, et al, 2000). The federal government has in the past attempted and is having some success with horizontal initiatives, such as the:

- Rural Secretariat which provides leadership, coordination and support to the Canadian Rural Partnership;
- Climate Change Secretariat which coordinates the development and implementation of a national climate change strategy for Canada; and
- National Secretariat for the network of Canada Business Service Centers whose goal is to reduce the complexity of dealing with various levels of

government by serving as a central resource for Canada business information.

None, of these initiatives however, display the magnitude of change presented by GOL, which simply due to its size, scope and complexity puts it at risk of failure (Longford, 2002).

4.5.1 GOL As A Transformational Change

Transformational change, also termed discontinuous, revolutionary or radical change, is defined by Nadler and Tushman (1995, p. 22) as change where “the organization is not trying to improve fit but rather to build a whole new configuration, with a new strategy, new work, new formal organization arrangements, and so forth”. According to the system of classification developed by Hickson et.al. (1986), a ‘revolutionary’ change is a change involving shifting / redefining existing parameters. For example, structure and technology would be likely to change. Nadler and Tushman would describe this type of change as a ‘re-creation’. By definition, a re-creation is both discontinuous as it involves a new strategy, new work and new organizational arrangements and reactive as it is in response to an external pressure with a clear and present requirement (Nadler and Tushman, 1995).

As stated previously, the principles of GOL are citizen-centered, integrated services that reflect public needs and expectations, and building partnerships to work collaboratively with departments and agencies in the public, private and voluntary sectors. In order for the GOL initiative to be successful, the government will be required to break existing organizational boundaries in its

current departmental design, in addition to introducing new organizational work responsibilities and technologies. Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) would term GOL as a transformational change as it deals with areas such as leadership, culture, mission and strategy requiring new employee behaviours. Finally, Cummings and Worley would describe the change as “quantum” as it affects several organizational dimensions, including structure, culture, rewards and work design (Cummings and Worley, 1997). Essentially, all of these change experts are referring to change at its most complex level where the organization can be expected to experience widespread disruption within relatively short timeframes.

While aspects of successful change for the GOL initiative will include particulars such as legal, policy, technology, privacy or accessibility issues, this thesis focuses only on those aspects related directly to the management of change (i.e. the success factors noted previously).

4.3.1 Horizontal Management

Horizontal management in the general sense, is the ability of an organization to work together across its functional boundaries and not produce either redundancy or gaps in services (Peters, 1998). At present, the Canadian federal government operates as departments working individually in ‘silos’. This structure enhances the challenges faced in delivering seamless client centric service. Many senior government officials have recognized the growing requirement for horizontal management.

“Significant changes to citizens’ expectations of government and silos in government are an important impediment to service delivery.”
(Deputy Minister Task Forces, 1996, p.10)

Horizontal management is difficult for both central agencies and departments in the federal government. Central agency management of horizontal change can create conflict. Program managers resent the power exercised by control organizations and often feel the center does not understand the programs being delivered. The central office on the other hand feels that program managers have a narrow view and do not understand the need to impose overall priorities on government (Peters, 1998). Further, a hierarchical approach to horizontal coordination assumes enough knowledge at senior levels, which may not always be the case (Peters, 1998).

Another challenge in horizontal management is that in order to reduce redundancies and incompatibility in programs, all stakeholders must work to make service provisions more compatible. This is not always easy (Peters, 1998). Gaining trust and securing the collaboration of a network requires a large investment in time and energy. One key determinant of success seems to be the extent to which participants developed a shared culture (Hopkins, et.al., 2001).

Horizontal management in government also faces the question of accountability. Accountability in horizontal management is difficult as it poses problems for both the politicians and the public to identify who is ultimately responsible for failures in a program (Peters, 1998). Despite this, Deputy Ministers recommended a transformation of the public service “based upon collaboration and teamwork rather than ‘turf’ as a key priority” (Deputy Minister Task Forces, 1996, p.13). A priority for action was “attacking ‘turf’ through systematic efforts to align the organization of work, systems and processes,

training, criteria for promotion, and rewards and recognition with the values of horizontality and collaboration” (Deputy Minister Task Forces, 1996, p.27).

In the case of GOL, technological goals have been defined by a government-wide strategy to establish an electronic portal to link government services and citizens. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive strategy outlining its (i.e. GOL’s) organizational objectives (Teofilovic, 2001). This leaves departments with the inclination to operate in their own vertical silos rather than horizontally (Teofilovic, 2001, p.15).

Because the GOL initiative success will be measured in large part by its ability to implement horizontal management, the changes required must overcome the barriers outlined in this section. These factors are what make GOL a transformational change. To make GOL work, the government must not only introduce programs and services online but also radically alter the current work processes and structures that have been imbedded in government operations for decades.

4.4 The Sample

The sample for this thesis was taken from the existing Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) GOL organizational structure of departmental GOL Project Managers and Cluster Managers at the time of data collection. GOL Project Managers are the TBS’s contact point for GOL initiatives and are responsible for the reporting and monitoring of GOL projects in the department. Cluster Managers are responsible for the coordination, oversight and reporting of the Canada web site (www.canada.gc.ca) clusters (i.e. Seniors, Youth, Health, etc.).

The survey and interviews were solicited from 47 GOL Project Managers and Cluster Managers working in the 29 federal departments and agencies implementing GOL. Those departments and agencies included:

- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
- Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
- Canada Customs and Revenue Agency
- Communications Canada
- Canadian Center for Management Development
- Canadian Heritage
- Canadian International Development Agency
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Environment Canada
- Department of Finance
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
- Department of Justice
- Department of National Defence
- Health Canada
- Human Resources Development Canada
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
- Industry Canada
- Natural Resources Canada
- Privy Council Office

- Public Service Commission
- Public Works and Government Services Canada
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- Solicitor General Canada
- Statistics Canada
- Transport Canada
- Treasury Board Secretariat
- Veterans Affairs Canada
- Western Economic Development Canada

Thirty surveys were returned for a response rate of 63.8% (survey sample) and 28 interviews conducted for a response rate of 59.6% (interview sample). Twenty-two of the twenty-nine departments involved in GOL participated in this research for a departmental response rate of 75.9%. Other response rates are incorporated in the report.

4.5 Data Collection Methodology

As mentioned previously, quantitative techniques were applied in the form of an initial survey administered to research participants with the bulk of the research being collected through in-depth interviews where qualitative methods of data collection were used.

“Qualitative methods consist of three kinds of data collection: (1) in-depth, open-ended interviews, (2) direct observation, and (3) written documents” (Patton, 1990, p.10). As direct observation is essentially impossible, (given the disbursement of respondents), and written documentation is limited, the primary

data collection methods used in this thesis are a survey followed up by in-depth interviews. Where possible, however, observation and documentation was also included.

Two types of data were collected in this research: a survey and a follow-up interview. Initial contact was made with the 47 selected participants by email. This email explained the purpose of the academic research, introduced the concept of culture and its effect on change management success factors, explained the objective of the research and asked the recipient for their participation. The email also introduced the first stage in the data collection process, a survey sent through the mail. The email is provided in Appendix A. Details on the survey and interview are given below.

4.5.1 The Survey

The survey asked respondents to give their impression of how important each of the change management success factors (as outlined in the research questions) are to change management in the public sector. This survey employed Likert scales to enable responses to be quantified and allow for patterns and exceptions to be more easily noted. Participants were asked to *rate* and *rank* each of the key success factors noted in the private sector research. Specifically, respondents were asked to:

- Use a five point Likert scale where 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = important, 4 = very important and 5 = critical *rating* their perception on the importance of each success factor in managing successful change, and

- *Rank* the key success factors in their perceived order of importance in public sector change management with one being most important.

The survey is provided in Appendix B. The answers to this survey were used to quantitatively calculate:

- 1) how important the respondents perceived the identified change management success factors to be in the federal government; and
- 2) to what extent the government is using each of these techniques to implement GOL.

The survey was pre-tested with two individuals in the GOL Office of the Treasury Board Secretariat and feedback was incorporated. The survey took between 15 and 30 minutes to complete. Thirty surveys were returned for a response rate of 63.8%.

4.5.2 In-depth Interviews

The second phase of the data collection took place in a follow up interview with respondents. Qualitative case study research seeks to assemble perceptions or knowledge through the descriptions given by respondents and the interview is the principal tool used in exploratory studies to gather multiple views (Stake, 1995). By using respondent narratives, qualitative researchers are better able to develop an experiential comprehension of the case (Stake, 1995). Open ended interviews can be very valuable in understanding how people feel and think in a undirected manner whereas questionnaires and survey instruments are generally less useful as they prejudge the dimensions to be studied (Schein, 2000). By allowing respondents more freedom to discuss their opinions, it was

expected that the researcher was better able to determine what issues may be prevalent in the case as: "Depth interviewing probes beneath the surface, soliciting detail and providing a holistic understanding of the interviewee's point of view" (Patton, 1987, p.108).

The evaluation process was also personalized in order for the researcher to be responsive to the interviewee and note non-verbal communications as well as provide a more conducive environment for the respondent to express their views. Being responsive requires face-to-face contact with people in the program and learning firsthand about stakeholders concerns (Patton, 1987). In-depth interviews were used to provide this setting in the majority of cases (89%) with the remainder being administered over the phone. The government is also unique in its vocabulary and so this native language was adopted whenever possible so that as patterns of word usage emerge, they were used in the analysis to represent the true views of participants (Patton, 1987).

4.5.3 The Interview Framework

Interview questions asked during interviews must have the capacity to collect the information required to answer the research questions and be measurable (Yin, 1994). The interview guide used in this research was developed from the literature review. At the interview, the initial survey was collected and used as a basis for extracting further information.

The interview framework was semi-structured and used open-ended questions to allow respondents to provide unique insights and experiences (Patton, 1987). Such techniques are common when the research is exploratory.

Standardized open-ended interviews where the interviewer takes the respondent through the same sequence and wording of each question also reduces the bias that can occur from having different interviews for different people (Patton, 1987). The framework was however structured in that questions related to the same type of change success factors are grouped together. Cooper and Schindler (1998) recommend such a structure and note that topical direction provides a frame of reference for the interview, which reduces response error and facilitates data analysis.

The interview guide is also a necessary requirement for measurement and analysis. It helps to make sure that the same information is obtained from a number of people covering the same material and makes interviewing different people more systematic and comprehensive by delimiting the issues to be discussed in the interview (Patton, 1987). The interview framework is provided in Appendix C.

Altogether, 28 individuals participated in the interview phase of the study for an interview response rate of 59.6%. Interviews were tape-recorded. By recording interviews, the interviewer was able to be more attentive to the interviewee in their responses and cues and allow for a more natural pace (Patton, 1987). This also allowed the researcher to capture exact wording thereby reducing the interpretative bias. Notes were also taken in the interview about observational information that may help to establish a context for the interview. Respondents were assured anonymity and recordings and notes taken during the interview are kept confidential.

In some questions, participants were asked to give a grade for their department or the federal government in general. Scores below 50% note a grade of F (failing), scores between 50% and 59% note a grade of D, scores between 60% and 69% note a grade of C. Scores between 70% and 79% note a grade of B and scores over 80% note a grade of A.

Again, the interview framework was pre-tested with two individuals in the GOL Office of the Treasury Board Secretariat and feedback was incorporated. Each interview took between 60 and 90 minutes to complete.

4.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis was done on both the survey responses and the findings from the in-depth interviews. Survey responses were analyzed by calculating the mean and standard deviation for each question.

The majority of data collected in the interview stage of the research was qualitative and descriptive. To analyze such data, a standard methodology was required. The methodology employed in this thesis was content analysis. Content analysis involves identifying coherent and important examples, themes and patterns in data (Patton, 1987). Content analysis provides a systematic method for analysis, “guards against selective perception of the content, has provision for the rigorous application of reliability and validity criteria, and is amenable to computerization” (Cooper and Schindler, 1998, p.418).

Analysis began with reviewing the data and organizing it into topics and files. Labeling the data and establishing a data index are the first steps in content analysis. Classification organizes and simplifies the complexity of the

data into some meaningful and manageable themes or categories (Patton, 1987). With case studies where the case serves to help us understand relationships within it, the need for categorical data and measurements is great (Stake, 1995). In organizing and classifying the data, inductive reasoning was required to form the framework for the discussion of the results and produced the basis of further research questions. Inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes and categories of analysis come from the data rather than being decided prior to collection (Patton, 1987). In accordance with a content analysis methodology, a code book was also established to aid in the grouping of responses and frequency counts. Other insights on data patterns were analyzed to reach inferences about the data.

5 Discussion of Results

This chapter will present and discuss the results obtained from the surveys and interviews conducted. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section looks at data comparing perceptions of how the public versus private sector manages organizational change. The second section analyzes findings pertaining to the history of change in the federal government. Section three deals with questions related to change management in the Government Online (GOL) initiative and section four explores more in-depth responses to the survey questions on change management success factors in the federal government. Finally, section five discusses responses to a few summary questions regarding the future of change management in GOL and the applicability of learning from GOL to federal initiatives.

Each section will be presented in a consistent manner. First, the question posed to research participants will be stated and then one or more figures and / or tables of results will illustrate the overall results for the question. Following the figures, a definition and elaboration of the response category and an analysis of the results will be given. A discussion of the results will present common themes, observation and insights and quotes will be utilized to support the findings. In tables and figures, only those categories of responses identified by 10% or more of the respondents are included. Where specific responses were given by only one or two participants, they were grouped into an “other” category and are referred to as “Other” in tables and in the discussions in the text. It

should also be noted that the percentages in the tables may not add up to 100% as in most cases, it was not only possible but common for respondents to provide multiple responses. Furthermore, in the tables showing number and frequency (%) of responses, the N denotes the number of respondents actually providing responses to the particular part of the question. However, the frequency will always be based on the total number of respondents to allow for comparison of results between questions in the sample. In some cases, both survey and interview data are presented while other sections rely on only one type of data: survey or interview. In all cases in the results and discussion section, the type of data being discussed is clearly stated.

5.1 Comparisons of public versus private sector

The first section of the interview was to determine if respondents noted a significant difference between the public and private sectors with respect to their organizational cultures and the way in which change is managed. Two questions were posed in this part of the interview:

Question 1: In your experience what are the main differences between the public sector and the private sector:

(a) In terms of the organizational culture?

(b) In terms of how change is managed?

Question 2: Both the public and the private sector are currently implementing a number of major change initiatives.

a) In your opinion, is it easier to implement transformational change in the public sector than the private sector, more difficult or is there no difference?

b) Why do you say this?

Responses to these interview questions are discussed below.

Question 1: In your experience what are the main differences between the public sector and the private sector:

(a) In terms of the organizational culture?

Differences in organizational culture were described by 92.9% (26/28) of respondents. Only 3.6% (1/28) of the sample said either there was no difference in culture or if there was a difference, that they did not know. While the explanations of variance between the two sectors varied depending on the individual's perceptions/experience in the private sector (to be described below), overall the results reflect the idea that there are significant differences in organizational culture between the public and private sectors. Figure 2 shows the frequency with which participants identified various differences between the two sectors.

Figure 2 - Comparisons of Public Vs. Private Sector Organizational Culture

N=28

The majority of the respondents attributed the primary difference in organizational culture between the two sectors to differences in the main focus of their daily operations. Almost two thirds (64%) of respondents indicated that the private sector was mostly concerned with profit where the public sector mainly concentrated on process. Many respondents emphasized this by describing the private sector as more competitive and survival oriented whereas they saw the public sector to be more concerned with following the correct procedures to ensure due diligence. The private sector was also differentiated from the public sector in terms of the level of bureaucracy with 43% of respondents saying that the public sector had many more levels of approvals and stronger adherence to fixed rules than the private sector. One third of respondents further indicated the public sector to be more change resistant than the private sector. This type of comment can be demonstrated using the following quote:

“Culture is much stronger in government and to the detriment of change initiatives”.

Approximately one in five respondents (21%) said that the public sector was more hierarchical with fewer people making all the decisions. The public sector was also described by as having more policies, being more politically oriented and having stronger departmental cultures versus a strong corporate culture (each of these views was held by 18% of respondents). Finally, 11% of respondents described the public sector as more service oriented with public servants feeling that they were working towards the good of the country (i.e. “There is a belief in the public sector that we are working towards a higher community purpose. The private sector works for profit.”).

(b) In terms of how change is managed?

This question asked respondents for their view on how the public and private sectors differed with respect to how change is managed in their organizations. Figure 3 illustrates the frequency with which respondents saw differences.

Figure 3 - Comparisons of Public Vs. Private Sector Change Management

N=28

All respondents were able to identify differences between managing change in the public versus the private sector, which demonstrates value in searching for a more specific set of change management success factors in the public sector. In their responses to the differences in how change is managed in the two sectors, the most common response was the speed of change. The public sector was described as much slower in their change management process by 64% of the sample. Respondents were not indicating this as a negative response, but noting that due to the size and scope of the federal government they perceived that the private sector was much more efficient. An example of this type of response was:

“The federal government is a monster. And because of this horizontally and because of the slowness and because of the uniqueness of its relationship to parliament you cannot do change quickly.”

The public sector was also described as having many more constraints in their change management ability than the private sector by 50% of respondents.

A primary example provided by some respondents were the procurement rules that the public sector must follow, often taking six months to a year to secure goods or services. The private sector on the other hand was described as having the capability to be more directive, (i.e. being able to reallocate resources depending on requirements). Another example provided by some respondents was the ability of the private sector to provide significant incentives for good performance and impose consequences for poor performance. This lack of an ability to apply consequences was seen to constrain the public sector ability to change.

Just over one third (36%) of the sample noted that the public sector had to consult a broader range of stakeholders. As opposed to the private sector where there is a more definitive product and more known client base, the public sector offers a wider range of products and services and has a much more varied definition of stakeholder. Those can vary from the political arena to stakeholders based on the requirements of the product or service (i.e. seniors, veterans, youth, students, business, and international). Furthermore, the requirements for delivery may vary with each ministerial authority. This point is illustrated by a quote from one respondent that “government has a broader mandate, broader requirements and there are internal workings that are particular to government”.

Respondents (29%) additionally distinguished the private sector as more easily able to create an urgency to change, due to its competitive basis for survival. The public sector is by definition a monopoly, so a sense of urgency without crisis, is much more difficult to create.

One quarter of respondents also felt that the public sector is much more resistant to change. An example of this sentiment is reflected in the following quote:

“In the public sector, any attempt to change parts of the organization is seen as a monumental effort so it is discouraged unless there is a real crying need. It is so complex that it discourages people. In the private sector, it is easier as they can make a case for a better way to do things and generally the manager of the business unit has the ability to make the business unit as effective as possible”.

One quarter of interviewees further noted that the public sector has much stricter accountability than the private sector in managing their change initiatives. These respondents felt that while the private sector must be accountable to shareholders and clients, the public sector, is spending taxpayer dollars and must therefore show much more due diligence with spending through both the administration and the political level.

One in five (21%) of the respondents indicated that the two sectors differed in their management of change with respect to the number of approval levels, reinforcing the previous argument of the increased bureaucracy and hierarchy in the public sector. Departmental versus corporate cultures was also cited as a difference by 21% of respondents who felt that change was managed much more on a departmental level than a corporate one in government (i.e. “Change is managed in silos; departmental or program in the public service”).

Finally, the preparation involved in a change was indicated as a difference as 21% of respondents said that the political level of government will often announce changes without enough preparation at the administrative level. This is illustrated by the following quotes:

“Government puts programs in place without a great deal of due diligence. You won’t find that happening in the private sector”; and

“Change is managed more in the private sector as opposed to being imposed”.

An example provided was the announcement of the Government Online (GoL) initiative where as part of the Speech from the Throne, GoL promised to have all services on line, in both official languages, available 24/7 by 2004. According to respondents, this goal was announced without enough investigation into the feasibility of meeting the targets and no known budget allocation.

Question 2: Both the public and the private sector are currently implementing a number of major change initiatives.

a) In your opinion, is it easier to implement transformational change in the public sector than the private sector, more difficult or is there no difference?

Figure 4 illustrates which sector respondents perceived to have the greatest level of difficulty in implementing transformational change.

Figure 4 - Level of Difficulty In Managing Change in the Sectors

N=28

The vast majority (79%) of respondents felt that it was more difficult to manage change in the public sector. None of the respondents indicated that it was more difficult in the private sector. Those answering that there was no difference felt that the difficulty would depend on the size and scope of the change in the private sector and that in large corporations the same challenges could exist. Finally, 7% of respondents said that they did not know.

b) Why do you say this?

This question asks the 79% of interview respondents who said managing change in the public sector was more difficult to elaborate on their response. Seven categories of response were given by over 10% of the sample (see Table 1).

Table 1 - Level of Difficulty In Managing Change in the Sectors

Response:	n	Frequency
Rationale for Change	16	73
Scope of Services	10	45
Organizational Overhead	9	41
Stakeholders	8	36
Political Agenda	5	23
Department vs. Corporate Goals	4	18
Organizational Culture	3	14

N=22

The most common response given for the increased difficulty in the public sector mentioned by the almost three quarters of the sample (73%), was that the rationale for change was more easily identified in the private sector.

Respondents felt that in the private sector, the goal of profit was consistent, clear and shared throughout the organization. In the public sector, goals could be varied and diverse depending on the departmental mandate, program objectives or geographical region of the country being targeted by the specific objective. As one respondent noted:

“Most changes in the private sector relate to competitiveness issues whereas in government, the drivers are less concrete and they tend to be more diverse”.

Similarly, the second most frequent response (given by 45% of the sample) was that the scope of services offered in the public sector had a much broader range than in most individual private sector companies. Respondents felt that due to the vast array of programs and services offered by government, competing operational goals often superceded or reduced focus on an overall corporate objective.

A further 41% of respondents identified the organizational overhead in government as a hindrance to change. Participants felt that in the public sector there are more levels of approval required and more rules that must be followed, although often for good reason. The following quotes illustrates this:

“In the private sector, there are fewer people devoted to the management of the organization and more people devoted to actual delivery of products and services in meeting the goals of the company so overhead is much lower. In government so much of the organization is actually devoted to managing itself that you automatically have a much more complex organization to deal with.”

“More red tape, more processes, more procedures and we are required to involve more people in decision making. This could be a factor of organizational size and the public service is very large.”

The varied level of stakeholders in government was identified by over one-third of the sample (36%) as another factor that made change in the public sector more difficult. These respondents felt that in the private sector, management can initiate and implement changes based on their own analysis and their ability to sell an idea to their governing Board of Directors. In the public sector on the other hand, respondents felt that there is a requirement for approval and buy-in from a broader range of stakeholders: from the political level through the administration to citizens, businesses and/or interest groups. Furthermore, they felt that changes implemented in government are more likely to affect stakeholders at a personal level, may not be elective for stakeholders and can similarly be more difficult to reverse. This requirement, while necessary, could therefore create much longer time frames and increasing difficulty in achieving common shared objectives in the public sector.

The fifth reason given for the increased difficulty in managing change in the public sector was its dependence on the political agenda. This difficulty was noted by 23% of respondents who described the administrative part of government as constantly having to shift and adjust goals based on the ever-changing political interests. These shifts were described as continual, with the correlation to existing operation not always easily recognized by the administration. An example of this can be demonstrated by the following quote:

“In the government, change is so constant, most people are simply cynical about change. It seems more as political meddling as opposed to change that’s actually going on in society or in the environment that causing that change to happen”.

The next most common reason for the increased difficulty in managing change in the public sector (identified by 18% of the sample) are conflicting goals between departments and the overarching corporate strategy of the government. Respondents felt that government employees were much more connected to their department or sub-unit in the department than with the Government of Canada as a whole. As one respondent said:

“When you talk to people in the federal public service they will either say they work for a department or an organization within a department. They will never say I work for the government of Canada. Whereas if you talk to someone in a company, they never say I work for a section of Microsoft. They say I work for Microsoft.”

Because of this loyalty to the department, achieving transformational change on a corporate level is seen as extremely difficult because people are always looking for their departmental benefits and costs. This is reinforced by the existing structure and practices of government as initiatives, (even corporate ones) are still funded and reported on at the departmental level.

The final rationale for change management being more difficult in the public sector (given by 14% of respondents) was the organizational culture. As described in the responses to *Question 1* of the interview, the Government of Canada is a process oriented, change resistant, bureaucratic and hierarchical organization. In the view of respondents, these factors make transformational change management much more difficult in the public sector.

5.2 The history of change in the federal government

The second part of the interview asked respondents to describe change previous initiatives within the government, (both successful and unsuccessful) and to speculate about what factors may have contributed to the level of success achieved. This was followed by a set of questions designed to elicit feelings about general change management abilities both at the federal and departmental levels. This section was intended to gather general context and background regarding change management in the federal government and should therefore help to identify change management issues within the public sector. Four questions were posed in this part of the interview:

Question 3:

- (a) Can you think of an example of a successful federal PS change initiative? Describe it briefly?**
- (b) Why do you think that this change initiative was successful?**

Question 4:

(a) Can you think of an example of a federal PS change initiative that failed? Describe it briefly.

(b) Why do you think that this change initiative failed?

Question 5: Think about the federal government in general. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

(b) How could they improve their grade?

Question 6: Think about your own department. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

(b) How could they improve their grade?

Responses to these questions are discussed below.

Question 3(a): Can you think of an example of a successful federal PS change initiative? Describe it briefly?

When asked to describe a federal public sector change initiative that was successful, one in five could not think of anything (see Table 2).

Table 2 - Successful Public Sector Change Initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Other	16	57
GOL	6	21
Could not think of one	6	21

N=28

The vast majority of successful initiatives were mentioned by only one individual (grouped into the “other” category). Some examples of other initiatives that were categorized as successful include:

- Team Canada Inc: Team Canada Inc is defined from the exportsource.ca web site as “a network of more than 20 federal departments and agencies working with the provinces, territories and other partners to help Canadian businesses prepare for the global marketplace”.
- Financial Information Strategy (FIS): FIS is described on the Treasury Board Secretariat web site as “ a government-wide initiative designed to enhance decision–making and accountability across government, and improve organizational performance through the strategic use of financial and non-financial performance information.”
- Y2K: Y2K was the Government of Canada initiative undertaken to ensure all government systems preparedness for the year 2000 date rollover.
- Program Review: Program Review was an exercise undertaken by the Government of Canada in the early 1990’s to downsize the federal government.

Respondents identified only one individual initiative as successful over 10% of the time. The initiative identified was GOL at 21%. It should be noted, however,

that due to the case study focus of GOL, and the role of the interview participant in the GOL project, this group was predisposed to identify GOL. Also, as GOL is not yet complete, the initiative could only be described as successful to date.

(b) Why do you think that this change initiative was successful?

In their response as to why a public sector change was successful, nine categories of response were given by over 10% of the sample (see Table 3).

Table 3 - Rationale for Success in Public Sector Change Initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Demonstrated Value	11	50
No Alternative	8	36
Strong Leadership	7	32
Buy-In	7	32
Defined Roles & Responsibilities	7	32
Manageable Scope	5	23
Horizontal Solution	4	18
Flexible Funding	3	14
Other	3	14

N=22

Where transformational changes were not mandated within a specified time period, half of the respondents associated success with the fact that decision makers had demonstrated value achieving the change. Participants felt that by showing the benefits and feasibility of a change, stakeholders were much more likely to also undertake and participate in the initiative with a comfort level that their time would be well spent and benefits achieved. Without knowing with

some certainty that an initiative had proven potential, the respondents felt that people would be easily taken to other priorities where there was certainty of requirements and benefits. A significant number of respondents (36%) indicated that having no alternative was the primary reason the change succeeded. In the case of Y2K for example, the date was immovable and therefore forced a sense of urgency on departments to meet their timelines.

Strong leadership was identified as a key success factor by 32% of the people interviewed. As the public sector was described as very hierarchical, many respondents felt that decision making authority and influence was a requirement for transformational change and in the absence of a senior level champion, any large scale change could not be successful.

Another key success factor (noted by 32% of participants) was achieving buy-in from stakeholders and those required to implement change. The rationale given behind this response was that the public sector has a need for a critical mass pushing the change in order for it to take priority among a large number of other priorities. As noted before, however, many felt that the public sector has no easy instrument for providing incentives to buy-in to a change at the employee level. Respondents, therefore felt that change agents needed to attain buy-in through other means to reduce resistance and create priority if the change was to be successful.

Well-defined roles and responsibilities were also stated as consequential in promoting successful change by 32% of respondents. This was emphasized as being especially important in transformational change across departments

where people are often dispersed by a variety of factors such as departmental goals or geography. This was illustrated by the following quote given in the FIS success example:

“Goals were very clear and it was measurable; you knew when you reached it.”

Similarly, given the size of the federal government, the idea that the change had a manageable scope was seen as critical to successful change by 23% of respondents. Interviewees noted that large-scale change is by nature, prone to failure, (especially in the federal government). Furthermore, they felt that in those cases where change was attempted with unrealistic targets, people became discouraged and complacent. Respondents (18%), also felt in the example of GOL, that horizontal solutions were a key success factor because they provided a higher value and incentive for change where possible. These respondents deemed horizontal solutions as more in line with the direction they advocate for the federal government and therefore more important to accomplish than individual departmental improvements. Finally, flexible funding was noted by 14% of the sample as a key success factor. Specifically, in the Team Canada Inc example, they were able to accomplish many of their goals outside the usual constraints imposed on the federal government. Other success factors noted by respondents included senior management bonuses being based on success, the ability to acquire skills and resources as well as building on an existing foundation of tools.

Question 4(a): Can you think of an example of a federal PS change initiative that failed? Describe it briefly.

When asked to provide an example of a public sector transformational change initiative that failed, three categories of response were provided by over 10% of the sample (see Table 4). In comparison to the responses about successful public sector change initiatives where 22% of respondents could not think of one, only 11% of respondents could not think of an unsuccessful public sector change initiative. Furthermore, respondents were unable to identify a single successful public sector change initiative over 10% of the time (with the exception of GOL which is not yet complete) but almost three-quarters of the sample identified the same unsuccessful public sector change initiative.

Table 4 - Unsuccessful Public Sector Change Initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
HR Reform	20	71
Other	5	18
Could not think of one	3	11

N=28

By far, the most repeated examples of federal public sector change initiatives that failed (given by 80%) were those that related to human resource reform (i.e. Universal Classification System (UCS), La Relève, PS 2000). The main objective of these initiatives was to modernize the Human Resources policies and processes to enable more efficient government operations. Other examples of failed change (grouped into the “other” category included:

- **Official Languages:** Official languages was defined by the respondent as a federal public sector initiative to fulfill the requirements of the Official Languages Act. From the Treasury Board Secretariat web site, “the Act states that the Government of Canada is committed to enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada and to fostering the full recognition and use of both English and French in Canadian society”.
- **Department of National Defense (DND) Logistics:** The DND Logistics project objective was defined by the respondent as an initiative to streamline supply management and involved the departments of DND, Public Works and Government Services (PWGSC), Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS).
- **Public Sector (PS) Compensation:** The PS Compensation systems project objective was defined by the respondent as a Government of Canada systems modernization initiative to centralize payments to employees.

(c) Why do you think that this change initiative failed?

As illustrated by Table 5, eight main categories of responses were provided by over 10% of the sample as to why the above-mentioned public sector change initiatives failed.

Table 5 - Rationale for Failure in Public Sector Change Initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Poor Vision	11	44
Lack of Buy-In	11	44
Poor Planning	8	32
Poor Leadership	4	16
No Political Will	4	16
Wrong Solution	3	12
Union Opposition	3	12
Other	7	28

N=25

The primary reasons given for failure by respondents were poor vision and lack of buy-in (both stated by 44% of the respondents). In discussing why the change initiative failed, participants said that, in the case of UCS and other initiatives, there was no common, agreed upon objective or vision communicated.

A quote that illustrates this is:

“The end result is that departments didn’t know what was trying to be achieved. It was a moving target”.

Because of this lack of vision, buy-in was also difficult to achieve. Another respondent illustrated the lack of buy-in by saying:

“There were a lot of stakeholders but no one really had a stake in it”.

Respondents also noted that the people in charge of the project had failed to show the value in the projects and where there was value, it was not demonstrated or communicated. The initiatives rather were imposed on people without any motivation or interest, and as one respondent described, “left people saying ‘oh here we go again’ and ... just lose interest”.

Poor planning was described as being a reason for failure in change initiatives by 32% of respondents. Respondents very often felt that they or their colleagues would be asked to work on a change initiative without any idea of what the goals were and what the overall strategy was for meeting them. One respondent said about UCS:

“It was in full swing before anyone put a plan on the table”.

Without a plan, respondents felt that people would find it hard to have any commitment to a change, as they could not see how their efforts related to an overall goal.

The next most frequent response (given by 16% of the sample) was poor leadership. A quote to illustrate this point follows:

“It was handed over to people that had a mindset that you just tell people deadlines and they will meet them and that’s all you need to do. It was an absolute disaster”.

Sixteen percent of respondents also felt that many change initiatives in government fail because there is not an appropriate level of champion or that those champions at the appropriate level do not have the necessary skills or resources to lead the initiative, such as the ability to influence or the funds to support it. The lack of political will in an initiative was also seen as reason for failure by 16% of the sample. Many used HR Reform as an example and noted that because this was an administrative change many politicians felt that they had no stake in it. They went on to note that with no political backing, HR Reform has continually been viewed as a lower priority with little sense of urgency.

Similar to poor planning, 12% of respondents viewed initiatives trying to implement the wrong solution as a factor in change failure. Interviewees cited cases where no requirements were gathered from stakeholders, solutions were formed and those people affected resisted the change because it would not meet their needs.

Finally, union opposition was seen by 12% of the respondents as the reason for failure, especially in the case of HR Reform initiatives. Because the union is so strong in the public sector, respondents felt that without union support, initiatives affecting employee job descriptions or work requirements would fail engagement and consensus from this group.

Question 5: Think about the federal government in general. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

In grading how well the federal government manages change in general, the response rate for the question was 93% (26/28). The mean grade given by respondents was 58%. The standard deviation of this statistic was 15.7 showing fairly diverse scores. Figure 5 shows the distribution of the grades respondents gave to the federal governments ability to manage change. Only 15.4% (4/26) of respondents gave the federal government a failing grade (F = a score less than 50%) in change management in general. The majority of respondents (80.8%) gave a grade of between 50% and 79% meaning passing but room for

improvement. Scores between 50% and 59% note a grade of D, scores between 60% and 69% note a grade of C and scores between 70% and 79% note a grade of B. Only one respondent gave the federal government a grade of A (80%+). Responses however were skewed towards the lower end of the scale leaving the average grade for the federal government's perceived ability to manage change at a D (58%).

Figure 5 - Grade for Change Management - Federal Government

N=26

(c) Why did you give them this grade?

In their responses, participants gave both positive and negative reasons to support the grades assigned. Seventeen of the 26 interview respondents provided positive reasons to support the grade they gave (typically C or better). Table 6 shows the responses given by over 10% of the sample that supported awarding a higher grade.

Table 6 - Federal Government Change Management - Positive Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Some Success	12	46
Awareness	3	12
Good Crisis Management	3	12

N=17

The main reason provided for positive grades given by respondents (46%) was that government has a lot of experience with change and some of those experiences were successful. Respondents in this category openly admitted that government also has a lot of examples of failure in change management but that recognized that even these also had elements of success. The following quote illustrates this point:

“We’ve got lots of successes. We certainly have lots of change. We can always pick out a few that didn’t go so well. We merge and integrate departments, we change priorities by the hour; we are a change culture and we wouldn’t still be doing as well as we are if we didn’t have the basics down right”.

Respondents (12%) also felt that their higher grade was supported by the fact that there was an awareness of the need for change in government and that although there may not be a lot of measurable progress to date, that this was a very positive step forward in the right direction. Finally, 12% said that they felt the federal government was good at managing change when a crisis occurred. These respondents felt that although on a daily basis, in the absence of political or other crisis, the government may have difficulty managing change, that when a crisis occurred, people were very skilled at responding even when the circumstances were unknown or uncertain.

Nineteen of the 26 respondents gave reasons supporting a lower grade.

Table 7 - Federal Government Change Management - Negative Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Organizational Structure	7	27
Complacency	7	27
Poor Change Management	6	23
Too Reactionary	4	15
Other	10	38

N=19

When referring to negative aspects of the federal government's ability to manage change, respondents had five categories of answers over 10% of the time (see Table 7). One of the most common responses, given by 27% of the sample, was that the organizational structure of government was a hindrance to transformational change. Specifically, participants were referring to the vertical silos that exist in government between departments both in their cultures and in their accountability structures. This, in their opinion, makes it difficult to manage cross-departmental initiatives. Each department is competing for scarce resources for their own interests and accountability is difficult to share with individual Ministries accountable for its own funding.

Complacency was also seen as an impediment to successful change management in government by 27% of the sample. Respondents felt that because of the lack of incentives for good performance, as well as the lack of consequences for poor performance, people in government have become complacent. Participants stated that at the employee level, people receive increments each year regardless of their performance until they reach the top of

their pay scale. An employee who does poor work will receive the same increment as an employee who does good work. At the executive level there is 'Pay At Risk', which is meant to be performance based pay. According to respondents, however, it is not really at risk as roughly 95% of executives receive this bonus and the criteria for receiving it is "pretty loose". Likewise with employees, there is little to no consequence for poor performance. Respondents noted that in the private sector, people have consequences, but in the government, nothing really happens when someone doesn't do their job. (i.e. "The private sector is much more competitive because its a lot easier for people to get fired for non-performance").

Poor change management practices were identified by 23% of the sample as their reason for giving a lower grade. Respondents felt that there was no education or standards as far as change management practices in government, leaving many managers without the proper skills or knowledge to implement large-scale change. One respondent illustrated this opinion by saying "we are very good at doing things right but I am not sure we are doing the right things".

Furthermore, 15% of the sample felt the federal government, as a whole, was too reactionary in their approach to change management and that while they were good at responding to emergencies when necessary, there was not enough proactive measures taken to improve change success.

Some other interesting negative points (given by the 38% of responses grouped in the "other" category) were a lack of senior management engagement, a risk averse culture and poor post evaluation practices.

(d) How could they improve their grade?

When asked how the federal government in general could improve its grade in change management, respondents came up with many useful suggestions.

These are listed in Table 8.

Table 8 - Improvement of Federal Government Change Management

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Change Organizational Structure	10	38
Incentives	8	31
Engage Senior Leadership	7	27
Buy-In	6	23
Visioning	6	23
Communication	6	23
Incremental Approach	4	15
Resources	3	12
Can't be Done	1	4

N=26

The most common response (given by 38% of respondents) was to alter the organizational structure of government. As this is a complex issue, respondents were unsure of how the organizational structure of government should look with any specificity; however, they felt that the constraints on horizontal initiatives as mentioned in part (a) of this question, should be rectified.

The next most frequent response (provided by 31% of the sample) was to provide incentives for exceptional performance. As one respondent noted:

“People are moved from one pay increment to the next every year regardless of performance. Pay should be linked to performance”.

Respondents felt that if employees had significant rewards for achieving change goals, that complacency would be significantly reduced and employees would not only enjoy the recognition but also a financial bonus.

One in four in the sample (27%) cited engaging senior leadership as the third most significant way to improve the government's grade in managing change. By engaging senior leaders, the sample expected stronger leadership, buy-in and accountability to the project. A method suggested by the sample for attaining the required leadership was to incorporate change goals into accountability accords of senior leaders such as Deputy Ministers.

Getting buy-in from other stakeholders was also listed by one in four as an activity to increase the grade for the federal government's ability to manage change. These respondents felt that getting stakeholder buy-in, (rather than the typical approach of mandating change) would both encourage future change as well as giving credibility and support to current initiatives.

Visioning and communication were also each cited by 23% of the sample as methods to increase the grade of managing change at the federal government level. In their definition of visioning, respondents described, "making the right changes", by which they meant that the government had a clear picture of a solution that best addressed the problem/ opportunity. In discussing communication, respondents said it must be consistent and honest, reach multiple levels of the organization and contain messages targeted appropriately to each specific audience.

An incremental approach as opposed to a radical approach was recommended by 15% of the sample. Respondents felt that because of the size and scope of most government transformational changes, people get overwhelmed and discouraged. By breaking changes into smaller, more manageable pieces government could increase its chances for success these success would, in turn, encourage further changes. Finally, 12% of respondents said that government needed to address staff issues with change such as creating a culture of change acceptance and acquire the skills and competencies necessary to have successful change management in government. Only one individual could not offer a suggestion on how change management can be improved within the federal public sector.

Question 6: Think about your own department. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

The response rate to the question was 96% (27/28). Respondents awarded their departments a mean score of 64% with a standard deviation of 15.6.

When asked to grade how well their own department manages change in general, respondents gave an average grade of 64% (C), slightly higher than the federal government in general. Figure 6 shows the distribution of the grades respondents gave to how well their department manages change. Only 11.1%

(3/27) of respondents gave their departments a failing grade (less than 50%) in change management in general. The majority of respondents (59.3%) gave a grade of between 50% and 79% (passing but room for improvement). A grade of A (80%+) was given by 29.6% of respondents, a much higher number than those who gave the same grade to the federal government in general (3.7%) (see Figure 7).

Figure 6 - Grade for Change Management - Department

N=27

Figure 7 - Grade for Change Management – Federal Government versus Departments

(Federal Government N=26; Departments N=27)

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

In their rationale for the grading of their department's ability to manage change, respondents provided both positive and negative reasons to support the assigned grade. Eighteen of the 26 interview respondents provided rationale for a positive response. Table 9 outlines their rationale with a discussion following.

Table 9 - Department Management of Change - Positive Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Culture Change	9	33
Change Management Process	7	26
Responsive	4	15
Incremental Approach	3	11
Communication	3	11
Common Vision	3	11
Other	4	15

N=18

The most frequent response supporting a positive mark (given by 33% of the sample) was related to culture. The respondents indicated that their departments were either making an effort to change the culture, had pockets of a change culture in the organization or were actually beginning to change the culture, to one more accepting of change. This response was not mentioned with in the discussion of change management for the federal government in general.

The second most common response (given by 26% of participants) was that they felt the department had implemented and was following change management practices to the benefit of change initiatives. Some examples of change management processes were getting buy-in from all levels of the organization, creating a shared and common vision and communications. These activities were also not mentioned in the discussion of the federal government's ability to manage change in general.

The next most frequent answer was that the department was very responsive to change. Respondents (15%) felt that their department was able to react well to changing circumstances both in daily operations and in a crisis and 11% of the sample gave their department a higher grade because of the incremental approach taken by the department in managing change.

Respondents said that because of the size and scope of government, an incremental approach was required to increase the chances for success. An incremental approach was defined by the sample as implementing large scale change in steps that were manageable would reduce the risk of misspending or poor public perception should an initiative fail. Good communication and creating a common and shared vision were also each indicated by 11% of the sample as reasons for raising the grade of their department's ability to manage change. The only response that was given for both the federal government and department's ability to manage change in general was their ability to respond well to a crisis situation.

Finally, examples grouped within an "other" category were (given by 15% of the sample) were active senior management engagement, good control structures and the ability to create innovative solutions.

Sixteen of the 27 interview participants provided reasons justifying their awarding a lower grade. These reasons are shown in Table 10 and discussed below.

Table 10 - Department Management of Change - Negative Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Traditional Processes	5	19
Culture	4	15
Poor Communication	4	15
Departmental Silo	4	15
Change Resistance	3	11
Senior Management Engagement	3	11
Lack of Momentum	3	11
Other	4	15

N=16

While there were many reasons given by the sample for their lower scores in change management at the departmental level, no one dominant reason stood out. One in five respondents (19%) justified their grade by saying that traditional government processes were a barrier to managing change at the department level. Participants discussed existing Acts, legislation and other traditional government processes which added to the level of difficulty in managing change (i.e. "There's a certain way that things are done and no one wants to deviate from that"). Similarly, the department being entrenched in the traditional culture was indicated by 15% of respondents. Participants felt that not only did people become constrained by the existing processes but that they also accepted the culture of bureaucracy to be a higher priority than creating change to the good of the organization.

Poor communication was cited by 15% of respondents as a rationale for providing a lower grade on change management at the department level.

Communication was described as inconsistent and disconnected between organizational levels. Further, respondents felt that communication was often held back at the executive level and that employees were not often given all of

the information. Again, 15% of participants said that their department deserved a lower grade in change management because there were 'silos' or sub-units that operated independently within the department. Respondents felt that in order for their departments to have good and successful change management, the entire organization needed to have common objectives and collaborate on a departmental scale.

Change resistance, poor senior management engagement and the inability to maintain momentum were also each noted by 11% of the sample as the rationale for a lower change management grade for the department. Other responses (given by the 15% of the sample) included in the "other" grouping were lack of empowerment and lack of a long-term vision, for example.

(b) How could the department improve their grade?

In order to improve their departmental grade in change management, respondents suggested many possibilities. These are listed in Table 11.

Table 11 - Improvement of Departmental Change Management

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Visioning	11	42
Communication	8	31
Incentives	6	23
Senior Management Engagement	6	23
Maintain Momentum	5	19
Buy-In	4	15
Streamline processes	3	12
Staff Development / Human Resources	3	12
Can't be Done	4	15
Other	8	31

N=26

In comparison to the suggestions made to improve the federal government's ability to manage change, responses related to departments repeated the notions of creating a common vision, delivering clear and consistent communication, providing incentives, engaging senior management, getting buy-in to the initiative and addressing human resource development for change management. Unique to improving departments ability to manage change are the suggestions of maintaining momentum with change initiatives and streamlining processes. Only 15% of respondents felt that their department could not improve its change management grade.

The most common advice given by participants (42%) was visioning. Visioning was described by respondents as setting longer term planning goals, setting realistic management expectations, creating a common vision based on concrete priorities.

The second most common response (31%) was to improve communication by increasing the frequency and making it consistent and comprehensive.

Almost one quarter (23%) of respondents said that providing incentives and imposing consequences based on performance would improve the department's grade in change management. The current compensation structure offers the same rewards to all employees regardless of performance and consequences for poor behavior are negligible. This, according to respondents encourages and promotes complacency.

Better senior management engagement was also identified by 23% of respondents as an important factor for the department to improve its change management. A quote that illustrates this point follows:

"Senior management tends to nod and say we agree but when it actually comes time to make the necessary changes, those activities just don't take a high enough priority. So what tends to get the priority are the routine base activities of the department that have always been done. None of the senior leaders want to have their priorities exempted by someone else saying that this change management is a higher priority so therefore you have to make the necessary adjustments in your areas."

Maintaining momentum was seen by 19% of respondents as a means to improve departmental change management practices. Respondents described their department, for the most part, as initiating a change and giving it a lot of attention "until the next big initiative comes along", when resources, priority and attention would be moved. Further, respondents said that this occurs rather frequently. By maintaining momentum, respondents were suggesting that departments follow up on the results of a change at various points in its lifecycle

and report on those changes. By ensuring consistent attention on a change, respondents felt that departments would be better able to mark progress and intervene if necessary as well as get some lessons learned.

Buy-in at all organizational levels was seen by 15% of the sample as an important way to improve change management in departments. While senior level buy-in and engagement received the most attention, buy-in at the middle manager and employee levels was also viewed as critical as these are the levels with the most influence in the implementation of the change. Furthermore, 12% of the sample said that streamlining processes within the department would increase its change management capability by making the department more efficient as well as aware of department responsibilities and objectives. This in turn would give them the capacity they need to undertake change as well as the knowledge to plan the best solution.

The same number of respondents (12%) said that concentrating on human resources would increase the change management grade of departments. Respondents felt that their department should hire new employees without traditional boundaries and focus on acquiring competencies that complement a change management agenda. In conjunction with this, respondents also suggested that their departments provide more staff training and development to assist those currently in government to become more flexible and conscious of the need for change. Finally, 31% of respondents had other answers such as linking changes to the political agenda and having more involvement from the department's regional offices in headquarter decisions.

5.3 Change management in Government Online (GOL)

This section of the interview was meant to focus specifically on the case of GOL for the purposes of studying a specific government wide transformational change. This section should be of particular interest to public sector managers working on GOL as it provides indicators with explanations on the performance of GOL change management. This section posed two questions:

Question 7: Now lets talk about the GOL initiative in particular. How good a job do you think that the federal government is doing with respect to managing this particular change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

(b) How could they improve their grade?

Question 8: How good a job do you think that your department is doing with respect to managing this particular change (GOL)? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

(b) How could they improve their grade?

Responses to these questions are discussed below.

Question 7: Now lets talk about the GOL initiative in particular. How good a job do you think that the federal government is doing with respect to managing this particular change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

The response rate of the question was 96% (27/28) and the standard deviation was 19.2. Respondents gave an average grade of 62% (C); about the same as the federal government's ability to manage change in general (58%).

Figure 8 illustrates the grades and shows a fairly flat grade distribution. Only 14.8% (4/27) of the sample gave the GOL initiative a failing grade (below 50%), again about the same as the 15.4% who gave the federal government a failing grade on managing change in general. Responses between 50% and 79% were given by 59.2% (16/27) of the sample indicating that the respondents felt that the federal government's ability to manage the change of GOL was acceptable but that there was room for improvement. The greatest difference in the grades between change management in general and change management in GOL was seen in the number of respondents giving a grade of excellent (80% and above). In the federal governments ability to manage the change of GOL, 25.9% (7/27) gave a grade of 80% and over whereas only 3.7% (1/27) gave a grade of excellent for change management in general.

Figure 8 - Grade for GOL Change Management - Federal Government

N=27

Figure 9 illustrates a comparison of the grades given for the federal government's ability to manage change in general versus with respect to GOL. While averages for each area of change management were not significantly different, (as shown in the Figure 9), fewer respondents gave GOL a mark in the C range and a higher proportion awarded an A.

Figure 9 – Grade for Change Management – Federal Government (In General vs. GOL)

(In General N=26; GOL N=27)

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

In their rational for assigning grades, respondents provided both positive reasons to support higher grades and negative explanations for lower grades. Eighteen of the 27 interview respondents provided rationale for a positive response. Table 12 shows the positive responses.

Table 12 - Federal Government Management of GOL - Positive Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Demonstrated Value	10	37
Departmental Engagement	9	33
Supporting Structures	7	26
Strong Leadership	7	26
Vision	6	22
Senior Management Engagement	4	15
Communication	3	11
Other	2	7

N=18

All responses given to support a higher grade for the federal government's ability to manage the change of GOL were unique from the positive responses given vis a vis the federal government's ability to manage change in general. The most common positive response for GOL change management, given by 37% of respondents, was that the federal government demonstrated the value of GOL through successful initiatives. Specifically, respondents referred to the federal government encouraging GOL by relaying the benefits of both client and departmental requirements. One in three of the respondents also felt that their department had been properly engaged in GOL in both determining what activities should be undertaken and how to achieve those goals. The federal government was also acclaimed by 26% of respondents for the supporting structures it had developed such as a dedicated GOL office at the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and the diversity and relevance of committees formed from both central agencies and within departments. Strong leadership was also noted by 26% of the sample. Specifically, respondents felt that the leadership within TBS and committees had a good understanding of the objectives of GOL

and the horizontal requirements in achieving their goals and were influential in encouraging others to follow. Twenty-two percent of respondents regarded the federal government's vision of GOL as a positive aspect of the change management. Respondents felt that TBS had provided guidance and direction to departments and that the client centric principles of GOL were an important part of its success. Additionally, 15% of respondents said that TBS had done a good job in engaging senior leadership, such as Deputy Ministers and the Clerk of the Privy Council. Finally, 11% of the sample felt that the federal government as a whole had provided the necessary communication to ensure that all participants were informed about the activities around GOL including policies, projects and the GOL direction.

Seventeen of the 27 interview respondents provided rationale for a positive response. Table 13 lists the rationale for awarding lower grades.

Table 13 - Federal Government Management of GOL - Negative Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Funding	9	32
Poor Communication	6	21
No Horizontal Focus	6	21
Poor Vision	6	21
Senior Level Engagement	5	18
Bureaucracy	3	11
Other	5	18

N=17

One in three of the respondents felt that funding was an issue. These respondents provided comments such as the funding was insufficient to achieve

their goals and that the funding process was not transparent enough for departments to understand what was required in order to receive financial support from GOL. Some respondents referred directly to the difficulty in attaining multi-year funding making planning for projects requiring longer timelines (i.e. those involving partnerships and large scale procurement or having legislative uncertainties) much more difficult. Further, respondents noted that a lack of multi-year funding created higher costs in implementing initiatives. Examples of these points are illustrated by the following quotes:

“Especially for business transformation, sometimes you need multiyear funding to have a strategy and a goal. It’s not always little pieces. We have to know we have funding for the whole piece; there is no point in delivering half a product and find out two years down the road, we are not sure of funding.”

“Because of single year funding, a lot of work is done by consultant as opposed to employees. We are training a lot of consultants on new technology. Money would have been better spent in planning with multiyear funding.”

Where 11% of the sample felt that communication was good, poor communication was indicated by 21% of respondents as an issue with GOL. These respondents felt that the objectives and direction of GOL had not been adequately communicated and that the vision and terminology of the program were constantly changing. The same number of respondents (21%) said that there was not enough of a horizontal focus taken with GOL projects and that the federal government could do a better job of involving multiple departments where common solutions could be achieved. A quote by one respondent to illustrate this was:

“We talk about fundamentally changing the way we do business. I see very little of that. We are still operating in stovepipes; the old bureaucratic turf protection is still there.”

While vision was noted as a reason for giving a positive mark to GOL by 21% of the sample, an equal number cited poor vision as a reason for a poorer grade (i.e. "There isn't a general plan on what type of services or benefits or which end client we are trying to satisfy."). Similarly, where 15% of the sample felt that senior management engagement was positive, 18% of respondents felt that there was a lack of participation from senior management. Finally, 11% of the study participants felt that there was too much bureaucracy around GOL. These respondents said that there were too many levels of reporting and that the reporting requirements keep changing. The following is a quote to illustrate this point:

"There's a lot of bureaucracy around GOL. There are so many levels of reporting to get funding it doesn't seem like TBS is coordinated. We spend a lot of time doing reports instead of building our product."

Examples of "other" responses given by 18% of the sample were that there are too many constrictive policies and that barriers to change were not being addressed.

(b) How could they improve their grade?

When asked for their advice as to how the federal government could improve its management of the GOL change, respondents offered many suggestions as outlined in Table 14. Twenty-six respondents provided suggestions and 2 respondents said that they did not know. A number of these suggestions are

repetitive of earlier proposals for improving change management both in the federal government and departments. New suggestions however, were made including increasing funding, providing more support for partnerships across departments, attaining senior level championship and linking the change initiative to government priorities.

Table 14 - Improvement of Federal Government Management of GOL

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Communication	11	41
Vision	9	33
Funding	7	26
Partnerships	5	19
Championship	4	15
Streamline priorities	4	15
Link to Government Priorities	3	11
Other	15	56

N=26

The most popular response (given by 41% of the sample) was that more consistent communication of goals, direction, roles and responsibilities would help. A clearer vision illustrating the feasibility post 2005 including the funding and management regime, was suggested by 33% of respondents while 26% said that providing more resources and transparent funding (including better access to multi-year funding) would increase the chances of success.

More support for partnerships between departments was indicated as important by 19% of the sample and the requirement for more visible and active champions at very senior levels was seen as critical by 15%. Further,

streamlining priorities in order to make achieving objectives more manageable was felt to be consequential by 15% of respondents. As one respondents said:

“For some departments GOL was already planned but for others it adds another layer to an already chaotic environment.”

Lastly, 11% of the sample thought that linking GOL to other government priorities would help to increase the visibility and perceived priority of GOL. Over half (56%) of the responses were given by one or two individuals and grouped together in the “other” category. Suggestions included broadening inter-jurisdictional work and increasing the political will from parliament in hopes of escalating the priority (and likewise funding) of GOL.

Question 8: How good a job do you think that your department is doing with respect to managing this particular change (GOL)? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.

In grading their departments with managing the change of GOL, respondents gave an average grade of 64% (C), the same grade given to departments in managing change in general. The response rate to the question was 96% (27/28) and the standard deviation was 20.1.

Figure 10 shows the distribution of grades given to departments for managing the change of GOL and Figure 11 shows a comparison of departmental change management in general versus the management of GOL. The number of respondents giving a failing grade to their department in managing the change of GOL was 14.8% (4/27), similar to the 11.1% that gave

their departments a failing grade on managing change in general. Again, the majority of respondents (55.6% or 15/27) gave a grade between 50% and 79%, for managing the change to GOL (i.e. pass but room for improvement). The same number who gave a grade of excellent (80%+) for managing change in general gave a grade of excellent in managing the change of GOL. Furthermore, in comparing of the grades given for GOL versus change in general, more respondents awarded their department a grade of B for GOL and C for change in general in essentially the same proportions.

Figure 10 - Grade for GOL Change Management - Department

N=27

Figure 11 – Grade for Departmental Change Management – In General versus GOL

N=27

(a) Why did you give them this grade?

Similarly to past questions, in responding to why they assigned their chosen grades, respondents gave both positive reasons to support a higher grade and negative reasons to support a lower grade. Table 15 lists the positive reasons where 18 participants provided answers. The discussion on these points follows:

Table 15 - Department Management of GOL - Positive Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Collaboration	8	29
Vision	7	25
Experience	7	25
Support Structures	5	18
Senior Management Engagement	4	14
Communication	4	14
Pilots	3	11
Change Management Practices	3	11

N=18

The most common reason (given by 29% of the sample) supporting a positive grade was that their departments worked collaboratively both within their departmental units, across departments and sometimes inter-jurisdictionally to identify the most value added solutions for GOL. One-quarter of respondents said that they felt a positive characteristic of their GOL change management activities was that the departments had created a GOL vision and plan for GOL. A similar number of respondents felt that their departments were successful at GOL change management because they had begun their GOL work even before the actual federal initiative had started and therefore had some experience and lessons learned from which to draw. Having the appropriate support structures in place within the department, such as a GOL office and committee structures also was credited for good change management by 18% of the sample.

Good senior management engagement was noted as a change management success factor by 14% of the sample (i.e. "The senior management in this department has bought into GOL, they are championing GOL and are supporting it continually"). This, however, was not the case for most departments

as can be seen in Table 16 where 32% of the population responded senior management engagement as a problem.

Good communication was further given as a positive factor by 14% of respondents in grading their departments GOL change management abilities. Some examples of communication provided by respondents were that the department held learning events as well as information sessions to inform staff and clients of what was happening around GOL.

Finally, 11% of the sample said that their department conducted pilots to prove value and feasibility as well as get buy-in to GOL. These actions had caused the respondent to raise their GOL change management grade. The same number of respondents said that their department had good change management practices in general.

Table 16 outlines the factors identified by 18 respondents as the reasons for lower grades.

Table 16 - Department Management of GOL - Negative Response

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Senior Management Engagement	9	32
Resources	6	21
Communication	5	18
Partnerships	5	18
Legislation	3	11

N=18

There were five main reasons respondents gave to justify lower grades. As mentioned earlier, one-third of the sample said that being unable to engage

senior management was a issue. Respondents felt that in relation to other competing priorities, GOL ranked low for senior management and that there was no real buy in from the highest levels in the organization. Also, due to the vast amount of other work both operational and new initiatives, over one-fifth of respondents (21%) indicated that they did not have the necessary resources or time to support the requirements of fulfilling the goals of GOL. Communication was further noted as a problem by one-fifth of the sample (18%). These participants felt that the messages coming from Treasury Board Secretariat GOL office were often unclear, that there was no vision communicated and that even messages internal to their own departments were sometimes inconsistent and ambiguous. This left respondents feeling unsure of what was required from them making it difficult to plan or measure their objectives.

Also indicated by 18% of respondents, was the lack of support for partnerships both across departments and inter-jurisdictionally. These participants perceived partnerships as a key success factor for their transformational initiatives but felt that departments were still working in silos and were in need of more support for horizontal partnerships from central agencies capable of forming and encouraging these relationships. Finally 11% of respondents said that legislative issues were a hindrance in their change management of GOL. Specifically, they noted that current legislation is built on ministerial accountabilities, which support departmental silos. This makes cross-departmental initiatives not only difficult but leaving program managers unsure of their boundaries and in a position where it could take years to determine.

(b) How could they improve their grade?

Twenty-five respondents gave eight categories of responses to suggest how departments could improve their grade on the change management of GOL (see Table 17).

Table 17 - Improvement of Departmental Management of GOL

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Senior Management Engagement	11	39
Funding	10	36
Buy-In	6	21
Communication	5	18
Longer Time Frame	4	14
Incentives	3	11
Vision	3	11
Other	12	43

N=25

The most common response (at 39% of the sample) was better engaging senior management. Those who gave this suggestion felt that this would not only increase the priority of GOL in the organization but also provide the necessary leadership at the departmental level.

The next most frequent response (given by 36% of the sample) was related to funding. These participants said that increased funding would help them to achieve their goals by allowing them to acquire the necessary resources and to figure out how GOL would be sustainable post 2005 (the date that the program funding is intended to end). A further 21% of the sample said that they

needed to work more on getting buy-in from all stakeholders, including middle managers, employees, citizens and other non-government organizations. This was deemed important by interviewees in achieving a critical mass aligning to the GOL goals, in implementing specific program processes and ensuring changes are institutionalized in the organization. Without buy-in, respondents felt that GOL would be considered just another “program du-jour” that would eventually go away without making any significant impact.

Almost one-fifth of respondents (18%) repeated their concern regarding communication and suggested that messages both from TBS and internal to their department be more consistent, frequent and manage expectations for both government and external stakeholders. Also, 14% noted that transformational change is complex and requires longer-timeframes allocated to reaching goals. Specifically, interviewees said that by allowing more time to do transformational work, the right changes would be made to program delivery and people would also be given the time to realize the benefits and see their place within the new processes and structures.

Both providing incentives and creating a vision that set a strategy for GOL were indicated by 11% of respondents as ways to increase their department's success with the change management of GOL. As noted earlier, respondents felt that government does not provide any concrete rewards for good performance or enforce any negative consequences for poor performance. Such behavior, they felt, leads to complacency and risk aversion. By providing such incentives, respondents felt that they may be better able to motivate and

encourage middle managers and employees. Also mentioned as an issue earlier in the question, respondents said that the current lack of vision leaves people unsure of requirements and their roles and responsibilities. Respondents suggested that a vision setting the strategy and goals of GOL would help them to align GOL with the goals of the departments and provide people with a common understanding of what is trying to be achieved and how they can contribute. “Other” responses were given by a total of 43% of the sample. Some examples of these responses were increasing the provincial engagement in the GOL agenda, having more short term wins to demonstrate success and motivate as well as better monitoring of current GOL initiatives to build on future improvement and gain lessons learned.

5.4 *Change management success factors in the Federal Government*

This part of the research was done in two stages. The first stage involved the administration of a change management survey (see Appendix B). This survey provided quantitative benchmark data on public sector change in general and the GOL initiative in particular. Participants were asked to *rate* each of the key success factors noted in the private sector with respect to its importance to successful public sector change. A Likert scale (1=not important to 5=critical) was provided for this rating. Respondents were then asked to *rank* the key success factors in their perceived order of importance to successful public sector change management. They were asked to give the factor they considered most important a one, the second most important a two and so on. While only 28

people took part in interviews, 30 of the solicited participants returned the survey. All participants (100%) rated all questions making the response rate 100% (30/30). Rankings were only completed by 93% (28/30) of the sample. In the second phase of the research respondents were asked to elaborate on or explain their survey responses. This design was used to provide the maximum of information while simultaneously reducing response burden. As part of the interview, follow up questions were administered asking the participants to elaborate on their ratings with respect to change management in the public sector. Table 18 summarizes the results of the survey means and standards deviations for both the *rating* and the *ranking* of the key success factors. To clarify the findings, the data was collapsed in to 3 groupings: 1 & 2 (not important), 3 (important) and 4 & 5 (very important). The percent giving each of these ratings was then calculated for each success factor. Each success factor and its corresponding statistics will be considered further in individual question discussions in the following section.

Table 18 – Summary of Survey Ratings and Rankings

Success Factor:	Rating:					Ranking:	
	Mean	Std Dev	% 1-2	% 3	% 4-5	Mean	Std Dev
Demonstrating the required <i>transformational leadership</i> to implement the change?	4.3	0.8367	7	3.3	90	5	3.3993
Communicating GOL information to executives?	4.23	0.6789	0	13	87	5.04	2.6174
Empowering executives in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	4.23	0.8172	0	23	77	6.61	2.8589
Ensuring changes resulting from GOL are institutionalized (i.e. become part of the new norms in the organization)?	4.2	0.9613	3	17	80	7.61	4.0765
Empowering middle managers in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	4.17	0.7915	3	13	83	6.86	3.4180
Using short term, smaller pilots to motivate and encourage change (i.e. short-term wins)?	4.13	0.7761	3	13	83	8.04	3.4586
Communicating GOL information to middle managers?	4.1	0.7589	3	13	83	6.46	3.2373
Creating a clear picture of the GOL future state?	3.97	0.8087	3	23	73	4.54	3.2940
Demonstrating the required <i>instrumental leadership</i> to implement the change?	3.77	0.8976	10	23	67	8.43	3.4793
Communicating GOL information to employees?	3.73	0.8683	7	33	60	8.25	3.1579
Empowering employees in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	3.7	0.7497	3	37	60	9.11	2.8459
Demonstrating the required <i>charismatic leadership</i> priorities to implement the change?	3.67	1.1547	13	27	60	6.57	4.4090
Creating a sense of urgency around the change?	3.3	0.9523	27	23	50	8.46	4.8723

N=30

In the section below, survey responses are provided first, followed by the follow up information collected during the interview.

Question 9: Research in the Private sector has indicated that creating a sense of urgency around the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave sense of urgency a rating of X in terms of importance.

As shown in Table 18, the most common rating for creating a sense of urgency was 4 (very important) or 5 (critical) (given by 50% of the sample). The average rating, however was 3.3 out of 5, indicting it to be slightly higher than important, the median rating in the questionnaire. While no one thought that creating a sense of urgency was not important, only 2/30 felt it was critical. Furthermore, creating a sense of urgency was ranked the lowest (13/13) of all success factors by 42.9% (12/28) of the sample. Its mean ranking was 8.46, the second lowest of all key success factors listed.

Why do you say this?

In their responses explaining their ratings, respondents gave rationale, which justified their saying this factor was more important or less important. There were two categories of responses supporting the importance of a sense of urgency given by the 19 respondents as indicated in Table 19.

Table 19 - Sense of Urgency Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Gives Priority	17	61
Promotes Interest	6	21

N=19

Interviewees said that creating a sense of urgency was important to the public sector because it gives visibility and priority in an environment competitive with pressures and is necessary to “make something happen”. The following quotes illustrate this point:

“In a bureaucracy as large as the federal government, in order to get things done you need to create a sense of urgency.”; and

“If it isn’t urgent, something else is. You’ve go to get your issue to a point of prominence where it cannot be easily pushed out by the day to day work”.

There were three categories of responses supporting a sense of urgency being less important given by 16 participants as outlined in Table 20.

Table 20 - Sense of Urgency – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Lost Meaning	9	32
Created by Political Agenda	4	14
Not Believable	4	14

N=16

With respect to justifying why a sense of urgency was less important, one of three respondents said that a sense of urgency is overused and has lost meaning in government. Specifically these respondents felt that everything was

labeled urgent sending the message that nothing was actually more urgent than anything else. Respondents (14%) also indicated that the urgency in government had to be created at the political level and not in the administration. Therefore, trying to create urgency without the political agenda support would not be taken seriously. Additionally, 14% said that a sense of urgency was not believable in government because the government is was “unlikely to ever go out of business”.

Question 10: Research in the Private sector has indicated that having a common clear picture of the future state is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave vision a rating of X in terms of importance.

As shown in Table 18, creating a clear picture of the future state or vision, was rated as very important (4) to critical (5) by 73% (22/30) of respondents. The average rating was 3.97 indicating most thought it was very important. This can be further supported in the rankings where the average ranking was 4.54, the highest of all success factors.

Why do you say this?

In their responses explaining their ratings, respondents gave rationale, which justified their saying this factor was more important or less important. Four

categories of responses supporting the importance of a clear picture were gathered from 25 respondents as listed in Table 21.

Table 21 - Clear Picture of Future State – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Common Objectives	20	71
Engages Stakeholders	13	46
Buy-In	8	29
Shows Value of Change	4	14

N=25

The most frequent reason (given by 71% of the sample) for supporting a clear picture of the future state was to provide a common view of objectives ensuring all stakeholders understand where the initiative is going (i.e. “If you don’t know where you will actually end up, it is difficult to create a roadmap”). This was deemed especially important in large-scale transformational projects attempting to support a diverse and widely dispersed public sector organizational structure. Almost half (46%) of respondents felt that a common clear picture of the future state would help to engage stakeholders in creating the vision, allow them to see where they fit into the big picture and ideally promote consensus on the vision.

Almost one third (29%) of the respondents saw a strong link between getting buy-in to the initiative and for creating a clear picture of the future state. These respondents felt that a clear common picture of the future state would create comfort in stakeholders, (from the senior management level to employees), that the solution is feasible. Finally, 14% of participants said that

creating a clear picture of the future state would show the reason for and value in making the change.

There was only one category of response given by over 10% of the sample with respect to why they did not see creating a clear picture of the future state as very important (see Table 22). Six respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 22 - Clear Picture of Future State – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Constantly Changing	5	18
Other	3	11

N=6

Almost one-fifth of respondents (18%) felt that a common clear picture of the future state was not that important as a success factor because the picture is constantly changing and evolving over time. An example of “other” responses given by 11% of respondents was that the vision may be different for each department and a common view for the entire government is not realistic given the variance in departmental mandates.

Question 11: Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to executives about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication a rating of X in terms of importance.

As previously demonstrated in the research findings, executives are deemed to be highly important with respect to making change happen (especially transformational). The data from this study (see Table 18) supports this view as 87% (26/30) of respondents rated communication to executives as very important (4) or critical (5) with a mean rating of 4.23. In the rankings, shown in Table 18, communication to executives was given a mean ranking of 5.04, the third highest ranking and in the top half of success factors. Furthermore, no participant ranked it below 10 out of 13.

Why do you say this?

In their rating of the importance of communication to executives in public sector change management to the success of the change initiative, 27 respondents attributed their higher ratings to four main factors as outlined in Table 23.

Table 23 - Communication to Executives Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Buy-In	22	79
Link to Organization	11	39
Create Vision	4	14
Consistency	3	11

N=27

The most frequent rationale (79%) for supporting communication to executives was to get their buy-in to the change initiative. Participants described

government as a top-down organization with decisions made from senior levels and implemented by lower levels. Therefore in order for an initiative to receive priority and resources, executives needed to understand and have the necessary knowledge regarding a change in order to make informed decisions. As one respondents noted:

“Government is much more top-down and hierarchical and so operating within the reality of the public sector, executives have to be sold on ideas”.

The next most repeated response (given by 39% of the sample) was that because executives have the broader mandate of managing larger parts of their organization, they were a critical link to the rest of the organization.

Respondents felt that executives, as the leaders of the organization, were influential in creating support for changes and that if executive support was not demonstrated, employees would in turn show less support (i.e. “GOL’s values in principle (i.e. citizen centric) are a real catalyst for change but it has to have uptake at the executive level across the board”). Furthermore, as communication is often passed down from executives to the rest of the organization, in order for the appropriate messages to reach critical mass, executives must first be provided clear and consistent messaging.

Fourteen percent of the sample said communication to executives was important as it is this group that is responsible for creating the overall vision for the organization. Respondents felt that by having the necessary information about a change, executives would be better equipped to incorporate and determine how outcomes from a change would fit into the bigger picture of where the organization is going. Finally, communication to executives was deemed

important by 11% of the sample to ensure that in an organization as dispersed as the federal government, there would be a consistent understanding about a change across multiple departments and agencies.

Only 5 respondents did not see this factor as important to the ultimate success of the change initiative. There was no consensus amongst those that did not consider it important with respect to why they felt this way (as shown in Table 24).

Table 24 - Communication to Executives Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Other	5	18

N=5

Reasons given by the five individuals who felt communication to executives was less important included the ideas that executives are given too much information already and only need high level views and that executives already understand the need for change and do not require further information.

Question 12: Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to middle managers about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication to middle managers a rating of X in terms of importance.

Based on the ratings provided as shown in Table 18, communication to middle managers was also seen as very important (4) to critical (5) to the

success of the change by 83% (25/30) of the sample with no respondents giving a rating of not important (1). The mean rating was 4.1 out of 5. The rankings, however, help to further distinguish the importance of communication to middle managers. The mean ranking was 6.46 placing it 4th out of the 13 success factors in its importance.

Why do you say this?

In supporting their rationale for perceiving communication to middle managers to be important, 26 respondents provided responses as listed in Table 25.

Table 25 - Communicating to Middle Managers – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Influence In The Organization	15	54
Planning	13	46
Link to Employees	12	43
Strategic	4	14
Other	1	4

N=28

The most recurrent element given by the sample (54%) was that middle managers have the most influence over the actual implementation of a change initiative. Respondents felt that if they did not buy into a change or were resistant, they could “make or break it”. By providing them with clear and consistent messages about the value and feasibility of the change, respondents

felt change agents could get buy-in, reduce resistance and gain the support of those people influential in making the change happen.

The next most frequent category of response (given by 46% of participants) was that middle managers needed to have the information so that they could plan for the change. By understanding what the expectations were of their teams and what would be required, middle managers would be better able to prepare resource allocations, ensure skill sets and plan for the change tasks in addition to their operational responsibilities.

Almost half (43%) of respondents also felt communication to middle managers was significant because “these are the people who have the most contact with employees”, the people who actually do the work. According to this view, middle managers are able to pass down communication to the employee level and can influence how changes are implemented within their areas. Finally, 14% of the sample said that communication to middle managers was important to allow middle managers to see the strategic link between the overall approach of the change to their business line. These respondents felt that if a manager was able to see how a change would fit into or affect a current strategy, they would not only be able to develop better solutions but also enable longer term change management.

While no responses supporting a rating of less importance were given by interviewees, however, one respondent noted that communication to middle managers was not as important as communication to executives and that the communication should flow down from executives to middle managers.

Question 13: Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to employees about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication to employees a rating of X in terms of importance.

As illustrated in Table 18, respondents indicated in the survey that communication to employees was also a necessary aspect of change management in the public sector with 60% (18/30) giving a rating of very important (4) to critical (5). The mean rating of this form of communication was 3.73. While this reveals respondent's view that communication to employees is required, it also presents a declining importance of communication to successful change with each level down in the organizational structure. For example, communication to executives was rated as very important to critical by 87% of the sample; communication to middle managers was rated as very important to critical by 83% of respondents while communication to employees was rated as very important to critical by only 60% of the sample. Additional evidence of this decline in perceived importance with organizational levels can be seen in the mean ranking scores: the mean ranking for communication to executives was 5.04, the mean ranking for communication to middle managers was 6.46 and the mean ranking for communication to employees was 8.25.

Why do you say this?

In explaining their rating decisions, 23 interviewees noted three categories of responses supporting more importance to communication to employees (see Table 26).

Table 26 - Communicating to Employees – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Need Direction	14	50
Buy-In	9	32
Provides Context	4	14

N=23

The most frequent reason for saying communicating to employees was important, (given by 50% of the sample), was to provide employees with the necessary direction they needed to become engaged in their tasks. Respondents felt that by understanding what was required of them, employees would be better able to achieve their tasks. Communication to employees was also seen by 32% of respondents as an effective method to get buy-in from employees. By sharing information about a change with employees, interviewees felt that employees were more likely to understand the reasons for the change and how the change would affect them, therefore reducing the uncertainty that can often cause resistance. Additionally, 14% of the sample felt that communication to employees was important to put their work into the context of the goals of the organization further engaging them in the broader objectives of the organization.

The justification provided for giving a lower rating to communication to employees are outlined in Table 27. Nine respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 27 - Communicating to Employees – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Not Decision Makers	5	18
Accepting of Tasks	4	14

N=9

There were two main reasons given by over 10% of the sample as to why communication to employees was less important. The most common indicated by 18% of interviewees was that employees are not decision-makers and therefore the information was less relevant or consequential to them. Secondly, 14% of respondents said that employees were most accepting of their given tasks and therefore there was less need to reduce resistance or get buy-in.

While these respondents still felt that communication to employees was relevant to successful change management, they emphasized the relatively higher level of importance to executives and middle managers and the requirement to provide appropriate information based on the target audience.

Question 14: Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering executives is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering executives a rating of X in terms of importance.

As depicted in Table 18, again executives are recognized as a critical player in change management in the public sector with an average importance rating of 4.23 out of 5 (77% (23/30) of the sample rating empowering executives as very important (4) to critical (5)). No respondents rated it as not important (1)

or slightly important (2). Furthermore, the mean ranking for empowering executives was 6.61; in the top half of success factors as listed in the survey.

Why do you say this?

There were two main supporting arguments for giving a higher rating to empowering executives as listed in (see Table 28). Twenty-five respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 28 - Empowering Executives Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Decision Makers	23	82
Empower Others	4	14
Other	4	14

N=25

By far, the most popular reason for granting a higher rating to empowering executives, (given by 82% of the sample), was that executives are viewed as the decision-makers and need to be empowered to carry out their set priorities. Participants felt that empowerment would give executives the confidence to make change happen whether it be through altering existing work plans or simply having the confidence that their decisions will be supported, reducing risk aversion. The following quote illustrates this point:

“If they are in a position where they can’t change their priorities to affect GOL change then GOL is not going to succeed. It is important to ensure they have the ability to go in and change some of the processes. If they can’t, then their hands are tied and GOL doesn’t go anywhere.”

Some respondents also perceived that empowerment would help to reduce risk aversion. As one respondents noted:

“There is a risk aversion at the senior level so its very hard to be innovative, progressive proactive when the people who have the final decisions are risk averse and very self concerned for their careers and the their public persona”.

There were two main reasons provided by 7 respondents supporting lower ratings to empowering executives (see Table 29).

Table 29 - Empowering Executives Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Already Empowered	4	14
Don't Actually Do The Work	4	14

N=7

Only two categories of response were collected supporting a lower rating for empowering executives (both given by 14% of the sample). The first group of respondents said that executives are already empowered and therefore did not have this as a concern. The second group of respondents felt that empowerment for executives was less important because they are not the ones who actually do the work and the working level is where empowerment is most important.

Question 15: Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering middle managers is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering middle managers a rating of X in terms of importance.

In their ratings of the importance of empowering middle managers, respondents gave an average rating of 4.17 out of 5 with 83% (25/30) indicating that this was very important to critical (see Table 18). While this factor was rated

as highly important, the mean ranking was only 6.86 making it 7th out of 13 in order of importance of all key success factors listed. While this data shows a clear belief that empowering middle managers is a success factor in the public sector, (observed on both scales), it is perceived to be lower in importance than empowering executives.

Why do you say this?

In explaining their ratings of empowering middle managers, the sample gave rationale, which justified their saying this factor was more or less important. Three categories of response to support the importance of empowering middle managers were provided by 27 participants. Table 30 outlines these responses.

Table 30 - Empowering Middle Managers – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
To Attain Resources	15	54
Increase Ownership	15	54
Reduce Risk Adversity	3	11
Other	1	4

N=27

A key supporting argument to the importance of empowering middle managers (given by 54% of the sample) was that middle managers required resources and empowerment would help them attain those resources. Also presented by 54% of respondents was the rationale that empowerment would increase the level of ownership in an initiative. Respondents felt that in the public sector, executives do not have the time to spend on each change initiative and

by empowering middle managers, these managers would be more engaged in decision making, feel more responsibility to the initiative and be able to move changes along at a faster pace. Finally, 11% of the sample said that by empowering middle managers, a more supportive environment would be created allowing middle managers to be less risk averse, less constrained by traditional rules and processes and more innovative. These constraints were noted as significant issues in the public sector (i.e. “Empowering is not a word that comes easily to government. We haven’t put enough emphasis on this”).

As mentioned previously, no single category of response was provided by more than 10% of the sample to support a lower rating in describing the importance of empowering middle managers in the public sector. However, 2 respondents provided answers to this part of the question noting that empowering middle managers was less important than empowering executives and that middle managers were sufficiently empowered.

Table 31 - Empowering Middle Managers – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Other	3	11

N=2

Question 16: Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering employees is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering employees a rating of X in terms of importance.

As illustrated in Table 18, respondents gave an average rating of 3.7 out of 5 for empowering employees with 60% (18/30) saying that this success factor was very important (4) or critical (5). This is again lower than middle managers and shows the same pattern of decreasing importance based on member levels in the organisation as observed earlier with communication. Furthermore, respondents gave this factor a mean ranking of 9.11; the lowest ranked success factor of all key success factors listed in the survey.

Why do you say this?

In describing why they gave certain ratings to empowering employees, respondents identified rationale to justify why they felt the success factor was more or less important. The reasons for rating empowering employees as more important are listed in Table 32. Twenty-four respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 32 - Empowering Employees Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Better able to achieve tasks	20	71
Reduces Risk Adversity	4	14
Other	3	11

N=24

Three categories of positive response were given for empowering employees with the most frequent (71% of respondents) being that empowering employees would make them better equipped to achieve their given tasks. Respondents also gave the caveat that although empowerment was important to

provide employees with the tools required to do their job, that the level of empowerment should reflect their position within the organization. The next most frequent reason (14%) given to support empowering employees was to reduce risk adversity and encourage buy-in from employees to the initiative. Other arguments given by 11% of the sample were to get buy-in and encourage ideas from this group.

Responses supporting a lower importance rating for empowering employees are listed in Table 33. Seven participants provided responses to this part of the question.

Table 33 - Empowering Employees Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Take Direction from Managers	4	14
Narrow Responsibility	3	11

N=7

Respondents giving negative answers to empowering employees, most often felt (14%) that employees take direction from managers and do not need to be empowered. Secondly, 11% of participants said that employees did not have a broad enough view of the organizations mandate and goals and due to their narrow responsibilities, empowerment for employees would not make enough of a difference in transformational change. As one respondent noted:

“Within the public sector, empowering individual employees to do things different generally doesn’t have as much an impact as it would in the private sector because they are part of this larger government apparatus and often they don’t have the broad picture”.

Question 17: Research in the Private sector has indicated that having short-term smaller projects (also called short-term wins) to motivate and encourage change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave short-term wins a rating of X in terms of importance.

As seen in Table 18, short-term wins were given an average importance rating of 4.13 out of 5 with 83% (25/30) of the sample indicating the success factor to be very important (4) or critical (5). In the ratings with other success factors, however, respondents gave a mean rating of 8.04 placing it 9th out of 13 of all success factors for public sector change management.

Why do you say this?

In describing the higher importance of short-term wins in the public sector, all (28) respondents provided four justifications as listed in Table 34.

Table 34 - Using Short Term Wins Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Demonstrates Value	26	93
Building Blocks	13	46
Efficiency	7	25
Defines Vision	3	11
Other	2	7

N=28

The most common reason for supporting a short-term win strategy in the public sector (given by 93% of the sample) was that it demonstrates the value of a change. Respondents felt that demonstrating value would reduce resistance to

a change and motivate people by showing success. As explained by one respondent:

“There is a lot of skepticism to do with change in the public sector. People have seen change initiatives come and go and when you look back, you find there actually wasn’t much change at all. It was kind of like re-arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. So if you actually demonstrate short-term wins and the immediate benefits, its inspiring and people lose some of their reluctance to participate”.

The next most frequent response (given by 46% of participants) was that short-term wins were an effective way to implement large-scale change incrementally (i.e. building blocks towards larger change). By doing smaller scale projects as opposed to massive change, respondents felt that change would be more manageable and have a better chance of success. As noted by one respondent:

“That is the only way to do change. It should be critical plus. Seriously, pilots are the answer. Because if you build too big a picture or model or plan, you get lost in the details right off the bat.”

Short-term wins were also seen by 25% of respondents as a more efficient means to achieving change where there are many competing priorities, such as in government. The following quotes illustrate this point:

“My experience is that you’ve only got limited energy when you are doing a change process cause you’re distracted by a whole lot of things so I’ve learned to put that energy into building pilots.”

“We are the McDonald’s generation. We want it now. The reality is that you’ve got to show some visibility and some wins so they actually believe you when you talk to them about how this will change things and how this is important to them.”

Finally, 11% of the sample said short-term wins were an effective way to help define the vision of transformational change, especially in the public sector where organizations are large, dispersed and varied in their mandates.

Only two categories of response were given (by 5 participants) with respect to why they had devalued the importance of short-term wins in public sector change management (see Table 35).

Table 35 - Using Short Term Wins Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Larger problems Need Attention	3	11
Other	3	11

N=5

One concern (given by 11% of the sample) was that by using short-term wins, the danger of not addressing larger problems would be increased, especially if resources are used in smaller projects. “Other” responses provided by 11% of respondents were that the time required to do short-term wins before implementing a project could cause the initiative to lose priority and that short-term wins had to value added and simply were not necessary.

Question 18: Research in the Private sector has indicated that institutionalizing the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave institutionalizing the change a rating of X in terms of importance.

As illustrated in Table 18, ensuring the change is institutionalized was given an average rating of 4.2 out of 5 by respondents with 80% (24/30) of the sample saying it was either very important (4) or critical (5). The mean ranking of institutionalizing change as a key success factor was 7.61 placing it eighth out of thirteen of all key success factors listed in the survey.

Why do you say this?

Twenty-five respondents provided three categories of responses to support a higher rating for institutionalizing change as a key success factor for change management in the public sector (see Table 36).

Table 36 - Ensuring Change is Institutionalized Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Achieve Benefits of Change	22	79
Current Structures Oppose New Req.'s	11	39
Credibility	4	14

N=25

The most frequent positive response (given by 79% of the sample) was that you need to institutionalize the change in order to achieve the benefits or goals of the change (i.e. "if it doesn't become a new norm, people will still do things the way that they're doing and this would just be an added cost").

Secondly, 39% of respondents said that institutionalizing the change was especially important in the public sector because current traditional structures and processes oppose new business requirements that changes are trying to address. GOL was raised as an excellent example of a requirement to work

horizontally (across departments) and current accountability structures acting as a constraint. As noted by one respondent:

“If changes aren’t institutionalized, then you are going to continue to have the conflicts between the authority and mandate of the department as they are structured today and the objectives we are trying to achieve with cross-organizational boundaries”.

Respondents felt that institutionalizing transformational change such as GOL will help to find ways to break down the traditional departmental silos with both policy and functional support mechanisms.

Finally, 14% of the sample said that by institutionalizing change, there would be more credibility given to future change initiatives, as people would find change more believable. This was seen as an important element specifically in the public sector where change initiatives often fail and organizational members become cynical.

Only one category of response supporting a lower importance to institutionalizing change was given by more than 10% of the sample. Six people gave answers to this part of the question.

Table 37 - Ensuring Change is Institutionalized Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Happen On Its Own	5	18

N=6

Those respondents (18%) that felt that institutionalizing change was not as important in public sector change management indicated that although following

through with the change in practice was important, it did not require extra effort as it would happen on its own.

Question 19: Research in the Private sector has indicated that transformational leadership is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave transformational leadership a rating of X in terms of importance.

In rating the importance of transformational leadership to change management in the public sector, the sample gave an average rating of 4.3 out of 5 indicating a high importance. This significance was reinforced with 90% (27/30) of participants giving a rating of very important (4) or critical (5) as illustrated in Table 18. Furthermore, respondents gave this factor a mean ranking of 5 placing it second most important out of the 13 key success factors listed on the survey.

Why do you say this?

In the rationale of their ratings, 27 participants gave four categories of response over 10% of the time (see Table 38) supporting a higher importance of transformational leadership.

Table 38 - Transformational Leadership Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Create Vision	22	79
Influence	13	46
Show Viability	8	29
Leadership Commitment	6	21

N=27

The most frequent reason (given by 79% of the sample) for giving transformational leadership a high rating was that transformational leaders are seen to have an exceptional ability to create and communicate the vision of the change to members of the organization. This was seen as essential as it proves the value of the change to people and creates buy-in to the change. The next most common reason for rating transformational leadership high (given by 46% of the sample) was that this type of leader was seen to be able to influence the opinions and attitudes of organizational members and encourage people to become engaged.

Just over a quarter (29%) of respondents also indicated that transformational leadership is consequential in public sector change management to show how the change can be done and promote the viability of a change so people can understand the outcomes.

Finally, transformational leadership was seen as important by 21% of respondents because it shows leadership commitment to a change in a public sector environment with many competing priorities. Respondents felt that by demonstrating commitment in an initiative, people were more likely to take it seriously and become involved.

While no one common response supporting a lower importance of transformational leadership was given by more than 10% of the sample, 2 (7%) participants felt that transformational leadership was not believable in the federal government.

Question 20: Research in the Private sector has indicated that charismatic leadership is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave charismatic leadership a rating of X in terms of importance.

Charismatic leadership was given an average rating of 3.67 out of 5 indicating it to be important to participants but perceived to be less significant to public sector change management than transformational leadership. As seen in Table 18, 60% (18/30) of respondents rated charismatic leadership as very important (4) or critical (5), much lower than the 90% giving the same rating to transformational leadership. The mean rating was 3.67 out of 5. Further, the importance of charismatic leadership was given a mean ranking of 6.57 placing it fifth out of the thirteen key success factors for public sector change management. This is correspondingly lower than the second place ranking given to transformational leadership.

Why do you say this?

In support of their ratings of the importance of charismatic leadership to public sector change management, 21 respondents gave two categories of

response as listed in Table 39. The most common reply (given by 68% of the sample) was that charismatic leadership was important to create the will to change. This was seen as especially relevant in the public sector where respondents described people as often being cynical of change and complacent in their jobs. The other notion, raised by 21% of participants in support of charismatic leadership, was that it was especially critical in the initiation phase of the change to communicate and market a new change idea.

Table 39 - Charismatic Leadership Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Creates Will To Change	19	68
Valuable In Initiation Phase	6	21

N=21

Ten respondents provided only one definitive argument indicating a lower importance of the value of charismatic leadership in the federal government with “other” comments combining to 11% of the sample (see Table 40).

Table 40 - Charismatic Leadership Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Not Believable	9	32
Other	3	11

N=10

Participants indicated (32%) that charismatic leadership was not believable in government and that people in the public sector needed to see

results to be motivated to change and personality alone would not be effective.

A quote to illustrate this point follows:

“Charismatic leadership is something that doesn’t ring right within most government departments. We’re not terribly charismatic; we’re bureaucrats”.

An additional “other” response provided was that charismatic leadership has no impact in government . As one respondent noted:

“In a bureaucracy, charisma gets you nothing. Its got to be somebody who has the potential for driving a project. The person who has the capacity or authority to demand transformation is the most important person”.

Question 21: Research in the Private sector has indicated that instrumental leadership is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave instrumental leadership a rating of X in terms of importance.

Respondents to the survey rated the importance of instrumental leadership an average of 3.77 on a scale of one to five with one being not important and five being critical indicating this factor to be between important (3) and very important (4). As illustrated in Table 18, 67% (20/30) gave a rating of very important (4) or critical (5). The mean ranking was 8.43 placing instrumental leadership as the third least important success factor of all key success factors listed on the survey. This leads to the conclusion that while leadership as a whole is seen as very important to public sector change management, transformational leadership is seen as the most important followed by

charismatic leaving instrumental leadership as the least important type of leadership required to manage change in the public sector.

Why do you say this?

There were three main reasons given by 24 respondents for indicating a higher importance of instrumental leadership as a key success factor in public sector change management (see Table 41).

Table 41 - Instrumental Leadership Rating – Why Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Knowledgeable	20	71
Value in Implementation	6	21
Believable	5	18

N=24

The most frequent response (given by 71% of the sample), was that an instrumental leader was more knowledgeable of the change requirements and would be in a better position to determine the correct vision for the change. One in five respondents also felt that instrumental leadership would be especially valuable in the implementation phase of a project (21%). Furthermore, instrumental leadership was seen to be more believable in government and would therefore create more buy-in to the change as organizational members would be more confident that the change was feasible (18%).

Another pattern regarding leadership emerges from this data.

Respondents said that they felt charismatic leadership was most valuable in the initiation stage of the change while instrumental leadership was most valuable in the implementation phase. Transformational leadership however, was seen to be important in all stages of the change. This is consistent with the fact that transformational leadership was rated more important to successful change than the other two types of leadership.

Two categories of response were given to support a lower importance of instrumental leadership in public sector change management. These are listed in Table 42. Six respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 42 - Instrumental Leadership Rating – Why Not Important

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Details Less Important	4	14
Lacks Influence	4	14

N=6

Both reasons given for a lower importance for instrumental leadership were supplied by 14% of the sample. First, respondents felt that the knowledge and management of project details were less important and could be worked out by officer level staff. Second the sample indicated that instrumental leaders lack the influence required to promote action in the public sector and were therefore less important.

5.5 Summary questions

This section of the interview was administered to provide respondents with the opportunity to submit overall views on change management in the public sector and to collect data to develop a more specific model for public sector change. Respondents were asked how transferable private sector success factors were to the public sector, what other success factors had not yet been discussed, to provide some broader advice on the implementation of GOL and the applicability of GOL as a case study for change management in the public sector. Responses to these questions are given below.

Question 22: To what extent do you think that the critical change success factors that have been observed in the private sector are transferable to the public sector? Why do you say this?

All respondents (100%) said that all private sector success factors were relevant but required a different emphasis in public sector change management.

As one respondent noted:

“You may approach some of them slightly different just by the nature that you are answering a Board of Directors on profit issues versus taxpayer money and government popularity but the core would apply pretty much the same”.

Question 23: Are there any factors that I have not mentioned that you think are important to successful PS change?

As outlined in Table 43, 27 respondents gave a total of ten suggestions for other key success factors for public sector change management with only 1 respondents saying that they did not know of any. All factors listed were considered very important or critical by respondents.

Table 43 - Other Factors For Successful Public Sector Change

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Managing the Political Process	22	79
Managing the Organization	21	75
Inter-jurisdictional Engagement	19	68
Performance Based Incentives	18	64
Citizen Engagement	18	64
Union Engagement	14	50
Acquiring Necessary Resources	12	43
Post Implementation Evaluation	8	29
Private Sector Engagement	7	25
Maintain Momentum	5	18

N=27

The most frequently mentioned (cited by 79% of participants) success factor specific to the public sector was managing the political process. In particular, respondents said that in government, change agents must monitor the parliamentary cycles such as the budget and funding cycles. They noted, for example, that there are specific opportunities within the public sector where funds may be requested whether in their ongoing budget (also referred to as A-base funding) or as part of a Supplementary Estimates process. Should the funds not be available in a department's A-base and committed to a change initiative, the process for requesting these funds is lengthy and rigorous as departments are required to prepare Treasury Board Submissions that go to the

Treasury Board cabinet sub-committee for approval. This process usually takes more than two months and often encounters additional delays while awaiting the required Minister sign-off. Timing within the election cycles must also be monitored as one respondent noted:

“Up to six months before an election cycle, no additional funding is granted unless it is related to ongoing activities”.

Other aspects to managing the political process include planning a change initiative with consideration of the political environment. Specifically, this refers to the inclination of parliamentarians to support a change initiative depending on public support and the recent history of media scrutiny of government operations. Finally, respondents felt that government is much more constrained by legislative factors and therefore must be more aware of their impact on change initiatives and develop viable options depending on political support. This was most frequently raised with the GOL example and privacy where respondents felt that in order to achieve transformational change, data sharing was a requirement and legislative constraints are unclear.

The second most common suggestion (given by 75% of the sample) was related to managing the organization. Respondents said that because the federal government was such a large and dispersed organization, there were many factors to consider in transformational change management such as departmental silos and subcultures. These factors were seen as issues when dealing with transformational change crossing multiple departments where there were requirements to share accountabilities. The current process in the federal

government is based on Ministerial Accountability where each department has its own Minister who becomes accountable for their department's activities. In multi-department initiatives, proven standards or practices for shared accountability are not yet readily available (i.e. "The government needs to change its organizational structure to accommodate a new service delivery model."). Similarly, managing horizontal governance and funding structures and creating partnerships to produce a whole of government culture are seen as key success factors in public sector transformational change.

Inter-jurisdictional engagement was the third most repeated unique success factor for public sector change (indicated by 68% of respondents). Respondents felt that depending on the requirements of the initiative, in those cases where different levels of government were stakeholders, engaging and working with provinces, territories and municipalities was essential for transformational success.

Performance based incentives were indicated by 64% of respondents as a key success factor for public sector change management. Currently, employees receive an increment annually regardless of performance until they reach the top of their level. While executives have "pay at risk", respondents suggested there was really no risk at all as roughly 95% of executives receive this bonus and it is considered by most to be part of their regular salary. In discussing the existing executive pay at risk and employee pay increment structure, one participant described it as not penalizing poor performance but creating complacency.

"The current performance process in government is more a method of preventing change than providing change".

Furthermore, in government, there is no method of rewarding employees with anything substantial. Verbal praise or instant awards are the most available forms of reward. These, however, were seen as insufficient to many respondents as the financial benefits and recognition were negligible. Some suggestions from respondents included managers having the ability to give promotions to deserving employees and more substantial financial rewards and recognition.

Two thirds (64%) of respondents said that citizen engagement was important to successful transformational change in the public service while 50% said the same of union engagement depending on the requirements of the initiative. Citizen engagement was seen to bring the benefits of meeting the needs of citizens and improving the perception of government being secretive. Union engagement was seen as a key success factor in the public sector as transformational change initiatives often involve employee roles and responsibilities changing. These responses were similar to engaging other jurisdictions in the change and emphasizes the perceived importance of engagement of key stakeholders to successful public sector change.

Acquiring the necessary resources was indicated by 43% of the sample as a success factor that was more important to public sector change management. Respondents described both hiring and securing the necessary financial resources as much more difficult and lengthy process than in the private sector and felt those managers responsible for change needed to dedicate substantial efforts in this area. In addition to monitoring the funding cycle and going through

the numerous steps to secure funding, hiring was further characterized as often taking months to complete. Furthermore, many respondents felt that even if the number of resources was sufficient in an organisation, the skill sets on hand were not often those required to implement change. With job descriptions referred to as very 'static' in government, this often requires additional attention from managers to ensure organizational members have the appropriate skills required to complete their tasks.

Post-implementation evaluation was also listed as a key success factor in public sector change management by 29% of the sample. The benefits described by respondents included accountability to departments, building on future changes and providing lessons learned for other initiatives.

Private sector engagement was also noted by 25% of respondents as a key success factor with the caveat that it depended on the requirements of the initiative. Participants felt that where the private sector would be impacted by a change or where they may have lessons or expertise to share, engagement of these stakeholders would be beneficial in increasing the chances of success of the change.

Finally, respondents noted that the public sector is constantly dealing with an increased volume and diversity of change initiatives. These participants (18% of the sample), therefore, felt that maintaining momentum and continuity with a change initiative was a key success factor for transformational change. The benefits described were to ensure some sense of priority and importance to the change and keep interest and participation levels of stakeholders at acceptable

levels, particularly where there are multiple departments with their own individual competing initiatives.

Of these additional success factors identified, many are mentioned in private sector research in some level of detail (i.e. providing incentives, acquiring the necessary resources, stakeholder engagement, post implementation evaluation and maintaining momentum). However, these factors are generally given less importance in the private sector than respondents felt they deserved in the public sector and did not deal with additional public sector constraints. For example, while very large corporations also have similar challenges in managing vast and dispersed organizations, many respondents felt that the public sector had stronger departmental subcultures due to the variety of mandates across the government. Similarly, while stakeholder engagement is widely regarded as a success factor for the private sector, respondents felt that there was a much broader range of stakeholders in the public sector (i.e. citizens, unions, other jurisdictions and the private sector) and that the accountability to those stakeholders was more consequential. Based on the literature review to date, managing the political process seems to be the only distinct success factor to managing change in the public sector as opposed to the private sector.

Question 24: What do you think is the probability that GOL will be successfully implemented by 2005?

In December 1999, the target for successful implementation of GOL (as having access to all government services online) was 2004. Successful implementation has since been redefined as “having the most commonly used services online by 2005”. When respondents were asked what they thought the probability was of meeting this target, however, there was still confusion regarding the parameters of success. In their responses, participants gave a probability in terms of a percentage between 0% and 100%.

One third (29%) (8/28) of the sample indicated that they did not know how to answer. The average probability that success would be achieved (given by the other 20 respondents in the sample) was 51% with a standard deviation of 24.5. The large standard deviation further indicates that respondents had varying opinions of how success would be measured.

(a) Why did you give this probability?

Twenty-two respondents provided rationale why they felt that the change would be successful as well as why they thought the change would fail. There were four main reasons given why respondents thought the change would be successful.

Table 44 - Successful Implementation of GOL by 2005 – Why Successful

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Individual Successes	19	68
Successful by Definition	9	32
Infrastructure	5	18
Silos Being Broken	3	11

N=22

While no respondents felt that GOL would entirely meet all of its goals, (specifically the transformational aspects of horizontal requirements) participants felt that some level of success would be achieved. This can be seen by the responses to this question (see Table 44). The most common response (given by 68% of the sample) was that GOL would have individual program successes that would be able to demonstrate success. An example of an individual success would be the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency service, allowing citizen to file taxes online. The second most frequent response (indicated by 32% of participants) was that regardless of how many programs were actually online, the government would portray the initiative as successful (they would define whatever work that was completed as evidence of success). The third category of support for a positive probability of success (given by 18% of the sample) was related to the infrastructure work being done with the Secure Channel project. Respondents felt that this project would provide the necessary foundation for all other programs requiring secure electronic transmission of data over the Internet. Finally, 11% of the participants argued a higher probability of success for GOL based on the work being done to break down the departmental silos in government. These respondents felt that because of the horizontal nature of

GOL, it was facilitating and often requiring departments to work together on common solutions and that in it-self was making GOL a success.

Twenty-eight respondents gave eight reasons for awarding GOL with a lower probability of success for GOL as outlined in Table 45.

Table 45 - Successful Implementation of GOL by 2005 – Why Failure

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
No Vision	16	57
Lack of Corporate Approach	14	50
Targets Will Not Be Met	13	46
Culture Change	9	32
Legislation Changes	7	25
Lack of Inter-jurisdictional Work	4	14
Lack of Funding	4	14
Other	3	11

N=28

The most common reason (given by 57% of the sample) as to why GOL would not be successful by 2005 was that participants felt that there was no clear vision as to what was trying to be achieved. Respondents said that the vision was not only unclear but that it seemed to be constantly changing without the proper communication to and consultation of stakeholders. Additionally, respondents felt that there was a lot of uncertainty with what would happen to GOL post 2005 when the program funding ended (i.e. "There is a big 'what now?' attitude come 2005").

Fifty percent of respondents said that GOL would likely fail due to the lack of a corporate approach service delivery and program implementation and that things were still too focused in departmental silos. The next most frequent

category of response (given by 46% of the sample) was simply that GOL targets would not be met by 2005 and therefore the initiative would not be successful. These respondents qualified their response by saying that while the initiative may not reach success in the given time period, that targets could eventually be reached as the program evolved.

The fourth most common response (given by 32% of the sample) was related to culture change. This group of respondents said that the GOL initiative required horizontal (cross-departmental) efforts and for the organization to think corporately as opposed to within their individual departments. In their opinion, this change in the norms, beliefs and cultural was a longer-term effort and could not be expected to occur at an adequate level to reach GOL targets. As one respondent noted:

“With the federal government, we form partnerships when the opportunity is there and some departments are very good at maintaining them but if you are forced into a partnership just to get the money, its not going to last.”

Legislation changes required to allow success were also indicated by 25% of the sample as a barrier to reaching GOL targets. The primary example of such legislation was related to privacy allowing multiple departments to share data between related programs enabling improved service delivery and service transformation. The sixth most frequent rationale for giving a lower probability of GOL success by 2005 (given by 14% of the participants) was that there was a lack of inter-jurisdictional work. Respondents noted that many citizen and business services were actually provided at the provincial/territorial and municipal levels and that for GOL to be truly citizen centric, the level of

collaboration with other jurisdictions should be intensified. A lack of funding was also indicated by 14% of the sample as a hindrance to reaching GOL targets. Finally, 11% of the respondents gave “other” reasons for providing a lower probability that GOL will be successfully implemented by 2005. Examples of “other” responses were that the lack of practiced standards were an obstacle in achieving GOL goals (including horizontal service delivery) and that competing pressures on departments would take away the priority of GOL. Examples of standards included both business and technical architecture and information management standards.

(b) How could they increase the probability that the change would be successful?

When asked for suggestions as to how the probability of success could be increased, 25 respondents had many suggestions as listed in Table 46. Only 3 (7%) respondents said that they did not know.

Table 46 - Increasing Chance of Successful Implementation of GOL

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Horizontal Approach	11	39
Increased Funding	11	39
Clear Vision Communicated	9	32
Resolve Legislative Issues	7	25
Incentives	5	18
Inter-jurisdictional Work	4	14
Create Priority	4	14
Focus on Key Priorities	3	11
Organizational Structures	3	11
Sustainability Plan	3	11
Other	7	25

N=25

The two most common suggestions (given by 39% of the sample) were that the government needed to create a more horizontal approach to service transformation and increase funding. With respect to creating a more horizontal approach, participants suggested that the government focus more on cross-departmental initiatives that promotes a culture of horizontal thinking, break departmental silos and allow longer-term risk taking and flexibility in a new online environment while also providing complete service to Canadians. With respect to funding, respondents indicated that funding be rationalized and increased making it more strategic to achieve GOL targets. They also suggested that the government give multi-year funding (i.e. "Treasury Board needs to change their funding to match a horizontal strategy (i.e. multiyear) but they haven't come up with a plan yet"). The third most common suggestion (given by 32% of the sample) was that a clear vision be communicated to stakeholders illustrating the requirements for GOL, roles and responsibilities and measurable targets. The resolution of the previously mentioned legislative issues (i.e. privacy) was

recommended by 25% of the participants and providing substantial incentives for good performance and consequences for poor performance was suggested by 18% of the sample. Increasing inter-jurisdictional work with provinces, territories and municipalities as well as creating a sense of priority at all levels of the organization for the GOL initiative were both suggested by 14% of the sample. A proposition for creating priority at the political level was to link GOL to the global economy and societal factors.

Additionally, 11% of respondents felt that the federal government should focus on key priorities for the GOL initiative rather than trying to do everything with few resources. Another 11% of the sample felt that the government needs to try to change its organizational structures to allow for collaboration across programs (although this was admittedly out of the scope of the GOL realm). Finally, 11% of respondents advised that GOL create a sustainability plan to show the viability of GOL past 2005 when the funding envelope is closed. Examples of “other” recommendations (given by 25% of respondents) were harmonizing policies and streamlining processes such as human resources, funding and procurement.

Question 25: What one piece of advice would you give the Clerk of the Privy Council with respect to the implementation of GOL?

Respondents gave the Clerk six main pieces of advice regarding the implementation of GOL (see Table 47). Although the question asked for only one

piece of advice, many respondents provided multiple answers. The response rate of the question was 91% (26/28) with only 7% (2/28) saying that they did not know.

Table 47 - Advice To Clerk of Privy Council

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Sustainability	6	21
Maintain Momentum	5	18
Championship	5	18
Vision	5	18
Inter-jurisdictional Focus	4	14
Allow Buy-In	3	11
Other	12	43

N=26

Participants most often said (21% of the sample) that the Clerk should focus on creating a sustainability plan for GOL with realistic targets past 2005.

Eighteen percent of the respondents recommended that the Clerk:

1. Maintain momentum: Interviewees said that the Clerk should renew the GOL mandate allowing the additional time required to achieve the horizontal benefits as outlined in the GOL objectives to ensure people don't give up too soon. As one respondent said:

"We have a tendency in government to drift. Once we've started something we get it going, we seem to be doing ok and we get complacent";

2. Provide more championship at the senior levels possibly by tying GOL performance to senior executive pay;

3. Ensure a clear and common understanding of the vision amongst all departments.

Increasing the inter-jurisdictional focus was recommended by 14% of respondents while 11% said that the Clerk should not make GOL mandatory but allow people to buy in based on the benefits and a collective vision of feasible goals.

Examples of “other” recommendations provided by 43% of the sample were to do more citizen focus testing of what the GOL vision should look like, work towards securing more GOL funding and to define GOL in a broader service agenda linking it to the political agenda.

Question 26: Do you think GOL makes a good case study for change management in the federal government?

This final question in the interview was asked to determine if GOL was an appropriate case study for change management in the federal government or if it was a unique case where learnings could not be generalized to future transformational change initiatives. The response rate to the question was 82% (23/28) with 18% (5/28) saying that they did not know. As illustrated in Table 48, three quarters of respondents felt that GOL was an appropriate case study with only 7% feeling that it was not applicable to other initiatives.

Table 48 - GOL A Good Case Study for Change Management

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	21	75
No	2	7
Don't Know	5	18

N=23

In support of their responses as to whether GOL makes a good case study for change management in the federal public sector, participants were asked how GOL was the same as other transformational changes in government as well as how it was different.

(a) How is it the same as other changes implemented in government?

Twenty-two respondents provided seven ways in which GOL is similar to other changes in government (see Table 49).

The most common response (given by 50% of respondents) was that the lessons learned in general would be beneficial for future changes. Some respondents were more specific in describing where they thought experience would benefit the government's understanding in key areas of concern. These areas are identified in the table (i.e. developing a whole of government approach to change initiatives, creating a culture more accepting of change, forming partnerships both across departments and with other stakeholders, communicating more clearly and consistently, resolving legislative and policy barriers and better engaging senior management in change initiatives).

Table 49 - How GOL is the same as other change initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Lessons Learned	14	50
Whole of Government Approach	13	46
Culture	12	43
Partnerships	10	36
Communication	5	18
Legislation / Policy	4	14
Senior Management Engagement	3	11
Other	3	11

N=22

(b) How is it different from other changes implemented in government?

Table 50 outlines how participants saw GOL as unique and possibly not applicable to other transformational changes in the federal government. Nine respondents provided answers to this part of the question.

Table 50 - How GOL is different from other change initiatives

Response:	Frequency	Percentage
Technology	5	18
Citizen Focused	3	11
Other	6	21

N=9

There were two main categories of response with additional “other” comments provided by 21% of the sample. The most common difference (given by 18% of respondents) was that they felt GOL was largely a technology change whereas most other government transformational change initiatives are not related to technology. As well, the citizen focus of the GOL change was seen by

11% of respondents as being distinct to GOL as most other changes have been internal to the organization (i.e. human resources, operational). Differences grouped into the “other” category were that GOL was not specific to just one program but potentially spanned all government programs, a larger scale change than any other government had done before and was externally driven both internationally and from the private sector. Overall, however, it would appear that most people see the lessons learned from GOL as applicable to other government change initiatives.

6 Conclusions

This section will summarize the data collected regarding change management in the public sector. In particular it will provide analysis on the management of change in the public sector and how the GOL initiative is currently perceived with respect to its change management capabilities. This will both answer the research questions and address the thesis objectives. Next, an exploratory model of key success factors for transformational change management in the public sector will be presented. Factors will be ordered by importance based on the findings from the survey and interviews. Following this, the strengths, limitations and benefits of the research will be noted and the state of GOL will be discussed. Finally, suggestions for further research will be proposed.

6.1 *Change Management In The Public Sector*

The analysis provided in this section is based on the responses to the questions asked in the *General Questions* and *Change Management In The Federal Government* sections of the interview (see Appendix C).

As suspected, the public sector was seen to differ from the private sector in a number of key ways that may mean the learnings on how to manage change in the private sector will not entirely apply to the public sector. Respondents portrayed the public sector as being process oriented, bureaucratic, hierarchical

and because of its monopolistic quality, not required to be competitive. The private sector on the other hand was described as competitive and profit oriented while having more organizational flexibility and tolerance for change.

The way change is managed in the two sectors was also considered to be significantly different. Change management in the public sector was perceived to be much slower with more constraints and stakeholders than in the private sector. Further, due to the varied goals, diversity of services, organizational overhead and the political agenda, change management was observed to be much more difficult in the public sector.

The federal public sector was not seen to be good at transformative change at either the department or corporate level. When asked for an example of a successful transformational change initiative in the federal government, GOL was the only example offered by over 10% of the sample (it was identified by 21% of the sample). One cannot place a lot of credence in this finding, however as the focus of the study (GOL) may have predisposed participants to identify this initiative. Furthermore, since the GOL initiative is not yet finished, it is hard to determine at this point in time if it is successful. The same proportion of respondents (21%) could not think of any successful transformational change initiatives. Where respondents did identify a successful transformational public sector change, the main reasons for success were that the initiative demonstrated value, there was no alternative and/or there was strong leadership. Unsuccessful transformational public sector change initiatives were identified by 89% of the sample with only 11% not able to think of one. The

primary perceived reasons given for failure were poor vision, lack of buy-in and poor planning.

As a whole, respondents gave the federal government a grade of D (58%) with respect to their change management abilities. The main barriers identified in managing change in government were its complex organizational structure, complacency among organizational members and poor (or no) change management practices. To improve this grade, respondents most often suggested changing the organizational structure (or being more innovative to overcome the restraints imposed by the structure), providing more substantial incentives for superior performance and better engagement of senior management.

Individually, departments graded their change management performance as C (64%). Respondents indicated departmental strengths to be a change in the culture within their department moving more towards horizontal management, good change management practices and standards and improved responsiveness to change. Areas of concern in departments were the constraints imposed by traditional processes and the associated culture, poor communication and the department still acting in its own silo as opposed to taking a horizontal approach. It is apparent from the responses to this section that departments fall along a broad spectrum with respect to the extent to which their culture supports change and horizontal thinking. Respondents most often suggested visioning, communication, incentives and senior management engagement to improve their grade. Furthermore, while the government does

not grade itself very well on their past change initiatives success or their ability to manage change, they were readily able to identify their strengths and weaknesses and have a growing understanding of the requirements for successful public sector change management.

6.2 *The State of Government Online*

This section will provide a summary of the data collected regarding the perceived state of GOL including how participants in the study graded GOL's success, the ability of the government to manage the change of GOL, areas of concern and suggestions for improvement.

Participants were asked to grade the federal government's and their department's ability to manage the change of GOL. The sample gave an average grade of 62% to the federal government as a whole with a standard deviation of 19.2. While the standard deviation shows a wide dispersion of the grades assigned, overall, this grade was similar to the federal government's ability to manage change in general where the sample gave an average grade of 58%. The main strengths of the GOL change management noted by respondents were that the Treasury Board Secretariat, as the central agency managing the initiative, demonstrated the value of the change to get buy-in, engaged stakeholders (departments), created the necessary support structures to manage the initiatives (i.e. committees) and provided strong leadership. The major areas of concern mentioned by study participants were poor communication, not enough horizontal focus, an unclear vision, a lack of funding

and a funding process that was not transparent or strategic. Finally, it was suggested by the sample that the federal government improve through more clear and consistent communication, a common understanding of the vision by all stakeholders, increased and more strategic funding, and more support for partnerships both federally and inter-jurisdictionally.

At the departmental level, participants graded their ability to manage the change of GOL at 64%, the same grade as they gave themselves for managing change in general. The main strengths identified in managing the change of GOL at the departmental level were that there is good collaboration (within the department), a commonly understood vision (within the department) and that the department often has experience with GOL. Areas of concern within departments were identified as a lack of senior management engagement, lack of resources, poor communication and low support for partnerships. For departments to improve, respondents suggested more focus on senior management engagement, increased funding, more effort to get buy-in from stakeholders and more clear and consistent communication.

6.3 A Model For Successful Change Management In The Public Sector

As mentioned in *Question 22* of the *Discussion of Results*, all key success factors derived from private sector research were seen as essential for public sector change management. However many respondents felt that the level of importance in the public sector would be different than that given in the private sector. As part of the initial survey completed by research participants (see

Appendix B), respondents were asked to rate each of the key success factors provided from private sector research in their order of importance in the public sector using GOL as a case study. An estimated order of importance was calculated by using the mean ratings for each success factor with the lowest score being the highest priority. Table 51 summarizes the results from this estimated ranking.

Table 51 - Key Success Factor Importance In The Public Sector

Ranking:	Success Factor:	Mean Score:
1	Creating a clear picture of the GOL future state/vision	4.54
2	Demonstrating the required <i>transformational leadership</i> to implement the change	5
3	Communicating GOL information to executives	5.04
4	Communicating GOL information to middle managers	6.46
5	Demonstrating the required <i>charismatic leadership</i> priorities to implement the change	6.57
6	Empowering executives in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL	6.61
7	Empowering middle managers in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL	6.86
8	Ensuring changes resulting from GOL are institutionalized (i.e. become part of the new norms in the organization)	7.61
9	Using short term, smaller pilots to motivate and encourage change (i.e. short-term wins)	8.04
10	Communicating GOL information to employees	8.25
11	Demonstrating the required <i>instrumental leadership</i> to implement the change	8.43
12	Creating a sense of urgency around the change	8.46
13	Empowering employees in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL	9.11

Based on the ranking above, there appears to be four groups of public sector change success factors. The first grouping, with mean rankings of 5.04 or higher (i.e. perceived as most important) includes creating a clear picture of the future state, demonstrating transformational leadership and communicating to

executives. These factors are also very important to successful change management in the private sector. It is interesting and informative to note that while these factors were seen to be critical to public sector change, they are also the areas that research participants identified as most problematic in the public sector (i.e. poor vision and lack of buy-in). Furthermore, respondents most often suggested these as areas for improvement in the public sector (i.e. visioning, communication and senior management engagement). In addition, these areas may have received greater emphasis due to their specific perceived problems within the context of GOL. For example, many respondents felt that the GOL vision was unclear in its objectives or its roles and responsibilities for departments.

The second grouping of factors, with mean rankings between 6.46 and 6.86 includes communicating to middle managers, charismatic leadership, empowering executives and empowering middle managers. While these mean rankings indicate a high level of perceived importance to successful change in the public sector (similar to the private sector), they are seen to be slightly less important than those in group one.

The third grouping of key success factors includes those with mean rankings between 7.61 and 8.04 (institutionalizing change and using short-term smaller pilots). While these are again slightly less important than those in groups one and two, their rankings would still indicate that they have an importance similar to that in the private sector.

Finally, the fourth group includes those factors with a mean ranking between 8.25 and 9.11 indicating the least perceived importance in the public sector. Group four factors include communication to employees, instrumental leadership, creating a sense of urgency and empowering employees. While these factors are seen to be highly important in the private sector, the public sector gives them much less emphasis. This difference in perceived importance of involving employees in the change in the public sector may help explain why the public sector has more difficulty in change management than the private sector.

The results with respect to the leadership of public sector change are very important. The findings suggest that public sector employees assign different levels of importance to the different types of leaders. Charismatic leadership was felt to be most useful in the initiation stage of an initiative whereas instrumental leadership was seen as most important in the implementation phase. Transformational leadership was felt to be of high importance throughout a change initiative in the public sector.

There are also trends in the importance of communication and empowerment in the research. Respondents felt that these two factors varied in their importance depending on what level of the organization was being discussed. Specifically, communication and empowerment were seen as most important at the executive level with a declining importance for middle managers and lowest importance at the employee level. These findings suggest that within

the public sector employees perceive that change management in the public sector is top-down.

In addition to the success factors from the private sector research used as a baseline for the public sector, other success factors were identified by the sample as being critical to public sector change (see *Section 5, Question 23*). Supplementary success factors identified by participants are (listed in their order of response frequency):

- Managing the Political Process
- Managing the Organization
- Inter-jurisdictional Engagement
- Performance Based Incentives
- Citizen Engagement
- Union Engagement
- Acquiring Necessary Resources
- Post Implementation Evaluation
- Private Sector Engagement
- Maintain Momentum

While all success factors were noted as very important or critical by respondents, managing the political process and managing the organization seem to be the most critical as they were noted by 79% and 75% of the sample respectively (see Table 43). Furthermore, managing the political process and to some degree, managing the organization are the only distinct or new success factors for the public sector (not mentioned in private sector research).

Therefore, a proposed exploratory model for successful change management for the public sector is illustrated in Figure 12.

Figure 12 - An Exploratory Model for Change Management in the Public Sector

Given the findings of the research, recommendations for change management in the public sector are suggested. Before attempting transformational change:

- An assessment of the political environment / mandate, budget / funding cycles and legislative aspects should be contrasted with the initiatives

requirements for success to ensure the political process supports success or plan for circumstances where it is a barrier.

- Where change requires cross-departmental efforts, departmental subcultures should be acknowledged and governance and funding structures should be considered to ensure buy-in across ministries despite ministerial accountability.
- Change management success factors noted as important in this research study should be given special consideration to ensure lessons learned are utilized in future initiatives. For example, creating a clear picture of the future state (vision) which is shared and consistent across all stakeholders should be one of the first change management activities to be conducted. This would ensure organizational members understand how the change will impact the organization, how it will benefit the organization and where they will fit into the new model. Furthermore, as change in the public sector has been suggested to be top-down, leadership (especially transformational) of the change as well as communication to and empowerment of the executive level is critical. Finally, communication, especially at the executive level as well as the middle manager level is seen to be a key success factor to ensure information about the change begins to disperse throughout the organization.
- Change management success factors noted as least important in this research should also be considered, as they may be a defining factor in previous difficulties with change management. For example, communication to and empowerment of employees, creating a sense of urgency and

instrumental leadership were seen as least important in this study. The lack of emphasis within the public sector placed on these key success factors may be a contributor to the failure of past change initiatives as according to private sector research, these elements are very important to successful change management.

- Finally, additional generic success factors should also be noted when planning change management strategies. For example, determining what type of incentives will provide motivation to achieve the change goals and how change agents can maintain momentum within a change initiative given competing priorities, planning for acquiring the necessary resources as well as creating an engagement strategy for stakeholders.

6.4 Strengths and Limitations of the Research

6.4.1 Strengths

The federal government has begun one of the largest and most transformative changes they have ever faced and they are moving along with no proven methodology for managing the change. Although proven change management success factors specific to managing horizontal initiatives in government are nebulous, a strength of this research is that it is based on change management research in the private sector, which is well grounded. The research design is also strengthened in the fact that the research is very

focused and there was access to key decision makers in government. Plus, the in-depth interview approach allowed the exploration of issues associated with change while the survey data provided quantitative research. Finally, the fact that GOL is a large transformative change provides an excellent opportunity to study change management in the federal government.

6.4.2 Limitations

Although care was taken to create a research design that would provide direct evidence for decision making, there are some identifiable limitations. One notable limitation was that the change was still occurring and its success could not yet be determined. Furthermore, the only departments interviewed were those identified in the TBS GOL mandate as part of the 29 key departments to bring services online first. Therefore, although the federal government is comprised of over 100 departments and agencies, smaller departments not yet involved in the corporate initiative were also not included in this study. Also, due to time and scope restraints, there was a limited number of respondents successfully solicited (28 respondents across all departments) and these interviews were conducted primarily with government officials in the National Capital Region (NCR) possibly creating a regional bias. While two respondents were located outside of the NCR, their interviews were carried out by telephone as opposed to in-person.

In addition, the focus of this research has been the opinions of those working in the public sector which may or may not actually reflect what is going on in the organization and the findings may more accurately reflect people's

frustrations with the public sector rather than attitudes towards change. Finally, as the researcher for this thesis was also an employee of the federal government working on the GOL initiative, interpretations of participant responses may have been coloured.

6.5 *Benefits of the Research*

The introduction of Government Online (GOL) has initiated a new way of operating and thinking in the public sector. GOL has given government at all levels the opportunity to reexamine how their services are delivered, what is most efficient for government and how services to the public and businesses can be improved. A major part of this thinking is the move to horizontal, cross-departmental initiatives where change becomes transformative. This research should provide a starting point in developing a proven model of change management for public sector for future transformational and horizontal change initiatives. Further, government can benefit from this research in enhancing their understanding of change management in as well as in developing educational programs for managers in government. The Canadian federal government will benefit from the research in determining the state of GOL, what their strengths have been, where there are concerns within departments and what departments feel are priorities for the initiative (see Section 6.3).

The research should also benefit academics in organizational development and public administration in understanding the challenges to

transformational change and thoughts on management techniques to succeed in the public sector.

6.6 *Suggestions For Further Research*

Although GOL was considered an excellent case study due to its transformative nature, one limitation on the study was that the GOL due date had not yet been reached. Therefore, this study could be redone post 2005 when the outcomes of GOL would be more evident and change management success factors may be more easily measured against the successes and failures of GOL.

Prior to preparing this research, no other empirical study specific to transformational change management in the Canadian Federal Government could be found in the literature. This study was therefore considered exploratory, as there was no existing model to test. Further research could take the exploratory model proposed in Section 6.1 and test it on future initiatives to determine its applicability on a wider scale.

In future research, one could also explore the importance of the sequencing of success factors in a change initiative as it has been stated in private sector research that the order in which change management success factors are executed is a key component in achieving change success. Additionally, future studies of change management in the public sector may also want to employ a more extensive set of success factors in the research. Furthermore, as the sample of respondents was limited to managers and

executives in this study, future research could also incorporate the opinions of organizational members at the front-line employee level. Finally, future research may also want to address more directly whether or not there are differences between managing change in the public sector than in the private sector or if these differences are simply perceived by those in public sector organizations.

7 Bibliography

- Altshuler, A. n.d. "Ten Lessons from Innovation." Innovation in American Government. <http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/10less.htm>
- Armenakis, A. and Harris, S. and Mossholder, K. 2000. Creating Readiness for Organizational Change, in French, Bell and Zawacki (eds), Organizational Development and Transformation, Toronto: McGraw Hill 327-341
- Armenakis, Achilles A. and Bedeian, Arthur G. 1999. *Organizational change: A Review of Theory and Research in the 1990's*. Journal of Management. 25, (3): 293-315.
- Barzelay, Michael. 1992. Breaking through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Beer, M., Eisenstat, R and Spector, B. 1990. *Why Change Programs Don't Produce Change*, Harvard Business Review, Nov. 158-66
- Beer, M. and Nohria, N. 2000. *Cracking the Code of Change*, Harvard Business Review, May-June 133-141
- Borins, Sandford. 2001. Leadership and Innovation in the Public Sector. University of Toronto
- Bozeman, Barry. 1987. All Organizations are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Chin, R. and Benne, K. 2000. *General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems*, In French, Bell and Zawacki (eds), Organizational Development and Transformation, Toronto: McGraw Hill, 43-63
- Cooper, D., Schindler P., 1998. Business Research Methods, New York: Irwin McGraw
- Cummings, T. and Worley, C. 1997. Organizational Development and Change 7th Edition. Cincinnati: South-West College Publishing
- Cummings, Thomas G. and Huse, E. F. 1989. Organisation Development and Change (4th edition). New York: West Publishing
- Dawes, S. et al. 2000. Four Realities of IT Innovation in Government. New York: Center for Technology in Government

- Denton, D. Keith. 1991. Horizontal Management: Beyond Total Customer Satisfaction. New York: Macmillan Inc.
- Deputy Minister Task Forces. 1996. Final Reports. Ottawa: Privy Council Office
- Dwivedi, O.P. and Gow, J. 1999. From Bureaucracy to Public Management: The Administrative Culture of the Government of Canada, Toronto: Broadview Press
- Floyd, S. and Woodridge, B. 1994. *Dinosaurs or Dynamos? Recognizing Middle Management's Strategic Role*, Academy of Management Executive, 9, (4), 47-57
- Fredrickson, George H. and Johnston, Jocelyn M., editors. 1999. Public Management Reform and Innovation – Research, Theory and Application. Alabama: University of Alabama Press
- Gersick, C. 1991. *Revolutionary change Theories: A Multilevel Exploration of the Punctuated Equilibrium Paradigm*, Academy of Management Review, 16, (1), 10-36
- Glor, Elenor D. 2001. *Key Factors Influencing Innovation In Government*. Innovation Journal:
http://www.innovation.cc/peer_reviewed/factors_of_innovation.htm
- Halachmi, Arie, and Bouckaert, Geert, (eds), 1995. The Enduring Challenges in Public Management, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Hall, Donald. 2002. You've Got to Conform to Create: The Implications of Corporate Culture on Innovation in the Canadian Federal Public Service. Ottawa: Innovation in Government Conference
- Hall, G., Rosenthal, J. and Wade, J. 1993. *How to make Reengineering Really Work*, Harvard Business Review, 71, (12) 119-131
- Hammer, M. 1990. *Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate*, Harvard Business Review, July-Aug, 104-122.
- Harper, S. 1998. *Leading Organizational Change in the 21st Century*, Industrial Management, May-June, 25-31
- Harvey, D. and Brown, D. 1996. *Organization Transformation: Strategy Interventions*, in An Experiential Approach to Organizational Development, Harvey and Brosn (eds), 405-429
- Heckscher, Charles and Donnellon, Anne (eds). 1994. The Post-Bureaucratic Organisation: New Perspectives on Organizational Change. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Heeks, Richard. 1999. Reinventing Government in the Information Age. London: Routledge

Hopkins, Mark and Couture, Chantal and Moore, Elizabeth. 2001. Moving from the Heroic to the Everyday: Lessons Learned from Leading Horizontal Projects. Ottawa: Canadian Center for Management Development.

Ingstrup, Ole. 1995. Reengineering In The Public Service: Promise or Peril. Ottawa: Canadian Center for Management Development.

Ingstrup, Ole. 1995. Public Service Renewal: From Means To Ends. Ottawa: Canadian Center for Management Development.

Ingstrup, Ole. 1998. The Three Pillars of Public Management: Secrets of Sustained Success. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Jones, Daniel Stedman and Crowe, Ben. 2001. Transformation not Automation: The e-government challenge, London: Demos

Kanter, R. 1983. *The Architecture of Culture and Strategy Change*, from The Change Masters, New York: Simon & Schuster, 278-306

Kanter, R. 1985. *Managing the Human Side of Change*, Management Review, 74, (6), 52-56

Katzer, J., Cook, K. and Crouch, W. 1978. Evaluating Information: A Guide for Users of Social Science Research, Philippines: Addison-Wesley

Kernaghan, K. and Siegel, D. 1999. Public Administration in Canada: 4th Edition. Scarborough: ITP Canada

Kettl, Donald F. 1995. Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Government Reform. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Kettl, Donald F. 2000. The Global Public Management Revolution: A Report On The Transformation of Governance, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press

Kiernan, M. 1993. *The New Strategic Architecture: Learning to Compete in the 21st Century*, Academy of Management Executive, 7 7-21

Kotter, J. 1995. *Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail*. Harvard Business Review, 73. (2): 59-67

Kotter, J. and Schlesinger, L. 1979. *Choosing Strategies for Change*, Harvard Business Review, March, 1979

Lawrence, P. 1969. *How to Deal with Resistance to Change*, Harvard Business Review, 46, (1) 4-13

Lewin, K. 1951. *Field Theory in social Science*. New York: Harper and Row.

Light, Paul. 1998. Sustaining Innovation: Creating Non –Profit and Government Organizations that Innovate Naturally. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Longford, Graham. 2002. Rethinking E-Government: Dilemmas of Public Service, Citizenship and Democracy in the Digital Age. Ottawa: Innovation in Government Conference

Lowe, Graham. 2001. Employer of Choice? Workplace Innovation in Government: A Synthesis Report. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks

Markus, M. Lynne and Benjamin, Robert I., "The Magic Bullet Theory in IT-Enabled Transformation", *Sloan Management Review*, Winter 1997, pp. 55-68.

McKevitt, David and Lawton, Alan. 1994. Public Sector Management: Theory, Critique & Practice, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Medina, William, A. 1982. *Changing Bureaucracies: Understanding the Organization Before Selecting the Approach*, New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Meyer, Marshall. 1979. Change In Public Bureaucracies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mintzberg, Henry. 1973. The Nature of Managerial Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Mitroll, I., Mason, R. and Pearson, C. 1994. *Radical Surgery: What will Tomorrow's Organizations Look Like*, Academy of Management Executive, 9 (2), 11-21

Nadler D. and Tushman, M. 1990. Beyond the Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change, *California Management Review*, 32 (2), 77-97

Nadler, D. and Tushman, M. 1995. *Types of Organizational Change: From Incremental Improvement to Discontinuous Transformation* in D. Nadler, R. Shw, A. Walton & Associates, Discontinuous Change. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass.

Nutt, P and Backoff, R. 2000. *Facilitating Transformational Change*, French, Bell and Zawacki (eds), *Organizational Development and Transformation*, Toronto: McGraw Hill, 350-363

Nutt, P and Backoff, R. 1995. *The Dance of What and How: Creating and Sustaining Organizational Transformation*, Halachmi, Arie, and Bouckaert, Geert,

(eds), The Enduring Challenges in Public Management, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Osbourne, David and Gaebler, Ted. 1993. Reinventing Government – How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. New York: Plume

Osbourne, David and Plastrik, Peter. 2000. The Reinventors Fieldbook – Tools for Transforming Your Government. New York: Jossey-Bass

Ostroff, Frank. 1999. The Horizontal Organisation: What the Organisation of the Future Looks Like and How It Delivers Value to Customers. New York: Oxford University Press.

Patton, M. 1987. How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation, Thousand Oaks: Sage

Patton, M. 1990. Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage

Peters, Guy. 1998. Managing Horizontal Government. Ottawa: Canadian Center for Management Development.

Pollitt, Christopher. 1995. Management Techniques for the Public Sector, Ottawa: Canadian Center for Management Development.

Porras, J. and Hoffer, S. 1996. *Common Behavior Changes in Successful Organization Efforts*, Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22, (4), 477-494

Recardo, R. 1995. *Overcoming Resistance to Change*, National Productivity Review, 14, 28-39

Reger, R. Mullane, J, Gustafson, L. and DeMarie, S. 1994. *Creating Earthquakes to Change Organizational Mindsets*, Academy of Management Executive, 8, 4, 31-46

Sanders, Ronald, P. 1994. *Reinventing the Senior Executive Service In New Paradigms for Government: Issues for the Changing Public Service*. Ed. by Patricia W. Ingraham, Barbara S. Ronzek & Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Schein, E. 1990. *Organizational Culture*. American Psychologist, 45, (2), p.109

Schein, E. 2000. *Organizational Culture*, In French, Bell and Zawacki, (eds) Organizational Development and Transformation, Toronto: McGraw Hill, 127-141

Schein, Edgar H. 1985. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seidman, Harold. 1993. *Reinventing the Wheel, Not Government*, Government Executive, 25, no. 4, April.

Shafritz, J. and Ott, S. 1996. Classics of Organisation Theory, Orlando: Harcourt Brace & Company

Shaw, Robert B. and Maletz, Mark C. 1995. *Business processes: Embracing the Logic an Limits of Reengineering* in D. Nadler, R. Shaw, A. Walton & Associates, Discontinuous Change. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass.

Spector, Bert A. 1989. *From Bogged Down to Fired Up Inspiring Organiztional Change*, Sloan Management Review, 30, (4) 29-34

Stake, R. 1995. The Art of Case Study Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stewart, Debra, W and Garson, G. David. 1983. Organizational Behavior and Public Management. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.

Taylor, James, R. and Van Every, Elizabeth, J.. 1993. The Vulnerable Fortress: Bureaucratic Organization and Management in the Information Age, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Teofilovic, Nada. 2001. The Reality of Innovation in Government. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada

Thomas, Paul G., D'Ombrain, Nicholas, Borins, Sandford F., Wolf, David, 2000. Change, Governance and Public Management: Alternative Service Delivery and Information Technology. Ottawa: Public Policy Forum

Treasury Board. 1994. Blueprint for Renewing Government Services Using Information Technology: Discussion Paper. Ottawa: Treasury Board of Canada

Treasury Board. 1994. The People Side of Re-engineering: A companion document to the Blueprint for Renewing Government Services Using Information Technology. Discussion Paper. Ottawa: Treasury Board of Canada

Tushman, M. and O'Reilly, C. 1996. *Ambidextrous Organizations: Managing Evolutionary and Revolutionary Change*, California Management Review, 36, (4), 8-30

Yin, R. 1994. Case Study Research, 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Zawacki, Robert, A. and Warrick, D.D. 1976. Organizational Development: Managing Change in the Public Sector, Chicago: International Personnel Management Association.

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix A – Initial Contact Email

Subject: Request for Participation In Research on Change Management in the Federal Government: A Case Study on Government Online (GOL)

Dear ...,

Organizations are continually searching for ways to improve service delivery to their clients, improve internal operations and function more effectively. Often, however, such initiatives depend on how changes are introduced and managed. The desire to successfully manage change has spawned a body of research and literature, which focuses on interventions associated with successful change. Managing change, however, differs across situations and what is feasible for some organizations may not be practical for others. Most research in the field of change management has taken place in the private sector where the changes were motivated by a desire to help businesses be more competitive, reduce costs and survive. In the public sector though, organizational characteristics and goals are different and creating change can be a much more ominous task.

I am writing to request your participation in a research study about Change Management in the Canadian Federal Government using GOL as a case study. This exploratory study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree from Carleton University, under the direction of Dr. Linda Duxbury.

The objective of the research is to understand how change management success factors and practices which have been primarily tested and implemented in the private sector, are being utilized in a public sector organization and to identify a more specific set of change management success factors for public sector organizations.

The research consists of two stages including a survey, which will be sent shortly through the mail, and personal interviews. In the first stage we would like you to fill out the survey, which asks about your opinions regarding the importance of specific change management success factors in the federal government and more specifically their importance in successfully implementing GOL. In the second stage, I will conduct an interview. In order to facilitate the interview, it would be appreciated if you would return the completed survey at the interview. During the interview, I will be focusing on your experience with change management in the federal government and your opinions on the applicability of specific change management success factors in the federal government. The survey and interview framework have been pre-tested. In the pretest, the survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete and the interview was approximately 1 to 1.5 hours in length. **Please be ensured that your responses will be held**

Questionnaire:

When answering questions (k), (l) and (m), please note the following definitions:

Transformational leadership – influences major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of people within an organization.

Charismatic Leadership – shows a compelling vision with a sense of purpose, has the ability to communicate and focus in pursuit of the vision.

Instrumental Leadership - focuses on process issues and guides towards established goals.

- 1) How would you rate the importance of each of these factors with respect to the federal government's ability to manage a transformational change initiative such as GOL?

Change Management Success Factor:		Rating Scale				
		Not important (1)	Slightly Important (2)	Important (3)	Very Important (4)	Critical (5)
a)	Creating a sense of urgency around the change?					
b)	Creating a clear picture of the GOL future state?					
c)	Communicating GOL information to executives?					
d)	Communicating GOL information to middle managers?					
e)	Communicating GOL information to employees?					
f)	Empowering executives in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?					
g)	Empowering middle managers in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?					
h)	Empowering employees in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?					
i)	Using short term, smaller pilots to motivate and encourage change (i.e. short-term wins)?					
j)	Ensuring changes resulting from GOL are institutionalized (i.e. become part of the new norms in the organization)?					
k)	Demonstrating the required <i>transformational leadership</i> to implement the change?					
l)	Demonstrating the required <i>charismatic leadership</i> priorities to implement the change?					
m)	Demonstrating the required <i>instrumental leadership</i> to implement the change?					

- 2) Please number each of the success factors from 1-13 in their order of importance (1 being the most important) with respect to the federal government's ability to successfully implement a change such as GOL.

Change Management Success Factor:		Rank (from 1 – 13)
1)	Creating a sense of urgency around the change?	
2)	Creating a clear picture of the GOL vision and goals?	
3)	Engaging executives in meaningful two-way communication about GOL?	
4)	Engaging middle managers in meaningful two-way communication about GOL?	
5)	Engaging front-line employees in meaningful two-way communication about GOL?	
6)	Empowering executives in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	
7)	Empowering middle managers in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	
8)	Empowering employees in defining and carrying out the goals of GOL?	
9)	Using short term, smaller pilots to motivate and encourage change (i.e. short-term wins)?	
10)	Ensuring changes resulting from GOL are institutionalized (i.e. changes become part of the new norms in the organization, are rewarded and recognized)?	
11)	Demonstrating the required transformational leadership to implement the change?	
12)	Demonstrating the required charismatic leadership to implement the change?	
13)	Demonstrating the required instrumental leadership to implement the change?	

8.3 Appendix C – The Interview Framework

General Questions:

1. In your experience what are the main differences between the public sector and the private sector:
 - (a) In terms of the organizational culture?
 - (b) In terms of how change is managed?
2. Both the public and the private sector are currently implementing a number of major change initiatives.
 - a) In your opinion, is it easier to implement transformational change in the public sector than the private sector, more difficult or is there no difference?
 - b) Why do you say this?

Change Management in the Federal Government:

3. Can you think of an example of a successful federal PS change initiative?
 - (a) Could you describe it briefly?
 - (b) Why do you think that this change initiative was successful?
4. Can you think of an example of a federal PS change initiative that failed?
 - (a) Could you describe it briefly?
 - (b) Why do you think that this change initiative failed?
5. Think about the federal government in general. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.
 - (a) Why did you give them this grade?
 - (b) How could they improve their grade?
6. Think about your own department. How good a job do you think that they do with respect to managing change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.
 - (a) Why did you give them this grade?
 - (b) How could they improve their grade?
7. Now let's talk about the GOL initiative in particular. How good a job do you think that the federal government is doing with respect to managing this particular change? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.
 - (a) Why did you give them this grade?
 - (b) How could they improve their grade?

8. How good a job do you think that your department is doing with respect to managing this particular change (i.e. GOL)? Please give them a grade between 0 and 100.
- (a) Why did you give them this grade?
 - (b) How could they improve their grade?

Change Management Success Factors:

Now I want to talk about the material that was covered in the survey that I sent you. As I noted there, my review of the literature indicated a number of techniques that the private sector has used successfully when implementing major change. I want to go over each of these factors with you and get your opinion on how important they are within the PS in general and with respect to the GOL initiative in particular.

9. Research in the Private sector has indicated that creating a sense of urgency around the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave sense of urgency a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
10. Research in the Private sector has indicated that having a common clear picture of the future state is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave vision a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
11. Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to executives about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
12. Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to middle managers about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
13. Research in the Private sector has indicated that open, in-depth and sustained communication to employees about the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave communication a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
14. Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering executives is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering executives a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?

15. Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering middle managers is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering middle managers a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
16. Research in the Private sector has indicated that empowering employees is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave empowering employees a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
17. Research in the Private sector has indicated that having short-term smaller projects (also called short-term wins) to motivate and encourage change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave short-term wins a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
18. Research in the Private sector has indicated that institutionalizing the change is important to the success of the change. On your survey you gave institutionalizing the change a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
19. Research in the Private sector has indicated that transformational leadership is important to the success of the change. (See definition of transformational leadership on survey). On your survey you gave transformational leadership a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
20. Research in the Private sector has indicated that charismatic leadership is important to the success of the change. (See definition of charismatic leadership on survey). On your survey you gave charismatic leadership a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?
21. Research in the Private sector has indicated that instrumental leadership is important to the success of the change. (See definition of instrumental leadership on survey). On your survey you gave instrumental leadership a rating of X in terms of importance. Why do you say this?

That was the complete list of success factors from the private sector.

22. I am interested in knowing to what extent you think that the critical change success factors that have been observed in the private sector are transferable to the public sector.
 - a) what is the overlap?
 - b) give as a percent.
 - c) why do you say this?

23. Are there any factors that I have not mentioned that you think are important to successful PS change?

Summary questions on GOL

24. What do you think is the probability that GOL will be successfully implemented by 2005?

(a) Why did you give this probability?

(b) How could they increase the probability that the change would be successful?

25. What one piece of advice would you give the Clerk with respect to the implementation of GOL?

26. Do you think GOL makes a good case study for change management in the federal government?

(a) How is it the same as other changes implemented in government?

(b) How is it different from other changes implemented in government?