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ABSTRACT

Little research has been dedicated to studying factors influencing a manager's perception of satisfaction and engagement success when working with an external consultant on a change implementation. This study proposed a model to specify the influence of negative expectations of the manager in regard to working with a consultant, the level of cynicism of the manager, the client-consultant relationship and the level of management change skills on a manager's client satisfaction. Further the model assessed how the manager's client satisfaction varied with the perceived implementation success. To test this model, a questionnaire was given to middle managers who had prior experience in working with an external consultant. The questionnaire assessed levels of the managers negative expectations, cynicism, perceived working client-consultant working relationship, a managers change management skills, client satisfaction and implementation success. The findings of the study were mixed; moderate support was found for the existence of relationships between the factors. Limitations of the study as well as the implications of the findings are discussed.
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The secret to maintaining a successful, healthy organization in today's business world is the ability to change. Globalisation, technological developments, structural sophistication and competition require businesses to undergo a continuous adaptation process. As the authors Burke, Spencer, Clark and Coruzzi (1991) state, "the only constant in the business world is change" (p. 87). The ongoing need to adjust to outside changes places a great burden on managers' shoulders, since they are the ones looked to for the direction and the new goals of a change.

Often, due to various reasons such as the complexity of the organization or a lack of expertise, help from external organizational consultants is acquired. Many researchers remark that over the last decade engaging help from outside consultants has become more and more popular (Gable, 1996; O'Driscoll & Eubanks, 1993; Sturdy, 1997; Wooten & White, 1989).

The increased demand for external consultants and the resulting growth of the consulting business has stimulated a great deal of research in a variety of areas surrounding
consulting, both by Industrial/Organizational psychologists and business/management researchers. Most of the literature published for managers pertaining to consulting focuses on how to choose the right consultant for the job to be done (Bird, 1992; Economist, 1988, Frankenhuis, 1977; Harding, 1991). I/O psychologists, on the other hand, have centered their interests on such issues as the theoretical orientations of organization development practitioners (Bazigos & Burke, 1997), personality factors predicting effectiveness of change agents (Hamilton, 1988), effects of different interventions (Neuman, Edwards & Raju, 1989; Landau, 1993), and knowledge consultants have about change (Church, Waclawiki & Burke, 1996). No research found in either the I/O or the business/management literature focuses on the middle manager, the implementing force of a change process, as the deciding element for the success of a change when engaging an external consultant. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to explore factors which may influence client satisfaction, and the resulting engagement success, as perceived by the middle manager when required to work with an external consultant.
Client Satisfaction and Engagement Success

To further the field of consulting, it is not only important to research how consultants can improve their effectiveness, but it is also necessary to develop instruments that will enable consultants to measure their success as perceived by their clients. This notion is especially important in light of research findings by O'Driscoll and Eubanks (1993), who found that consultants and clients differed in their views of what constitutes effective consultant performances and successful interventions.

The call for measuring consultant effectiveness as it is perceived by the client has also been made by other researchers (Hamilton, 1988). Gable (1996) writes that "one factor that contributes to many apparently failed consultancies is a poor appreciation by both the client and the consultant of the client's true goals for the project, and how to assess progress toward these goals" (p.1175). Further appeal for more research on client satisfaction has also been offered by marketing scientists. According to Patterson, Johnson, and Spreng (1997) customer satisfaction overall is "an indispensable means of creating a sustainable advantage in the
competitive environment of the 1990s" (p.4). Due to the high financial stakes involved in business-to-business professional services, a category I/O consulting belongs to, one would expect that consulting businesses would have a great interest in monitoring their customer’s satisfaction (Patterson et al., 1997).

One way to measure client satisfaction has been developed by Gable (1996). Gable proposes a multidimensional model to measure client success when engaging the help of an external consultant to select an information system. He suggests that client success is influenced by three major areas: the degree to which a client is satisfied with the consultant recommendations, the degree of client learning, and the overall rating the client gives for the consultant performance. These three areas can be measured through seven dimensions.

The first dimension, recommendation acceptance, measures the degree to which the client has the intent of using what had been proposed by the consultant. The second dimension, recommendations satisfaction, is the degree to which the client is satisfied with the consultant’s recommendations. Next, it is also important to measure if there has been a certain degree of client learning, called understanding improvement. Since
proposed changes will most likely require such understanding one has to look at the degree to which the client comprehends the suggested improvements. The fourth dimension, understanding satisfaction, measures how satisfied the client is with his/her degree of learning. According to Gable, some clients may want to learn less than others. The gained level of understanding may not be what the consultant had envisioned, but on the dimension, understanding satisfaction, only the client’s impression is important.

The fifth dimension, performance objective, evaluates to what degree the results of the project match up with the beginning objectives, such as estimated cost and time. The sixth dimension, performance reasonability, assess to what degree the client felt that the time and fee required to complete the change were reasonable. And last, according to Gable (1996), it must be assessed how satisfied the client is with the performance of the consultant, performance satisfaction. It is only when all of these positively associated dimensions are taken into consideration that one can accurately assess client satisfaction (Gable, 1996).

Gable’s (1996) multidimensional model of client success is a clear demonstration of how complex client
satisfaction is and that out of this complexity a need arises to understand more about these dynamics. There are many influential aspects. However, there are multiple other aspects which are not accounted for in Gable’s model, such as the managers’ change skills or cynicism. Further insight into the complex world of client satisfaction can be found in a study conducted by the marketing scientists Patterson, Johnson, and Spreng (1997).

Based on the client’s prior expectations, the performance of professional service providers, and the paradigm disconfirmation of expectations, Patterson et al. (1997) developed a model to explain client satisfaction/dissatisfaction from a marketing standpoint. According to Patterson et al. (1997), customer satisfaction is based on disconfirmation. Disconfirmation is defined as “the difference between an individual’s pre-purchase expectations (or some other comparison standard) and post-purchase performance of the product or service” (p.5). The researchers concluded, after surveying three management consultant firms and 128 of their clients, that the client’s expectations and disconfirmation had a more powerful influence on customer satisfaction/dissatisfaction than performance of the consultant.
A possible explanation for these findings is that services offered by consulting firms are so complex and difficult to understand that clients often do not have the appropriate knowledge to accurately evaluate the performance of the consultant. As a result the client will rely on other, more readily available information, such as prior expectations or the functional aspects of the consulting process (e.g. report presentation, feedback, professionalism of the consultant) to make a performance evaluation (Patterson et al., 1997).

Thus, Patterson et al.'s (1997) findings are support for the notion that there are multiple factors other than those proposed by Gable (1996) involved in the process of client satisfaction development. More importantly, Patterson et al.'s study demonstrates that measuring client satisfaction may not solely depend on the performance and interaction with the external consultant.

There is one other important point which needs to be mentioned in regard to measuring client satisfaction with a consulting process. According to Gable (1996), to fully understand the dynamics in a change implementation aided by an consultant, a process versus results distinction has to be made. This means that a distinction has to be made between the "results of an engagement," that is a
successful implementation, and the "effectiveness of, or satisfaction with, the consultant's performance in arriving at those results," that is the perceived satisfaction with the client-consultant working relationship (p.1176).

This client satisfaction/engagement success distinction is another important aspect when focusing on the manager in a change process. The implementation of a change with the help of a consultant may be successful; however, the manager/client may feel that working with the consultant was everything but pleasant and is very unsatisfied with the entire experience. Thus, the question that arises is whether it is possible to have engagement success without client satisfaction.

Client-Consultant Relationship

In 1961 Argyris wrote that one important goal for I/O consultants should be to increase the understanding of the client-consultant relationship, and its impact on the intervention process. Today, organizational consulting is an established and growing field, but very little research can be found about client-consultant relationships (McGivern, 1983; Sturdey, 1997). Thus, although the I/O literature does suggest that the client-consultant
relationship is a determining factor in the outcome of the consulting process (Bird, 1992; Hamilton, 1988; McGivers, 1983; McKinney Kellog, 1984; O’Driscoll & Eubanks, 1993; Shays, 1994; Wooten and White; 1989), many aspects of this relationship are still unexplored.

Sturdey (1997) remarked that many details of client-consultant inter-relationships have been neglected by the I/O field partially due to the utility that is gained from not knowing too much about the dynamics between consultants and clients. Without knowledge of the relationships, clients can be kept in a state of insecurity, and thus remain dependent on the consultant. Managers live under constant pressure to keep up with the newest and hottest management fads. Consultants are the ones who can help the manager stay up-to-date and competitive with the trends. Thus, what consultants are truly selling to managers, according to Sturdey, is a sense of security.

It must be said that not all researchers share such an extreme view of the client-consultant relationship. The existing literature suggests that the client-consultant relationship is of a complex and delicate nature, and is often the deciding factor in the success of a consulting project (McGivern, 1983; Hamilton, 1988).
This delicacy of the relationship, often called 'trust' or 'chemistry,' is the reason cited by researchers to explain the lack of research (McGivern, 1983). As argued by McGivern (1983), little research has been done in the area of consultant-client-relationships because of the difficulty to define this elusive, abstract concept of "chemistry." After all, how would one go about studying such an influence?

McGivern (1983) chose to explore the client-consultant relationship by interviewing consultants and some of their clients. The researcher asked both parties to explain how they viewed and experienced the interaction with the other. According to McGivern, the necessity for mutual trust was something both client and consultant named as being an important factor in determining whether a client-consultant relationship is successful or not. However, both parties based their trust in the other party on slightly different aspects. The client’s trust in the consultant was built by such behaviors as the flexibility of the consultant to modify change plans in accordance with the client’s needs and wishes as well as a perceived honesty from the consultant. For the consultant, it was necessary to feel that the client was willing to work with
the consultant in an open and supportive manner without, for example, suppressing important information.

A brief excursion into literature pertaining to trust revealed, for example, the findings that there are four factors in a professional working relationship which seem to determine the development of trust: a) open communication, b) share in decision making, c) sharing of critical information, and d) honest sharing of perceptions and feelings (Mishra & Morrissey, 1990). Further, people who are congruent in what they verbally express and nonverbally demonstrate are considered to be trustworthy (Sinetar, 1988). Mishra and Morrissey (1990) write that trust is the essence of all relationships. Without trust, according to the researchers, a productive work environment is impossible. Hence, McGivern’s (1983) research results are no surprise.

A different approach to quantifying the dynamics in the client-consultant relationship can be found in the work of Wooten and White (1989). The researchers proposed that an intervention is based on a very dynamic and sensitive interrelationship between client and consultant. This process requires both the consultant and client to adopt different roles at various stages of the intervention process. A failure to adopt the appropriate
role at the right time will endanger the intervention. Yet, because the client-consultant relationship is so sensitive and dynamic in its nature, many things can go wrong. According to Wooten and White (1989), building on role conflict theory as defined by Katz and Kahn (1978), the greatest danger to the client-consultant relationship is role conflict and role ambiguity. Having opposing roles to fulfill, such as being expected to be helpful to an outsider, yet endangering one’s own position, and an ambiguous situation, such as unclear goals and expectations, can hinder the client or consultant in adopting the appropriate role. Thus, the researchers identify six different forms of potential role conflict in the organizational development process: Intra-sender conflict, intra-role conflict, person-role conflict, role-overload, and role ambiguity. Consequently, according to Wooten and White, the success of a client-consultant relationship depends on clear roles rather than “chemistry.” Therefore, the client-consultant relationship is endangered when either the manager or the consultant is unclear as to what his or her role is at any point in time of the change process.

McKinney Kellog (1984) is less abstract in her work. In her content analysis of twenty interviews with
consultants, she writes that there are seven factors that determine whether a favorable or unfavorable client-consultant relationship can and will be established. The first step towards establishing a successful client-consultant relationship is a clear contract between both parties. Unclear working terms, according to McKinney Kellogg may lead to misunderstandings between the client and consultant. Next, the content analysis showed that it is best if the contract is short term and has a clearly defined time limit. Further, interviewees said that the client needs to show true interest in the project. Consultants expressed that it is difficult to work with a customer who does not care (McKinney Kellog, 1984). The client also should not be skeptical about the consultant’s competence. Also, the consultants voiced that it is important to have respect for the client. Additionally a frequent exchange of information is considered essential for the client-consultant relationship. And lastly, an effective feedback process is important to build a positive relationship. However, even though defining a concrete framework, McKinney Kellog (1984) also, mentions that in addition to the seven factors, a good “fit” between client and consultant is necessary for a successful working relationship.
Thus, even though researchers have a difficult time defining or quantifying what "chemistry" between client and consultant is, there is consensus that the relationship of the client with the consultant has a strong influence on the outcome of the consulting project. Consequently, supported by the literature pertaining to client-consultant relationships (Gable, 1996; Hamilton, 1988; O'Driscoll & Eubanks, 1993), and research findings pertaining to the development of trust in working-relationships (Mishra & Morrissey, 1990; Sinetar, 1988) it is essential that the client's, or manager's perception regarding the relationship with the consultant be included when examining factors influencing client satisfaction.

Managers and Organizational Change

Managers have to be the leading, as well as the driving forces behind organizational changes for change to happen. Without direction, support and monitoring from the managers, organizations or departments will not undergo the adaptive changes proposed by the external consultants. The importance of managers in the change process is stressed only indirectly in research (Agocs, 1997; Church, Waclawaki & Burke, 1996; Nadler, 1991).
However, a closer look at the aspects involved in a change implementation demonstrates the importance of the manager in change processes.

According to Nadler (1991), effective management of change is a three-step process. The first two steps assess the current state of the situation and decide what the future state should be. The third step implements those changes that will lead to the new state. Typically, the external consultant will be very active in the first two steps. The responsibility of seeing a change through to completion, however, will be that of the organization’s managers. Further, Nadler (1991) writes that the success of managing change is dependent on the ability to overcome employee resistance to change. This process requires motivating the employees to change, understanding the anxieties involved with change, continuous control over the situation before, during and after the change, as well as shaping the political dynamics within the organization to support the change.

Church, Waclawaki and Burke (1996) offer a more detailed explanation on what conditions need to be met for effective change to happen. Change agents, including managers, need to have an understanding of six fundamental areas of change for the change to successfully happen.
First of all, the change agent needs to have an understanding of how the individual employee may respond to change. Possible reactions of employees could, for example, be apathy or resistance. Further, it is necessary for the change agent to have an understanding of the general nature of change, and likewise effective planning strategies for the change. Next, there is a need to manage the people side of the change, which entails such aspects as communication with employees and allowing time for disengagement and adjustment to the new state. There also is a need to manage the organizational side of change that represents such actions as creating a symbol for the new stage. Last, an evaluation of the change effort is needed.

Altogether, change is a process involving many factors. Not considering or paying attention to one or several of these factors can endanger the success of a change plan. And, not attending to all facets is where a conflict arises: According to researchers’ empirical evidence, many of today’s managers do not have the required skills to implement changes (Burke et al., 1991; Spreitzer & Quinn, 1996).

Burke et al. (1991) surveyed 700 executives from several industries over a time period of five years to
assess managers' understanding of change management. Based on the conditions that need to be met for effective change to happen, Church, Waclawiski and Burke (1996), developed a survey instrument, the Managing Change Questionnaire. The Managing Change Questionnaire is composed of 25 true or false questions on six dimensions pertaining to the nature of change. Results indicated that managers had difficulties understanding the concept of change management.

More specifically, managers scored the lowest on the two dimensions: people-side of change and individual responses to change. Thus, managers are more comfortable planning changes and giving instructions to implement changes than dealing with the human issues involved with change. Ironically, in a change process utilizing a consultant, the most important task of the manager would be exactly what Burke et al. (1991) found to be the weakness of the majority of the managers: To manage the people and individual response-side of change.

Considering that the consultant is neither present in the organization on a daily basis nor there for an unlimited time, it will have to be the manager who, by being capable of managing the people-side and individual responses to change, will in the long run ensure the success of the
change. However, many managers apparently do not understand what is one of the most essential parts of their responsibilities in the change process. Thus, without proper support from the organization, it is not surprising that changes often fail.

A reality-based example demonstrating the fatal consequences of manager’s lack of understanding of the people and individual related aspects of change can be found in a case study conducted by Spreitzer and Quinn (1996) at Ford Motor Company. This research revealed that a training program specifically developed to educate and motivate managers to adopt change skills failed because, among other reasons, there was not enough understanding of the powerful dynamics that people and individuals in organizations present when trying to make changes within departments and whole organizations.

In light of these research findings, one very important aspect to evaluate when assessing a manager’s perceived satisfaction with an external consultant and a change implementation has to be the manager’s understanding of change management. Researchers have emphasized that a client’s understanding of the proposed changes, as well as learning for future, similar changes, is necessary for a successful change implementation.
(Gable, 1996; Mckinney Kellog, 1984; Wooten & White 1989). Is it, however, enough that the manager understands the proposed changes and learns how to make similar changes in the future?

Overall then the understanding of the nature of change is an influencing factor in successfully implementing and monitoring change. Since it is the middle manager’s responsibility to monitor the change, the manager’s lack of understanding regarding change could negatively influence the relationship with the consultant, as well as negatively influence the implementation of the changes.

"Above All Else, Do No Harm"

Many people in the business world are still very skeptical about the true value of consulting. Frequently it appears that the only people approving of the idea of engaging consultants are the CEOs. For top management, consultants are the ones who will take care of a problem they do not know how to handle. For middle managers as well as employees the announcement that a consultant will be brought in for help and advice is very likely not joyful news.
'Consultants are people who borrow your watch to tell you the time,' is a sarcastic description of what some people think of the worth of a consultant. The establishment of such a low opinion of consultants is reflected in various articles that have been published in business magazines. For example, International Management published an article titled "How to survive an external consultant." In this article the author, Clutterbuck (1982) suggested to the reader that there are several ways to manipulate and 'effectively' handle external consultants to limit the damage and the changes the consultant can make. The objective, according to Clutterbuck is to 'hang in there' until it is time for the consultant to leave again. According to Wood (1983), a survey of management consultant clients showed that managers believed consultants to be, among other things, "failed practitioners with no proven record of achievement" and not "practical within the realities of the market place" (p.42). In their management textbook Reframing Organizations, Bolman and Deal (1997) write "Sometimes the consultants are more hindrance than help. More than a few managers wish that the Hippocratic injunction ("Above all else, do no harm") applied as much to consultants as to physicians" (p. 9). Surely such
publications do nothing to improve the image that some managers have of consultants.

This notion of a love-hate relationship between the client/manager and the consultant has not gone unnoticed among I/O psychologists. For example, Gable (1996) writes that, "often the relationship between clients and external consultants is perceived as one of protagonist versus antagonist" (p.1175).

The important question that arises from this literature review is whether or not such a poor reputation can influence client satisfaction. Is it possible that a manager, by being aware of the negative reputation I/O consultants have, will be aversely influenced when being asked to work with a consultant? This question becomes even more pertinent in light of the findings by Patterson et al. (1997), that the expectations of a client (for us the manager) has a more powerful influence on the development of client satisfaction/dissatisfaction than the performance of the consultant.
Cynicism - Result of and Fuel for Failure

Many organizations involve themselves in an abundance of improvement activities which, being without professional guidance, on the bottom line, do not show results (Kotter, 1995; Schaffer & Thomson, 1992). It is the experience of such failures that will make employees wary as well as uncooperative when the next improvement changes are announced. And, engaging a consultant means that change in a department or organization is expected to follow. Support for the idea that failed change activities will tire out employees can be found in research pertaining to cynicism and organizational change.

According to Reichers, Wanous, and Austin (1997) cynicism about change will occur if employees have prior experience with several failed change attempts. Reichers et al. (1997) interviewed 120 managers and employees as a prelude to an empirical study about cynicism and organizational change. They found that many of the interviewees carried an attitude of disbelief, stating that whatever the researchers had planned will fail just as all the other projects had failed. Individuals who predicted failure in Reichers et al. (1997) research project described how they had witnessed the failure of so
many other change efforts. These findings were part of a larger study in which Reichers et al. (1997) surveyed employees of a Fortune 500 firm, which was in need of several organizational improvements. The employees were surveyed before and after a change intervention about several issues, including individual levels of cynicism.

Reichers et al. (1997) developed an eight-item scale to measure employees' cynicism about organizational change. The cynicism scale asks respondents to either agree or disagree with such items as "Plans for future improvement won't amount to much," or "Suggestions on how to solve problems won't produce much real change" (p.57).

The researchers found more cynicism among employees than managers, not surprising because the wording of the cynicism items targets managerial behaviors; results also indicated that employees who did not feel informed and involved in the change process were more cynical about the success of the change. Thus, managers who think that the consultants were brought into the organization without their informed consent have the potential to be cynical about the change project. And, being cynical about proposed changes, according to Reichers et al. (1997) leads to self-fulfilling prophecy. Believing that the intervention or changes will not work will result in
failure of such. Further, although open refusal to cooperate with the consultant could lead to endangering their position, managers still could show passive resistance. There are many forms of passive resistance, cynicism being only one example. The importance of considering a manager's level of cynicism towards organizational change is supported by the work of Agocs (1997).

In the research article *Institutionalized resistance to organizational change: Denial, Inaction and Repression* Agocs (1997) describes how certain behaviors and actions of decision makers can undermine the success of change implementations. Agocs defines institutional resistance as a “pattern of organizational behavior that decision makers in organizations employ to actively deny, reject, refuse to implement, repress or even dismantle change proposals and initiatives” (46). Thus, according to Agocs, employees who, for example feel threatened by a change or do not believe in the success of a change, can and will undermine the success of a change project.

The purpose of this literature review, concluding with research findings pertaining to cynicism, has been to explore factors that may influence client satisfaction as perceived by the middle manager when required to work with
an external consultant. Although the models developed by Gable (1996) and Patterson et al. (1997) both offer insightful views on the development of business-to-business client satisfaction of professional services there still remain many other influencing factors which neither model directly addresses. Factors which have not been directly addressed in connection with client satisfaction as perceived by a middle manager are change management skills, negative expectations of the manager through hearsay, client/consultant relationship and cynicism. As seen in the above reviewed research findings there is however supporting evidence that the nature of the client-consultant relationship, the manager's cynicism and negative expectations through hearsay, as well as the managers change skills need to be examined for their potential to influence client satisfaction.
Model of Moderating Factors of Client Satisfaction as Perceived by a Manager

Based on the reviewed literature the following model (Figure 1) was proposed to test the influence of the manager-consultant relationship, the managers change management skills, negative expectations (hearsay), and cynicism on client satisfaction as perceived by the manager.

Figure 1. Model of Moderating Factors of Client Satisfaction as Perceived by a Manager
The influences of the four variables on client satisfaction were predicted as follows: Negative expectations was proposed to have a negative effect on client satisfaction. Thus, if the manager was aware and influenced by the poor reputation of consultants reflected in the literature, the manager may have a lower degree of client satisfaction. Cynicism was proposed to have a negative effect on a manager's client satisfaction. Cynical managers, that is, managers who believe that the planned implementations will not change anything in their department or the organization, will be associated with less perceived client satisfaction. Relationship with consultant is proposed to have either a negative or positive influence on client satisfaction depending on how the relationship is experienced by the manager. Change management skills of the manager are proposed to have either a negative or positive influence on client satisfaction depending on the level of understanding the manager has.

Further, the model proposes the following relationships between the factors: Negative expectations and cynicism are proposed to covary together depending on the strength of each factor. Hence, very cynical managers would be more susceptible to the hearsay of an I/O
consultant's poor reputation, and managers holding strong negative expectations due to hearsay could be more likely to be cynical. Cynicism is proposed to covary with the relationship with the consultant. Cynical managers will be less likely to trust consultant and as a result experience difficulties in building a positive working relationship with the consultant. Relationship with the consultant and negative expectations are proposed to covary together. Managers with strong negative expectations may experience difficulties in building a trusting working relationship with the consultant. On the other hand, a positive or negative working relationship experience with the consultant may override any negative beliefs the manager has about consultants. Relationship with consultant and change management skills are proposed to covary together. Thus, managers with high change management skills will have an easier time forming a positive relationship with the consultant. Also, a good relationship with the consultant may result in an increase in change management skills since the manager may learn more about change through a good understanding with the consultant.

Last, it is proposed that client satisfaction will influence engagement success. Low client satisfaction
will lead to the failure of the change implementations, that is, a lack of engagement success.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Population

Target participants of this survey study were managers who had working experience with an external consultant. Potential participants were approached through work place and peer contacts as well as though networking. The major criterion for inclusion in the study was that the manager had worked with a consultant and had been responsible for the resulting change implementation. Based on the afore-mentioned method of contacting participants, this study’s sample constituted a nonprobabilistic convenience sample.

Ninety managers, 43 women and 47 men, participated in the study (see Table 1). All participants held positions in lower (n=32), middle (n=35) or executive management (n=22), supervising between one and 500 employees. The average manager supervised 43 employees and had been employed in a managerial position anywhere between one and 40 years. The majority of the respondents (78%) had either a Bachelor or a Masters degree, while 14% of the respondents held a Doctorate degree, and 8% had completed high school or an Associates degree.
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents (N=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Male: n=47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: n=43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Management Position:</td>
<td>Lower: n=32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle: n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive: n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td>High School: n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates: n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor: n=33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters: n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate: n=12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' organizations were of a variety of sizes, in several different industries. The majority of the managers in the study were employed in manufacturing (20%), health and human services (17%), the government (21%), financial industry (15%) or in education and training (12%). While 14% of the respondents worked for organizations employing 300 employees, the majority of the respondents (86%) were employed in organizations varying in size anywhere between 2 and 35,000 employees.

The most predominant types of consulting services the managers received were in the areas of organizational restructuring, computer technology, management and strategic planning (see Table 2).
Twenty-nine managers reported that at the time of the survey completion, the change implementation was still in progress. Twenty-four of the respondents indicated that the change implementation took place more than one year ago. The remainder of the managers (n=36) reported that the change implementation had been completed anywhere between one and twelve months ago. Eighty-four percent of the managers spent between one and twelve hours per week working with the consultant.

All respondents were asked to complete a survey instrument created specifically for this study. To assess the reliability and validity of the instrument as well as to uncover any possible misconceptions, the survey was pilot tested on a small sample of students at California State University San Bernardino. An analysis of the descriptives as well as a reliability analysis of the scales in the survey revealed no problems or inconsistencies. The reliability scores of all scales
indicated high internal validity and reliability (see Table 3).

Table 3. Pilot Test Scale Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Relationship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Consultant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Success</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the pilot test results indicated the need for some minor changes to the wording and formatting of some of the questions on the instrument. Question number one and sixty nine, were changed from open ended questions to closed ended questions, that allowed respondents to chose from set intervals rather than having to recall the requested information. On questions twenty and twenty-five the anchors were modified to more accurately describe the scale. Last, to be more specific question seventy was divided into two separate questions. These slight modifications were made before the final administration of the tool.
Procedure

A questionnaire entitled Survey of Managers Experiences in working with External Consultants and Managing Change was used to collect the research data. Using a non-probabilistic sampling method, respondents were solicited through peer and networking contacts. In accordance with Institutional Review Board regulations, each participant was informed of the purpose and voluntary nature of the survey prior to completion. Further, respondents were ensured that their responses would be kept strictly confidential. A stamped and self-addressed return envelope was provided with every questionnaire. Participants, if interested, were also offered the possibility of receiving a copy of the research findings once the study had been completed.

Measures

Participant and situation characteristics were measured by using a survey instrument consisting of 71 items in a total of six scales. The first six closed-ended questions of the instrument addressed the characteristics of the situation surrounding the change implementation. Respondents were asked to provide information on issues such as who initiated the first
contact with the consultant and how much time the manager spent working with the consultant. The respondents’ overall perception in regard to their working relationship with the consultant was measured though a seven-item scale. The development of this scale was based on research findings pertaining to trust and successful client-consultant working relationships. Choosing from a five-point rating scale, managers were asked to rate various different aspects of their working relationship with the consultant. The managers’ perceived client satisfaction was captured using a seven-item scale. Items for this client satisfaction measure were adopted from Gable’s Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (1996). Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with such issues as fees charged, recommended solutions, and overall services provided by the consultant. The engagement success of the change implementation was measures using three questions pertaining to the influence the changes had on the productivity of the of the managers’ department. Again, respondents were asked to provide feedback using a five-point rating scale. To assess the respondents’ level of cynicism, the Measure of Cynicism about Organizational Change Scale, developed by Reichers et al. (1997), was
used. The scale consisted of eight Agree/Disagree dichotomous items to measure employees’ cynicism about organizational change. The cynicism scale asked respondents to agree or disagree, with such items as “Plans for future improvement won’t amount to much,” or “Suggestions on how to solve problems won’t produce much real change.” To maximize variability for this study the cynicism scales expanded to a five point Likert scale with Agree/Disagree anchors. To assess the managers’ beliefs regarding consultants prior to the establishment of the working relationship a five-item scale was developed. This scale followed the five-point agree/disagree format.

The managers’ skill and knowledge in the area of change implementation and management was identified using the Management Change Questionnaire (MCQ) developed by Burke (1996). The MCQ instrument is a 25 item, true/false questionnaire composed of six dimensions pertaining to the nature of change. The survey concluded with eight closed-ended questions addressing respondent demographic information.

All six scales used in the questionnaire were found to be reliable measures of their constructs (see Table 4).
As seen in Table 4, the Management Change Questionnaire had the lowest alpha (a=.47) of the six scales in the questionnaire. However, this result is in alignment with the findings of the publishers of this scale, Church, Waclawiski and Burke (1996), who described their instrument as having a "reasonably defensible" content validity (p.33). Since this study’s finding is in alignment with the publishers, the data collected through the Managing Change Scale was included in this analysis.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Prior to testing the model, all variables were scanned for missing values and incorrect data entry. Using SPSS programs, descriptive statistics were run, the reliability and validity of the scales were assessed, and the data were scanned for univariate outliers. No outliers or irregularities were found.

Using AMOS (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999), the relationships between the two observed endogenous variables, Implementation Success and Client Satisfaction, were examined. Further, the predictive validity of Negative Expectations, Cynicism, Perceived Relationship, and Management Change Skills on Client Satisfaction was examined. Included in the analysis was the evaluation of interactions between the observed exogenous variables Negative Expectations and Cynicism, Negative Expectations and Perceived Relationships, Cynicism and Perceived Relationships and Perceived Relationships with Management Change Skills. The hypothesized model is illustrated in Figure 1.

The independence model testing the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated from one another could be
rejected, $\chi^2(21, N=90) = 1479.4, p < .05$. The hypothesized model was tested and found to be non-significant. A chi-square difference test shows reasonable support that there is a fit between the independence model and the hypothesized model $\chi^2(5, N=90) = 8.690, p = 0.122$. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) for the hypothesized model is CFI = .99. Fifty-three percent of the variance in the Implementation Success construct is accounted for by its predictor. Forty-nine percent of the construct Satisfaction With Change is accounted for by its predictors. The final model with significant coefficients presented in standardized form is shown in Figure 2.

Negative Expectations and Cynicism were found to be significantly related (correlation coefficient = .39, $p < .01$). Negative Expectations and Perceived Relationship were found to have a significant negative relationship (correlation coefficient = -.54, $p < .01$). As Negative Expectations of the manager increase or decrease, the state of perceived relationship with the consultant will either decrease or increase. A manager's level of Cynicism was also found to have a significant negative relationship to the Perceived Relationship with the consultant (correlation coefficient = -.27, $p < .05$). The
relationship between the Perceived Relationship with the consultant and a manager's Management Change Skills was not found to be significant. For a list of all implied correlation estimates see Table 5, Model Correlations.

Figure 2. Final Model - Moderating Factors of Client Satisfaction as Perceived by a Manager

χ² model(5, N=90) = 8.690
p=0.122

*=Significant at p<.05, **=Significant at p<.01
Table 5. Model Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mngmnt Change Skills</th>
<th>Prcvd Rel</th>
<th>Cyn</th>
<th>Neg Exp</th>
<th>Impl Success</th>
<th>Satisf With Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mngmnt Change Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prcvd Rel</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyn</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg Exp</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impl Success</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisf With Change</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*=Significant at p<.05, **=Significant at p<.01)

Additional Analysis

In order to get a more in-depth look at some of the factors at work in this model, relationships between several variables and demographics were examined using Pearson correlations in SPSS. Of these relationships that were examined, several proved to be significant.

Implementation Success (r=-.317, p<0.001), Satisfaction with Change (r=-.424, p<0.001) and the Perceived Relationship with the consultant (r=-.278, p<0.05) were
found to be negatively related to whether or not the manager felt that the change project was something he or she could have done without the help of a consultant. The amount of time a consultant was reported to have spent on site was found to be negatively related to the Negative Beliefs the manager reported to hold about consultants (r = -.365, p<0.001). On the other hand, the amount of time the consultant spent on site was positively related to a manager’s rating on the Perceived Relationship with the consultant (r = .375, p<0.001). Lastly, a manager’s level of cynicism and the years a manager has been employed in a managerial position were found to be positively related (r = .282, p<0.05).
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study had been to examine various influences on a manager's client satisfaction when working with an external consultant as well as how client satisfaction could influence the outcome of the change implementation. The influence of the four variables Negative Expectation, a manager's level of Cynicism, the manager's Perceived Relationship with the consultant, and the manager's Management Change Skills was addressed. As proposed, the four variables influenced a manager's overall satisfaction with the change implementation. Not surprisingly the manager's perception of the working relationship with the consultant had the greatest influence on Satisfaction with Change. These findings echo those of prior studies (Hamilton, 1988; McGivern, 1993; Mishra & Morrissey, 1990) that client-consultant working relationships greatly influence the client's overall satisfaction. Although the influence of Negative Expectations, Cynicism, and Management Change Skills are not significant influences on the manager's Satisfaction with Change, two of these variables, Negative Expectations and Cynicism, are significantly related to the variable
Perceived Relationship. This suggests the possibility that these two variables work in conjunction with Perceived Relationship to impact the managers overall satisfaction with the change implementation. Perceived Relationship is negatively correlated to both Cynicism and Negative Expectations indicating that manager's with higher levels of cynicism towards change will perceive their relationship with the consultant to be less than productive. Additionally, managers with higher Negative Expectations about working with a consultant may perceive their working relationship to be less favorable. This suggests the possibility that managers who are cynical and have negative expectations may be less likely to be satisfied with change implementations.

Unfortunately no significant relationship between Perceived Relationship and a manager's change implementation skills was found. This leads to the speculation that the attitudes of a manager play a more important role in the outcome of client satisfaction than does a manager's skill level and knowledge in change management. Strong negative attitudes are more damaging to client satisfaction than a manager's lack of skill in change management.
In addition to looking at manager's attitudes, skills and relationships with consultants and how these factors influences their client satisfaction, this study looked at how satisfaction and implementation success influence each other. Manager Satisfaction with the overall Change significantly influences the implementation success of the change. Greater satisfaction with the overall change will increase the likelihood of the manager considering the change implementation to be successful. On the other hand, managers who are less satisfied with the overall change experience will perceive the implementation to be less successful. Conversely, the success of the change implementation was not found to significantly impact the managers' satisfaction with the change process. This result leads to the speculation that attitude is more important in client satisfaction than results or that attitude may color a manager's perception or interpretation of the results. This conclusion is further supported by the finding that managers who thought they could have handled the change project without a consultant's services, were less likely to indicate satisfaction with the change as well as the success of the implementation.
Last, since the client-consultant relationship has such a significant influence on the managers overall satisfaction and satisfaction in return strongly influences the perceived implementation success, one might conclude that the relationship is an important factor in the overall success of the change implementation. Through their influence on the client-consultant relationship, negative expectations and cynicism then could be inferred to have an influence on the success of the change implementation. Management Change Skills, however, may not have an influence on the outcome of the change implementation.

Further support for the importance of the client-consultant relationship can be found in the results from the additional analysis that examined variables and demographics. One such supporting finding was that the amount of time the consultant spent on site working with the client significantly improved the manager’s perception of the working relationship with the consultant. Additionally, managers who employed consultants that spent more time on site, reported significantly reduced negative beliefs about consultants. In conclusion, this study concurs with findings in the literature that the client-consultant relationship is a determining factor in the
outcome of the consulting process and thus the success of the change implementation.

Limitations

Several limitations impacted the results of this study. As with every survey study, this research relied on the respondent's self-reports and perceptions to draw conclusions. There is no way to confirm the accuracy of the respondents' answers. Further, considering the investment in time and money that change implementations require, it is quite possible that respondents' answers to the questionnaire could have been influenced by a desire to rationalize the great expenditures of resources involved in these types of efforts. Given the fact that this research data was collected via a survey, there is the possibility that the respondent population was self-selected. Thus, there could be underlying factors influencing all respondents who chose to participate in the survey, that could have alter the nature of the data.

Another limitation of this research is the sampling method used. All respondents were recruited through peer and college networks rather than through random sampling. Peers most likely would not select their greatest adversaries to complete surveys, but rather select
managers with whom they had good working relationships and felt comfortable approaching. This means of collecting data could have an impact on the results.

The less than desired internal reliability of the Managing Change Skill questionnaire could have also influenced the outcome of this study. Had a scale of stronger internal validity been used, the influence of knowledge about change could have been assessed more accurately. Along those same lines, some of the other scales could have been expanded to measure the underlying constructs more thoroughly. The amount of time required to complete the questionnaire was a major driver in the development of the tool. As a result the scales were kept short.

Future research may want to focus on further analyzing the various aspects that influence the client-consultant relationship. Another aspect that warrants more attention is the importance of the manager's change implementation skills on the change implementation outcome. Also left unanswered by this study is the question of how any of the demographic variables influence client satisfaction and implementation success. Ideally, this study should have used a true random sampling method to collect the data. For example, future studies may want
to randomly choose their respondents from membership lists of professional management organizations. Additionally, choosing target respondents from pools such as a list of Fortune 500 companies could improve the homogeneity of the sample.

Implications

The results of this study could guide future research by giving further insight into the dynamics of a change process when engaging an external consultant. Since I/O consultants undergo continuous efforts to improve the services offered to organizations, it is beneficial to understand how some of the factors examined in this study influence the consulting process and outcome. Managers could use these research findings to improve their awareness of what will influence their efforts in successfully completing and evaluating change implementations. When studying the return on investments of change implementations, it is helpful to know that the attitudes and perceptions of the change agent towards the consultant strongly drive their opinion of the outcome.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX:
Survey of Managers Experiences in Working with External Consultants and Managing Change

Prior to answering our questions regarding your experiences in working with external consultants and managing change, we would like to get to know the circumstances of the change implementation better.

1. How long ago did this change implementation aided by a consultant which you participated in take place?
   (please choose one)
   - □ change implementation is still in progress
   - □ less than one month
   - □ 1-2 months
   - □ 3-4 months
   - □ 4-5 months
   - □ 6-8 months
   - □ 9-12 months
   - □ more than one year

2. What type of consulting did you receive from the consultant?
   - □ Organizational Structuring
   - □ Management
   - □ Communication/Computer
   - □ Strategic
   - □ Performance
   - □ Other (Please specify)

3. What was the duration of your working relationship with the consultant? ______ Months

4. How much time did the consultant spend on site? ______ Hours per week

5. How much of that time did the consultant spend working with you? ______ Hours per week

6. How did this working with a consultant come about?
   - □ My supervisor arranged for the consultant to come into my department due to my request.
   - □ My supervisor arranged for the consultant to come into my department without my requesting help.
   - □ I solicited the help of the external consultant.
   - □ Other (Please specify): __________________________________________________
Please tell us more about your relationship with the consultant: (circle one of the options)

7. Did you feel you were able to participate in the decision making process when planning the intervention?  
   **Always** 1 2 3 4 5 **Rarely**

8. Did you feel that the consultant shared critical information with you?  
   **Always** 1 2 3 4 5 **Rarely**

9. How flexible was the consultant in modifying implementation plans in accordance to your needs?  
   **Very flexible** 1 2 3 4 5 **Very inflexible**

10. How would you rate the level of communication between yourself and the consultant?  
    **Very open/talked freely** 1 2 3 4 5 **Inhibited, only talked about the bare necessities**

11. Did you perceive the consultant to be honest in the advice and help he/she gave you?  
    **Very honest** 1 2 3 4 5 **Very dishonest**

12. How would you rate your trust in the consultant?  
    **Very high** 1 2 3 4 5 **Very low**

13. How would you rate your working relationship with the consultant?  
    **Very successful** 1 2 3 4 5 **Very unsuccessful**

Please tell us more about your client satisfaction with the consultant: (circle one of the options)

14. How do you feel about the fees charged by the consultant?  
    **Reasonable** 1 2 3 4 5 **Unreasonable**

15. Was the total cost of the consultants recommended implementation more or less than the original estimate?  
    **Much more** 1 2 3 4 5 **Much less**
16. How well do you feel that the solutions recommended by the consultant satisfy your needs?

17. Did the recommended implementation turn out to be more or less complex than the consultant had indicated at the beginning of the project?

18. Was the actual duration of the project more or less than the consultant's initial estimate?

19. How confident are you in the consultant's recommendations?

20. What value do you place on the consultant's recommendations overall?

21. What value do you place on the consultant's services overall?

22. Taking everything into consideration, how satisfied are you with the outcome of the change implementation?

Please tell us more about the success of the change implementation: (circle one of the options)

23. How would you rate the change improvement overall?

24. The results from the change improvement so far have been:

25. Based on the changes your department now is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poorly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High confidence</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More productive</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More unproductive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the level at which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: (circle one of the options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Most of the programs that are proposed to solve problems around here don't do much good.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The people who are responsible for solving problems around here don't try hard enough to solve them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Attempts to make things better around here won't produce good results.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The people who are responsible for making improvements around here don't know enough about what they are doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Suggestions on how to solve problems won't produce much real change.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The people who are responsible for making things better around here don't care enough about their jobs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Plans for future improvement won't amount to much.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The people who are responsible for solving problems around here don't have the skills needed to do their jobs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please recall your beliefs regarding consultants prior to your working relationship with an external consultant. To what degree would you agree or disagree with the following statements? (circle one of the options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Based on what I had heard from coworkers, working with a consultant would be difficult.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. All that consultants did was to help make things more difficult.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Consultants thought they were superior to managers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. Consultants were failed business people who could only give advice but not achieve goals.

38. Consultants had no knowledge about how things in the "real" business world worked.

The following statements pertain to the nature of change in organizations. Please read each statement carefully and then indicate whether you believe the statement to be true or false: (circle one of the options)

39. People invariably resist change. True False

40. The articulation of the organization's future state by its leaders is one of the most important aspects of a successful change effort. True False

41. The most difficult aspect of any change effort is the determination of the vision for the future state. True False

42. In any change effort, communicating what will remain the same is as important as communicating what will be different. True False

43. Lacking freedom of choice about change usually provokes more resistance than change itself. True False

44. A highly effective, early step in managing change is to surface dissatisfaction with the current state. True False

45. A common error in managing change is providing more information about the process than is necessary. True False

46. As movement toward a new future begins, members of an organization need both time and opportunity to disengage from and grieve for the loss of the present state. True False
47. The planning of a change should be done by a small, knowledgeable group that communicates its plans on completion of this task. True False

48. Despite differences in organizational specifics, certain clear patterns typify all change efforts. True False

49. In any change effort, influencing people one-on-one is more effective than in small groups. True False

50. Managing resistance to change is more difficult than managing apathy about change. True False

51. Complaints about the change effort are often a sign of progress. True False

52. "Turf issues," both individual and group, are usually the greatest obstacle to systemic change. True False

53. The first question asked by most people about organizational change concerns the general nature of the future state. True False

54. Symbols, slogans, or acronyms that represent organizational change typically reduce the effectiveness of the effort rather than add to it. True False

55. Leaders find it more difficult to change organizational goals than to change the ways to reach those goals. True False

56. Successful change efforts typically require changing the reward systems to support the change. True False

57. With little information about the progress of a change effort people will typically think positively. True False

58. A change effort routinely should begin with modifications of the organization's structure. True False
59. The more members of an organization are involved in planning the change, the more they will be committed to the change effort.  True  False

60. A reduction in the organization's problems represents clear-cut evidence of progress in the change effort.  True  False

61. Organizational change is typically a response to external environmental pressures rather than internal management initiatives.  True  False

62. In managing change, the reduction of restraints or barriers to the achievement of the end state is more effective than increased pressure toward that end state.  True  False

63. Effective organizational change requires certain significant and dramatic steps or "leaps" rather than moderate incremental ones.  True  False

Last, please provide us with some background information:

64. How many employees do you supervise? _____

65. How many employees overall does your organization employ? _____

66. How would you categorize your organization?
   - [ ] Manufacturing
   - [ ] Transportation
   - [ ] Construction
   - [ ] Scientific and Technical Services
   - [ ] Finance and Insurance
   - [ ] Health and Human Services
   - [ ] Education and Training
   - [ ] Telecommunications and Computers
   - [ ] Government

67. How many years have you been employed in a managerial position? _____ Years
68. How would you describe your position? Please choose one:

☐ Lower level management
☐ Mid-level management
☐ Executive management
☐ Other (please specify)______________________________

69. Overall, do you feel that this change implementation is something you could have done by yourself without the help of an external consultant?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If your answer to question 69 was YES, which part specifically do you feel you could have done by yourself? Please mark all applicable.

☐ Diagnosis of the problem
☐ Development of change recommendation
☐ Development of change plan after diagnosis and recommendations were made
☐ Implementation of the changes
☐ Other (please specify)______________________________

70. What is your level of education?

☐ High School
☐ Associates
☐ Bachelor
☐ Masters
☐ Doctorate

71. Are you ☐ male or ☐ female?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses are greatly appreciated.

Please return this survey in the provided envelope to:
Jan Kottke, CSUSB, 5500 University Parkway, Jack Brown Hall, Room 263, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397.
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