Finding the Sweet Spot for Change

Laurence T. Spring
Manhattanville College

Change management literature has grown dramatically, has a significant focus on how to make change happen, and a bias toward change. Despite this, nearly 70% of all change efforts fail. There is a need to focus more attention on the notion of excessive change and its detrimental effects on organizations. This paper proposes a unit of measure and a methodology to measure and calculate the magnitude of initiatives, an audit process to quantify the effort required by all initiatives in an organization at any given moment in time and proposes organizational limits beyond which organizational performance will suffer.

Keywords: change management, change capacity, change fatigue, excessive change, organizational stability

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are experiencing an ever-increasing level of change fueled by notions like leadership must involve change, that organizations must change in response to their environment or perish, and change is necessary to improvement. None of these precepts are wrong, but the concept of "too much of a good thing" deserves a more prominent place in leaders' playbooks and the change management literature.

This paper proposes a concept, for examination and study, of a unit of measure for the magnitude of planned change effort; a way to measure, across contexts, how much effort a particular initiative or a collection of initiatives will demand from an organization. Additionally, a methodology for calculating the magnitude of planned change effort, a methodology for auditing that effort for all initiatives in an organization, and a theoretical limit regarding the amount of change effort an organization can exert before performance is negatively impacted is suggested and offered for examination and study.

Organizational leaders, especially those that lead complex and multifaceted organizations like institutions of higher education, will benefit from this process by being better able to assess the effort required by planned change. Leaders using this tool will be able to manage change in a more nuanced way and be proactive in preventing change fatigue, change skepticism, and change cynicism.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE EFFORT

Most organizational change is less effective than hoped or intended, with several studies indicating that organizational changes fail at the rate of 70%. While the validity of the 70% figure may be questionable (Hughes, 2011), there is significant evidence that change fails at a staggeringly high rate (Smith, 2002), with significant variance depending on the nature of the change. In a review of several studies, Smith (2002)

found that cultural change had the highest rate of failure (81%) while more technical or strategic changes were sometimes successful more than 50% of the time.

Whether one considers the origins of the change management field to be Taylor's Scientific Management (1911), Max Weber's Economy and Society (1922), or the Hawthorne efficiency studies of the late 1920's and early 1930's, the evolution of thinking has fueled different movements such as Total Quality management, 6 Sigma, and a long list of programs that are ostensibly designed to help managers enact positive change in their organizations. The field is publishing at an astounding pace. A recent search of Amazon revealed over 1,000 books released on change management in the last 30 days and a similar search in Google Scholar revealed more than 250,000 results from the year 2020 alone. This astounding volume of literature on change management may be due to the ever-increasing amount of change that organizations are experiencing as well as the high degree of failure of those changes.

Most of the literature on making change more effective is focused on improving change management techniques. A 2015 review of the literature by Al-Haddad and Kotnour showed a focus on the methods of change and the need for a better way to match methods with context or need. The obvious implication is that significant amounts of change are needed and are good, and success depends on the skill of change management.

In a 2011 review of the management literature, Nasim and Sushil found nine dominant views on organizational change: planned vs. emergent change, episodic vs. dynamic change, incremental vs. revolutionary change, piecemeal vs. holistic change, macro vs. micro view of change, epistemological concerns, exploitation and exploration, Theory E and Theory O, and continuity vs change. The overwhelming majority of viewpoints examine the 'hows' and 'whys' of change with only one also addressed the "how not to," or having some substantial focus on stability. This finding reinforces an earlier assertion of Sturdy and Grey (2003) that the organizational change management literature is biased toward change and marginalizes voices that argue the merits of stability.

EXCESSIVE CHANGE

Not all scholarship is focused on the "how to" of change management. There have been several studies examining the notion of change fatigue, mostly as a psychological state impacting members of an organization, but also as a collective state of an organization. The plea for moderation in change management has not been without some voice. In 1994, Collins and Porras, perhaps most famously, illustrated this concept in the bestselling book *Built to Last*. However, the need to manage both continuity and change has been studied and written about by others, illustrating the benefit of limiting the amount of change happening at one time in an organization (Alvy, 2017; Brown, Wey, & Foland, 2018; Doyle, Claydon, & Buchanan, 2000; Huy, 2002; Kraatz & Zajac, 2001; Leana & Barry, 2000; O'Toole & Meier, 2003; Power & Reid, 2005; Reeves, 2010; Schmoker, 2018).

Furthermore, because of the focus on the benefits of planned change, it is possible for an organization to fall into the unhelpful pattern of 'if a little is good, more must be better, and a lot more must be great.' There appears to be a limit to how much change an organization, and the individuals within that organization, can enact before their performance begins to decline (Pierce & Aguinis, 2013). This is an illustration of Nasim and Sushil's (2011) ninth view, the paradox of continuity and change.

The notion of 'excessive change' has been formally defined as the pursuit of "…several seemingly unrelated and sometimes conflicting changes… and …implementing new changes before the previous change is completed and evaluated" (Stensaker, Meyer, Falkenberg, & Haueng, 2001, p. 3). To avoid excessive change, there is a need for periods of stability between change allowing for organizational structures to find a new stable state (Falkenberg, Stensaker, Meyer, & Haueng, 2005). This concept of excessive change has been built on the psychological construct of demand resource theory, or conservation of resources. The resources in question are emotional or psychological, like self-esteem, mastery, or status, and are valued like other more tangible resources (Hobfoll, 1989). The basic premise of this theory is that when a change demands more resources than an individual has, new behaviors emerge to cope with the increased stress.

The impact of excessive change on individuals can be detrimental to both the individual and the organization. Organizational change often results in increased stress for members of an organization, which can lead to decreased job satisfaction, increased employee turnover and change fatigue; a state of stress, exhaustion, and burnout (Brown et al., 2018). When emotional exhaustion occurs, or there is a demand for more interpersonal resources than someone has, organization members are more likely to withdraw from their peers, increase efforts to conserve energy, identify as exhausted, suffer performance decline, and leave the organization (Bernerth, Walker, & Harris, 2011; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

Prolonged exposure to excessive change will result in change fatigue and, if allowed to persist, can progress to change skepticism, and eventually change cynicism (Ouedraogo &Ouakouak, 2020). Change cynicism is related to a lack of trust in the organization or leadership and manifests itself as an increased resistance to change (Stanley, Meyer, & Topolnytsky, 2005). Along the way, the commitment of these individuals to the organization, their jobs, the quality of their work, and new initiatives wanes, sometimes resulting in resistance, sabotage, and departure from the organization (Aslam, Ilyas, & Imram, 2016).

In addition to the psychological stress that excessive change places on individuals, the organization also suffers. When individuals experience excessive change, they are more prone to perceiving a violation of the 'psychological contract' they have with the organization thus reducing their commitment to the organization and being less likely to report illicit activities like fraud (Scheetz & Fogarty, 2020). Excessive change is related to an increased loss of staff, a decline in the ability of managers to effectively manage, a loss of organizational routines, and lines of responsibility becoming confused. In short, the organization loses the ability to implement change and run daily operations effectively (Stensaker et al., 2001).

To date, inquiry into the notion of excessive change has been focused on identifying or measuring the symptoms of excessive change and documenting the relationship between organizational performance and excessive change. Identifying the symptoms of excessive change can be thought of as helping practitioners identify the effects of too much change, based on the symptoms or responses exhibited by either the individual or the organization during or after change has been implemented. These after-the-fact measures do little to help the practitioner who is trying to avoid a state of fatigue with staff, sacrificing trust, and further eroding any willingness to embrace subsequent initiatives.

The perception of organization members that too much change is happening as shown by phrases like "Lots of people are just tired of constant change" (Doyle et al., 2000, p. 68) illustrates the pervasiveness of the issue. Both O'Toole and Meier (2003) and Power and Reid (2005) found correlations between excessive change and negative organizational performance. Similarly, Pierce and Aguinis (2011) found an over application of otherwise positive and scientifically supported interventions can have detrimental effects. Reinforcing the notion that too much change can be addressed, Boyne and Meier (2009) found that in the face of necessary change or turbulence, the negative effects can be mitigated through structural stability, or a purposeful attempt to not change some elements of the organization.

MEASURING THE MAGNITUDE OF CHANGE

It stands to reason that while change exerts a toll on the organization and the individuals within it, not all change exerts the same toll. Different types of changes demand differing levels of energy and elicit commensurate levels of resistance and success (Del Val & Fuentas, 2003; Peus, Frey, Gerkhardt, Fischer, & Traut-Mattausch, 2009).

Despite some agreement that the size, or magnitude, of change being implemented is related to the likelihood of success, and that larger changes engender greater levels of resistance from organization members, there is no scale against which to objectively measure the magnitude of change. There have been limited attempts to measure the magnitude of planned change. Some researchers have measured change in a very context specific manner. In 2000, Zajac, Kraatz, and Besser did so by comparing the change in residential mortgages as a percentage of S&L business. Other attempts have included a frequency count of changes (Power & Reid, 2005) and a measure of stability instead of change (Boyne & Meier, 2009).

Other researchers have noted the lack of ability to measure the magnitude of change and point toward the need for a measure (Bernerth et al., 2011; Nasim & Sushil, 2011). It has also been suggested

that the magnitude of change is too subjective of a concept and therefore not able to be measured in an objective manner (Falkenberg et al., 2005).

The ability to quantify planned change efforts would allow practitioners the ability to anticipate when organization members are approaching fatigue rather than reacting once the fatigue state is reached. In doing so, it is suggested that if leaders had a better sense of how much change their organization was undergoing, they would have greater success at balancing change and stability and ultimately being successful with more of their change efforts.

The concept of a unit of measure for magnitude of change elicits several issues for consideration, chief among them being the variables that would make up this measure and the suggestion of a theoretical limit of change effort that an organization can produce. This paper proposes a simple and relatively direct way to address this issue.

Anatomy of a Unit of Measure (Membership, Affinity, and Depth)

The proposed unit of measure is called the change value unit, or CVU. The CVU of an initiative is comprised of three variables, membership, affinity, and depth, derived and simplified from a number of more complex aspects of change management, such as resistance and change readiness. Each variable is scored on a scale of one to five, and the results multiplied, resulting in a gross Change Value Unit for that initiative.

To quantify the change, a simple algorithm was developed to help capture the scale of the change effort. Each variable is assigned a value between one and five, these results multiplied, and the result is a CVU for an initiative. In this model low scores mean less energy is needed for success. Leaders can use the data from this formula to make more thoughtful decisions about the number or type of change efforts that can be reasonably undertaken without the system losing significant performance.

Membership Involved in Change Effort

The first variable is membership, or the percentage of organization members that the initiative affects. This variable is not often discussed in considering effectiveness of change management but has been identified as a key missing ingredient in the past (Sirkin, Keenan, & Jackson, 2005). In general, the larger the percentage of members an initiative affects, the larger the Membership Factor and the greater effort demanded of the organization to enact the change. The effect of the concept of a membership score has been demonstrated, to the extreme, in the work of Boyne et al. (2009) through the creation of a stability measure for staffing turnover. While employee turnover is an extreme form of change, the principle can also apply to lesser forms of change.

TABLE 1
MEMBERSHIP FACTOR DETERMINATION

Percentage of *Membership Affected	Membership Factor Assigned (M)
0% - 5%	1
5.1% - 10%	2
10.1% - 20%	3
20.1% - 40%	4
40.1% - 100%	5

*There is a corollary to the Membership Factor calculation if the initiative involves a single, unique, subset of organization members, as opposed to a heterogeneous set of members.

The Membership factor for any initiative is calculated by identifying the total number of organization employees, identifying the number of them expected to change their behavior as a result of the initiative, and dividing. The percentage of members of the organization that are affected by the initiative have an analogous Membership factor. This is not a proportional scale. Achieving the lowest score would be any

change involving less than 5% of the organization. However, the highest score is achieved with any change that affects more than 40% of the organization (See Table 1).

Affinity Toward Change

The second variable is affinity. Affinity considers a number of issues: trust, readiness, beliefs, track record of change success, and values. The "Affinity for Change" is a five-point Likert scale rating how much dislike or lack of affinity the change represents. Most change represents a level of dislike that must be overcome. However, not all dislike is equal. Under the best of circumstances, leaders can lead initiatives that involve changes that are somewhat welcome, or where people are indifferent to the new order of things. There are also initiatives that elicit intense dislike among organization members. Sometimes this dislike is rooted in a rational, technical reason, and other times it is less rational or emotional.

There are a number of validated tools to measure readiness for change such as fatigue, cynicism, or skepticism. This model suggests using a group process to reach consensus on the affinity score as a way to resolve the differences in individual perception as described by Falkenberg et al. (2005). Group process has long shown the ability to overcome differences in perception and group conflict of opinion (Banathy & Jenlin, 2005; Isaacs, 1993; Maturana, 1988).

Gauging the level of affinity for or against a proposed change is difficult to predict. The analysis of past experience with similar initiatives, member affinity for other activities, the use of multiple perspectives, and some educated guesswork are all necessary. Affinity at a level one would represent relative indifference to the proposed course of action or even a desire for it. A rating of five represents an intense dislike for the change that seems to defy rational explanation (See Table 2).

TABLE 2
AFFINITY FACTOR DETERMINATION

1	2	3	4	5
Indifference or even preference for the change	Objections based on comfort or preference	Rational or technical objections	Objections based on trust or motives	Non-rational objections to change or values conflict
Little to no resistance		Moderate resistance		Significant resistance

For example, initiatives that focus on a change in values are geared toward changing organizational culture and/or changing the beliefs of members. A requirement to change behaviors related to a change in values is more likely to generate cynicism and resistance toward that initiative and warrants a larger affinity score which in turn reflects an increased difficulty in enacting change (Stanley, 2005). Stated another way, if the initiative conflicts with deeply held beliefs or values held by members, the effort needed for success increases and is reflected in the increased affinity score.

In contrast, initiatives that do not conflict with beliefs but have logistical or issues of practicality are subject to change skepticism (Stanley, 2005), warranting a moderate affinity score on the scale. For example, issues related to trust in the manager, in the project manager, or a track record of failure on similar initiatives result in a reluctant membership group which is reflected in a moderate affinity score (Erwin & Garman, 2010; Judge and Douglas, 2009; Peus et al., 2009).

Any change is likely to be met with varying degrees of objections and requires effort. Most change requires information sharing, increased development time, and stakeholder engagement. However, responses to change that have objections in the emotional, value or, held belief realm take more energy. Overcoming the emotions related to change is much more difficult and requires more intensive conversations and greater stakeholder engagement.

Depth of Change

The third variable is depth, which calculates the intersection of two related aspects of the initiative on a five-point scale: the degree of interdependence needed for success in the initiative and complexity of the task involved (See Table 3). This variable is an interpretation of the work done by Wood (1986) on task complexity. Interdependence represents the degree to which an individual's success on a task is dependent or not on the success of others in the organization. Complexity refers to the nature of the task being demanded, ranging from simple behavioral tasks to dynamic cognitive functions in response to unpredictable environments.

The aspect of interdependence is an assessment of the ability for any organization member to be successful without the success of others in the organization. There are three levels to this measure: individual, departmental, and system. When an organization member's success with an initiative is unrelated to other members' success, there is a low degree if interdependence. When an individual's success on an initiative is dependent upon the success of those that work closely with them, such as in the same department or group, there is moderate interdependence. In some instances, there is a high degree of interdependence requiring success from all members for any single member to be successful, such as when an organization is working toward a collective goal.

TABLE 3
DEPTH OF CHANGE FACTOR DETERMINATION

		Complexity		
		Behavioral	Cognitive	Dynamic
Interdependence	Individual	1	2	3
	Departmental	2	3	4
	System	3	4	5

The second aspect represents the complexity of the change as described by Woods (1986): behavioral, cognitive, or dynamic. Behavioral changes represent simple and prescriptive changes in how things are done. Behavioral changes can be provided with a script and do not require re-thinking. Cognitive changes are prescriptive changes in the way people should make decisions, but it represents a clear change in thinking pattern for members, exercised in a static environment. Dynamic changes are those in which members are making cognitive changes in an environment that is not static. Dynamic changes may represent multiple changes interacting with each other.

Once the Membership factor, Affinity factor, and Depth factor have been identified, the CVU for the initiative can be calculated. The formula below is used to calculate the Change Value Units (CVU) for each initiative.

$$\text{CVU} = \text{Membership factor} * \text{Affinity factor} * \text{Depth factor} \quad (1)$$

MAPPING CVU RESULTS

Assessing the magnitude of all planned change effort in an organization can be a daunting task. Broadly, the process involves identifying all planned initiatives in the recent past and future. Then identifying the gross CVU score associated with each and mapping the roll out of that initiative with specific dates according to a five-phase plan. Each phase uses a percentage of the gross CVU score associated with the initiative. Engaging in these two activities repeatedly, until every initiative is accounted for allows for a visible, chronological representation of the effort being expected to support organizational change.

The process is conducted in two repeated phases. The first phase consists of the calculation of the total CVUs associated with an initiative. Phase two involves associating specific dates and lengths of time with each of five phases of change management: (a) planning, (b) ramping up, (c) implementation, (d) acclimatization, and (e) normalization. This simplified five-phase process has been developed to not overtly conflict with nor endorse any specific change management model already in use in the field. This process is mapped against several other well-known change processes (See Table 4).

TABLE 4
CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

<table>
<tr><th>5 Phase Process</th><th>Lewin (1946) / Schein (1999)</th><th>Judson (1991)</th><th>Kotter (1996)</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Plan</td><td rowspan="4">Unfreeze</td><td rowspan="3">Analyze and Plan</td><td>Create Urgency</td></tr>
<tr><td>Build Guiding Coalition</td></tr>
<tr><td>Create a Vision</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Ramp Up</td><td>Communicate</td><td>Communicate the Vision</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gain Acceptance of New Behaviors</td><td>Empower Others</td></tr>
<tr><td>Implement</td><td>Change</td><td rowspan="2">Change from Status Quo to Desired State</td><td>Short Term Wins</td></tr>
<tr><td>Acclimatize</td><td rowspan="2">Refreeze</td><td>Consolidate Improvements</td></tr>
<tr><td>Normalize</td><td>Consolidate and Institutionalize</td><td>Institutionalize</td></tr>
</table>

The magnitude of all planned changes can be mapped to specific dates according to the existing scheduled roll out plan. Leaders identify specific date ranges for each of the phases associated with the initiative. Initiatives can then be mapped to a Gantt chart with corresponding CVUs associated with each phase of the initiative.

Phase one, planning, makes use of the smallest number of people and the people who are most likely to have greater commitment and enthusiasm for the initiative. This phase has similarities to Judson's analyze and plan phase (1991), Lewin' s unfreeze phase (Schein, 1999), and would be analogous to Kotter's phase of creating urgency, building a guiding coalition, and creating a vision (1996). The planning phase is estimated to demand only 5% of the total CVU calculated for the initiative.

Phase two, ramping up, involves more people, the amassing and staging of resources, and communication prefacing the coming changes. In the realm of Lewin's three phases, this would still be categorized as unfreezing. Judson would call this communication, and Kotter's process would consider this communicating the vision and empowering others. These activities often create angst amongst organization members who will be affected by the change. The ramping up phase demands 30% of the total CVU calculated.

Phase three, implementation, involves the training, coaching, and feedback associated with the initiative. Additionally, this is the first phase where actual changes in the organization members' behavior will be expected. In Lewin's model, this is the action phase. Judson characterized this with the two phases of gaining acceptance and changing from status quo while Kotter has a phase imploring short-term wins. Implementation is a high demand activity, making use of 100% of the CVU calculated for the initiative.

Phase four, or acclimatization, refers to the activities that follow implementation and are designed to embed the new, expected behaviors in practice. Acclimatization may refer to new routines of accountability and reporting, new feedback loops, corrective action pathways, or evaluations regarding the new behavior. Acclimatization shifts into the refreezing phase in Lewin's model, consolidate and institutionalize in

Judson's model, and consolidate improvements in Kotter's. Acclimatization demands approximately 60% of the total CVU calculated for the initiative.

Phase five, normalization, refers to the period of time it takes for these new behaviors to transform from new patterns and habits to embed themselves into the culture of the organization. Once these behaviors become the new norm and people see a fit between the new behaviors and their self-concept, then the initiative can be looked upon as standard practice (Schein, 1999). Normalization can be considered part of Lewin's refreezing phase, and Judson's consolidation and institutionalization phase, along with Kotter's institutionalization phase.

Initiative Audit

By mapping every initiative to dates associated with the phases of change and the analogous CVU score, a comprehensive map showing all of the change effort expected for the time period is produced. By totaling the CVUs associated with each initiative on the axis of time, leaders can easily identify when they are expecting an excessive amount of energy from their organization and when they can expect lower quality work product, reduced commitment, and greater change resistance.

This activity is generally best accomplished by a cross functional team. Having different perspectives is important when determining things like the affinity for change factor, or even if something still qualifies as a change effort or has made its way into accepted practice.

It is important to conduct this activity several times each year, especially during any strategic planning sessions. Often during a leadership retreat, or other such planning event, it can be easy to plan more change than the organization can handle. However, this is also a valuable exercise to conduct during implementation. Once implementation is underway, it is not unusual for adaptations or additions to creep into the activity sphere. This activity will help to monitor this "scope creep." Additionally, it can serve as a good check to see if the organization is exerting its influence on change efforts – reducing depth – in unanticipated areas.

Initial observations of organizations using this tool suggest that the sum of all change initiatives should not exceed 225. Organizations looking to implement change that exceeds 225 Change Value Units can expect organization members will conserve energy, reduce commitment to initiatives, and the organization itself, manifesting as behaviors that can range from 'lip service' to outright resistance or sabotage of initiatives. It has also been observed that individual initiatives requiring 80 CVUs or more, represent significant, disruptive, and taxing events with a much-reduced chance of success. They should be treated with great care and caution.

Table 5 illustrates what the initiative audit, calculation of CVUs, and phasing looks like in an organization. While the organization could be of any type, this one represents a public school district in the United States. The leadership team of the district conducted this exercise over the course of several days, reaching consensus on the individual ratings for each initiative.

During this school year, the district reported ten different initiatives that were in various stages of roll out. Some of them were already into acclimatization as the year began and others would not begin until later in the school year.

TABLE 5
DISTRICT INITIATIVE AUDIT RESULTS

Initiative	Membership Factor	Affinity Factor	Depth Factor	CVU Score
Authentic Learning	4	3	3	36
Cultural Competence	5	4	4	80
New Learning Management System	5	1	2	10
ELA Curriculum	3	2	4	24
Social Emotional Learning	5	4	3	60
STEM Curriculum	2	2	3	12

Spam Filter	5	1	2	10
Work Order System	3	2	1	6
Teacher Evaluation Model	5	4	4	80
Family and Community Partnerships	5	4	4	80

Table 6 illustrates the effect of phase on CVU weight, demonstrating that initiatives demand variable effort throughout roll out. It is important to consider the CVU demand for any given moment in time. In the table 6, these initiatives are mapped to two different moments in time, one being the third week of the school year and the second being the fifteenth week.

TABLE 6
TOTAL CVU DEMAND AT TWO MOMENTS IN TIME

Initiative	Gross CVU	Week 3 Phase	Week 3 CVUs	Week 15 Phase	Week 15 CVUs
Authentic Learning	36	Acclimatization	21.6	Acclimatization	21.6
Cultural Competence	80	Acclimatization	48	Acclimatization	48
New Learning Management System	10	Normalization	3	Normalization	3
ELA Curriculum	24	Implementation	24	Implementation	24
Social Emotional Learning	60	Planning	3	Implementation	60
STEM Curriculum	12	Implementation	12	Implementation	12
Spam Filter	10	N/A	0	Implementation	10
Work Order System	6	N/A	0	Implementation	6
Teacher Evaluation Model	80	Planning	3	Implementation	80
Family and Community Partnerships	80	N/A	0	Implementation	80
			114.6		344.6

Early in the school year, the district is still finishing three initiatives from the previous year. An initiative to increase authentic instruction began this year already in the acclimatization phase, as did an initiative to increase the cultural competence of all staff. While both of these efforts are reasonably significant initiatives because they were implemented several months ago it is easy for leaders to forget about the continued effort they are demanding from the organization. There was also a much smaller initiative involving the implementation of a learning management system that is in the normalization phase. Likewise, there are several other initiatives in various stages of planning, ramping up, implementation, or not even planning yet. The total CVU load as the school year begins is a mild 114.6.

Later in the school year, it is clear that no initiatives have reduced their demand on the organization, but several have progressed into implementation mode and are making significant demands on the organization. By the fifteenth week of the school year, the CVU demand has more than tripled and the aggregate CVU score for that week is 344.6. It stands to reason that staff will begin to feel the stress of change fatigue in week 15.

Figure 1 demonstrates the continuous nature of CVUs in a Gantt chart. In this view, it becomes evident that the organization will have an elevated level of stress by week 11, and significant stress by week 14 as a result of several initiatives from the past year still requiring energy, even as new initiatives are being planned and implemented.

FIGURE 1
CVU GANTT CHART

	Weeks																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Planned Initiatives																	
Authentic Learning	Acclimatization - 21.6																
Cultural Competence	Acclimatization - 48																
New Learning Management System	Normalization - 3																
ELA Curriculum	Implementation - 24																
Social Emotional Learning			Planning - 3						Ramping Up - 18					Implementation - 60			
STEM Curriculum	Implementation - 12																
Spam Filter					Planning - 1			Ramping Up - 3			Implementation - 10						
Work Order System					Planning - 1			Ramping Up - 2			Implementation - 6						
Teacher Evaluation Model	Planning - 3				Ramping Up - 24						Implementation - 80						
Family and Community Partnerships					Planning - 3				Ramping Up - 24					Implementation - 80			
Total CVUs Demanded	111.6		114.6		143.6			147.6	180.6		250.6			344.6			

The calculation of Change Value Units involves the multiplication of membership, affinity, and depth factors, each of which can range in value from one to five. Thus, individual initiatives can have CVU scores demanding energy ranging from 1 to 125 CVUs.

While the algorithm involves uncomplicated math, the calculation of CVUs and the weighting of those values to stages of roll out can be complicated and laborious. The initiative mapping exercise can be automated by using software designed for this purpose. Making the calculations and visualization of the Gantt chart automatic increases the likelihood that practitioners would use such a tool to monitor their planned changes. Such a tool exists and is being tested for this purpose.

CONCLUSION

In summary, this paper presents an argument for the need to pay attention to magnitude of change in the change management literature. Further, a significant amount of organizational change fails, and much of that failure could be avoided by attending to the amount of energy being demanded by the initiatives the organizations have planned. Additionally, this paper proposes a unit of measure and a methodology to measure and calculate the magnitude of an initiative as well as a process to audit the total magnitude of all initiatives at any given time within an organization.

As the field moves forward, many areas will need further research. Additional research is encouraged to test this concept in multiple contexts, explore the relationship between the variables of membership, affinity, and depth, and test the validity of the group process to assign values for these variables. In addition to testing the base construct of a CVU, the data will be available to allow for analysis and testing of the proposed limits of 80 CVUs for an individual initiative and 225 CVUs for an organization. Initial

observations have reinforced previous research that initiatives involving more complex, or deeply held beliefs will require greater energy or, perhaps be more prone to failure. However, the benchmarks of 80 and 225 CVUs, respectively, have been made without a validation of the measure or in multiple contexts, which are prime prospects for further research.

What this paper attempts to provide is a mechanism for organization leaders to use as they make decisions between change and stability, and the likelihood of success as they move forward. This concept can inform the work of leaders of all organizations and shape the thinking in disciplines that have change management as a key tenet, light business management, and educational leadership.

REFERENCES

Al-Haddad, S., & Kotnour, T. (2015). Integrating the organizational change literature: A model for successful change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *28*(2), 234-262. doi: 10.1108/JOCM-11-2013-0215

Alvy, H. (2017). Overpromising and overloading and effectively using human, fiscal, and material resources. In *Fighting for change in your school: How to avoid fads and focus on substance* (pp. 53-78). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Aslam, U., Ilyas, M., & Imran, M.K. (2016). Detrimental effects of cynicism on organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *29*(4), 580-598. doi:10.1108/JOCM-12-2014-0231

Banathy, B.H., & Jenlink, P.M. (Eds.). (2005). *Dialogue as a means of collective communication*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Bernerth, J.B., Walker, H.J., & Harris, S.G. (2011). Change fatigue: Development and initial validation of a new measure. *Work and Stress*, *25*(4), 321-337. doi: 10.1080/02678373.2011.634280

Boyne, G.A., & Meier, K.J. (2009). Environmental turbulence, organizational stability, and public service performance. *Administration & Society*, *40*(8), 799-824. doi: 10.1177%2F0095399708326333

Brown, R., Wey, H., & Foland, K. (2018). The relationship among change fatigue, resilience, and job satisfaction of hospital staff nurses. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *50*(3), 306-313. doi: 10.1111/jnu.12373

Collins, J.C., & Porras, J.L. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Del Val, M.P., & Fuentes, C.M. (2003). Resistance to change: A literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision*. doi:10.1108/00251740310457597

Doyle, M., Claydon, T., & Buchanan, D. (2000). Mixed results, lousy process: The management experience of organizational change. *British Journal of Management*, *11*(s1), S59-S80. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.11.s1.6

Erwin, D.G., & Garman, A.N. (2010). Resistance to organizational change: Linking research and practice. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *31*(1), 39–56. doi:10.1108/01437731011010371

Falkenberg, J., Stensaker, I.G., Meyer, C.B., & Haueng, A.C. (2005). When change becomes excessive. In *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 15, pp. 31-62). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.

Hobfoll, S.E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513-524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hughes, M. (2011). Do 70 per cent of all organizational change efforts really fail? *Journal of Change Management*, *11*(4), 451-464. doi:10.1080/14697017.2011.630506

Huy, Q.N. (2002). Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*(1), 31-69. doi: https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/3094890

Isaacs, W.N. (1993). Taking flight: Dialogue, collective thinking, and organizational learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, *22*(2), 24-39. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(93)90051-2

Judge, W., & Douglas, T. (2009). Organizational change capacity: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *22*(6), 635-649. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810910997041

Kraatz, M.S., & Zajac, E.J. (2001). How organizational resources affect strategic change and performance in turbulent environments: Theory and evidence. *Organization Science*, *12*(5), 632–657. doi:10.1287/orsc.12.5.632.10088

Leana, C.R., & Barry, B. (2000). Stability and change as simultaneous experiences in organizational life. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 753–759. doi:10.5465/AMR.2000.3707707

Maturana, H.R. (1988). Reality: The search for objectivity or the quest for a compelling argument. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, *9*(1), 25-82. doi: 10.1080/03033910.1988.10557705

O'Toole, L.J., Jr., & Meier, K.J. (2003). Plus ça change: Public management, personnel stability, and organizational performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *13*(1), 43-64. doi:10.1093/JPART%2FMUG009

Ouedraogo, N., & Ouakouak, M.L. (2020), Antecedents and outcome of employee change fatigue and change cynicism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1108/JOCM-05-2019-0141

Peus, C., Frey, D., Gerkhardt, M., Fischer, P., & Traut-Mattausch, E. (2009). Leading and managing organizational change initiatives. *Management Revue*, *20*(2), 158-175. doi: 10.5771%2F0935-9915-2009-2-158

Pierce, J.R., & Aguinis, H. (2013). The too-much-of-a-good-thing effect in management. *Journal of Management*, *39*(2), 313-338. doi:10.1177%2F0149206311410060

Power, B., & Reid, G.C. (2005). Flexibility, firm-specific turbulence and the performance of the long-lived small firm. *Review of Industrial Organization*, *26*(4), 415-443. doi: 10.1007/s11151-005-0224-5

Reeves, D. (2010). The law of initiative fatigue. In *Transforming professional development into student results* (pp. 81-98). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Scheetz, A.M., & Fogarty, T.J. (2020). Uncertain jobs produce reluctant employees: Psychological contract violations and intentions to whistleblow. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *32*(2),176-194. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/journal/jmanaissues

Schein, E.H. (1999). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Reflections: The SoL Journal*, *1*(1), 59-74.

Schmoker, M. (2018). The importance of simplicity, clarity, and priority. In *Focus: Elevating the essentials to radically improve student learning* (2ed.). Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/118044/chapters/The-Importance-of-Simplicity,-Clarity,-and-Priority.aspx

Sirkin, H.L., Keenan, P., & Jackson, A. (2005, October). The hard side of change management. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2005/10/the-hard-side-of-change-management

Smith, M.E. (2002). Success rates for different types of organizational change. *Performance Improvement*, *41*(1), 26-33. doi: 10.1002/pfi.4140410107

Stanley, D.J., Meyer, J.P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *19*(4), 429-459. doi: 10.1007/s10869-005-4518-2

Stensaker, I., Meyer, C., Falkenberg, J., & Haueng, A.C. (2001, August). Excessive change: Unintended consequences of strategic change. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (No. 1, Vol. 200, pp. G1-G6). Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of Management.

Sturdy, A., & Grey, C. (2003). Beneath and beyond organizational change management: Exploring alternatives. *Organization*, *10*(4), 651-662. doi:10.1177%2F13505084030104006

Wood, R.E. (1986). Task complexity: Definition of the construct. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *37*(1), 60-82. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(86)90044-0

Wright, T.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(3), 486-493. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.486

Zajac, E., Kraatz, M.S., & Bresser, R F. (2000). Modeling the dynamics of strategic fit: A normative approach to strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*, 429–453. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200004)21:43.9.CO;3#