

SHIFTING A SPORTS TEAM'S FRONT OFFICE CULTURE:
INTRODUCING ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT TO THE SPORTS INDUSTRY

Candace M. Younkins

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
October 2017

Copyright by
Candace Marie Younkens
2017

This project is dedicated to my husband, Jordan,
for his never-ending support, but most importantly for
believing in my dreams, and blending them so perfectly with his own.

Also, to our soon-to-be firstborn, who has been with me
on the last leg of this journey, and who has given us
a whole new purpose in life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Terry Beehr (chair and professor of psychology), Dr. Matthew Prewett (professor of psychology), and Dr. Kevin Love (professor of management). Their guidance, support, and invaluable advice has not only contributed to this project, but will stay with me for many years during my professional development. I would like to especially thank Terry, for both believing in me and for being a trusting advisor throughout my entire graduate school experience. I would also like to acknowledge Central Michigan University for providing me with an education that has not only allowed me to create a life I am proud of, but one that I love. It was the perfect playground for learning and growing, and Mount Pleasant will always hold a special place in my heart.

Of course, none of this would be possible if it were not for the love and support of my parents, Gary and Janine Younkings, who have always been my biggest cheerleaders. They have taught me the importance of hard work, finishing what you started, and always doing the right thing, and it is amazing what those three simple lessons have helped me to accomplish. I will forever be thankful for two parents who are not only role models on how to do life, but on how to raise children, the next lesson on my life's curriculum.

Lastly, I thank my partner in life, my husband and my rock, Jordan Wilson. The completion of this project would not have been possible if it was not for his support, and I will forever be thankful for his gentle push, his belief in me, and his belief in how this degree will play into our future. I cannot wait to see where this next adventure takes us, and I cannot imagine sitting next to anyone but him. Jordan, you make me better, and you make this ride fun! Thank you for loving me so well, and for being the world's greatest best friend.

ABSTRACT

SHIFTING A SPORTS TEAM'S FRONT OFFICE CULTURE: INTRODUCING ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT TO THE SPORTS INDUSTRY

by Candace M. Younkins

The sports industry has only now begun to take interest in organization development, and for the first time the present study examined how the introduction of organization development interventions impacted the evolution of a culture within the front office of a professional sports team. The culture change was studied using a mostly emic approach, as the study's author served as the OD practitioner during the interventions. Culture was measured with multiple methods, across multiple levels, and across four time periods in order to adequately measure Schein's three layers of culture: artifacts, values and cultural norms, and underlying assumptions. It was hypothesized that the overall culture would improve and evolve over time on each layer of culture, especially targeted features of the aspired culture, or the company's new ideology.

The study's findings indicate that cultural artifacts and underlying assumptions did significantly evolve over the course of the study, as evidenced by various methods of qualitative data. In addition, it was found that targeted areas of cultural norms also changed over time, although several areas were not evidenced to change on all quantitative measures or at all layers of culture. However, qualitative data and additional measures were able to provide support for these variables, as this study answered researchers' calls to utilize multiple methods to measure culture, including a return to qualitative data. There is evidence that the implementation of OD interventions significantly impacted the organization's culture, specifically by the evolution and shifting of its culture, and because this is the first study of its kind in the sports industry, there are numerous opportunities for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		viii
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Organizational Culture.....	2
	<i>Climate and Culture</i>	4
	<i>The Complicated History of Defining and Studying Culture</i>	7
	<i>Answering the Call to Evolve Culture Research</i>	11
	Organization Development	13
	Changing Culture	17
	The Present Study and Hypotheses.....	22
II.	METHODS	26
	Participants.....	26
	<i>First Dataset: Diagnostic Survey</i>	28
	<i>Second Dataset: Performance Management and Development</i>	
	<i>Planning Form</i>	28
	<i>Third Dataset: Culture Survey</i>	29
	Procedure	29
	<i>Treatment 1.1: Creation of New Company Mission, Vision, Structure,</i>	
	<i>and Ideology</i>	30
	<i>Treatment 1.2: Implementation of a Strategic Planning Process</i>	32
	<i>Treatment 1.3: Implementation of a Performance Management and</i>	
	<i>Development Planning Process</i>	32
	<i>Treatment 2.1: Implementation of a Customer Service and</i>	
	<i>Recognition Program</i>	33
	<i>Treatment 2.2: Implementation of Hiring Practices and Employer</i>	
	<i>Branding Representative of the Culture</i>	34
	<i>Treatment 2.3: Implementation of Events and Programming to</i>	
	<i>Celebrate Wins and Create Pride</i>	34
	<i>Treatment 3.1: Implementation of a Tightly Integrated Summer</i>	
	<i>Internship Program</i>	35
	<i>Treatment 3.2: Implementation of Company-wide Knowledge-Sharing</i>	
	<i>Seminars</i>	35
	<i>Treatment 3.3: Implementation of Meeting Structure and Process to</i>	
	<i>Target Better Collaboration</i>	36
	Measures	37
	<i>Cultural Artifacts</i>	37
	<i>Cultural Underlying Assumptions</i>	37
	<i>Cultural Norms and Values</i>	38
	<i>Demographics</i>	39

Analysis.....	39
<i>Hypothesis 1</i>	40
<i>Hypothesis 2</i>	40
<i>Hypothesis 3</i>	41
<i>Exploratory Question</i>	42
III. RESULTS	43
Hypothesis 1.....	43
Hypothesis 2.....	49
Hypothesis 3.....	61
<i>Performance Scores on the Target Areas of the Ideology</i>	61
<i>Past Performance Scores</i>	76
<i>Attrition and Accretion</i>	77
Exploratory Question	79
IV. DISCUSSION	85
Future Research	89
Limitations	90
Implications.....	92
APPENDICES	94
REFERENCES	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. <i>Cultural Artifact Observations: Time 1, Time 4</i>	44
2. <i>Diagnostic Survey Results: Time 1, Time 4</i>	50
3. <i>Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4</i>	53
4. <i>Employee Development Goals: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4</i>	59
5. <i>Employee Development Goals – Top Theme Examples: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4</i>	60
6. <i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables</i>	62
7. <i>Means and Standard Deviations for Performance Scores on Ideology Target Areas</i>	72
8. <i>Employee Commitments: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4</i>	78
9. <i>Means and Standard Deviations for Culture Survey Dimensions</i>	79
10. <i>Culture Survey Results: Time 3, Time 4</i>	81
11. <i>Culture Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 3, Time 4</i>	83

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

We are constantly surrounded by and immersed in organizations. We are born in them, we learn in them, and we work for them. Jeffrey Pfeffer may have said it best when he wrote:

“We live in an organizational world. Most of us are born in an organization (a hospital) and our very existence is ratified by a government agency that issues a certificate documenting our birth. When we die, a death certificate will be issued by another public bureaucracy and our passing may be announced in a newspaper organization. And during the time in between, more than 90 percent of individuals living in the United States will earn their livelihoods working for an organization... having been prepared for employment through schooling in educational organizations” (Pfeffer, 1998, p.733).

It should be no surprise then that we have spent so much time studying them. From Frederick Taylor’s scientific management in the 1880s, Gilbreath’s time and motion studies and Mayo’s Hawthorne studies in the early 1900s, and then Kurt Lewin and the growing popularity of organizational psychology following World War II, we have been obsessed with understanding how we impact organizations and how they impact us (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008; Katzell & Austin, 1992; Pfeffer, 1998). Even now in the 21st century, the fascination still hasn’t waned.

Despite its deep roots in American factories, industrial and organizational psychologists have been urged for years to narrow the practitioner-researcher divide in their field (Anderson, Herriot, Hodgkinson, 2001; Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). In particular, they have been encouraged to take multidisciplinary approaches and to proliferate theories and methods (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008; Pfeffer, 1998), and this is especially true in organizational culture research (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996). The current study attempts to play a role in bridging the practitioner-researcher gap by taking organizational development principles based on empirical research findings, introducing them into an organization (and its industry) for the first time, and in turn, studying that organization and blending its findings back into the organizational culture

literature. In addition, the organization in this study has two attributes that are largely underrepresented in research: It measures culture with multiple methods and at multiple levels, and it takes place in the front office of a professional sports team.

Though this study's setting will add to the literature in a unique way, it will also answer calls to re-address some of the most studied topics of organizational psychology: organizational culture (e.g., Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996; Schein, 2010) and organizational change (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Schein, 2000). Sports organizations are particularly susceptible to a great deal of change. This is of course true with the sports team itself, as coaches and players can change teams quite frequently, but this can also be the case in the front office. Regardless of whether change is planned by them, or when it happens to them, sports organizations have historically handled change on their own, with little or no application from organizational psychology. The team in this study was in the midst of a culture shift during the study period, but it is one of the first professional sports organization to strategically select and hire an organizational psychologist to implement organizational development initiatives to help manage the change. To understand how this organization is changing its culture through organizational development, it is first necessary to understand the intricacies of both organizational culture and organizational development before we can understand how they can work together to create and manage change.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture has grown increasingly important both in American companies and in research over the past 30 years, and it is difficult to ignore the praise that some of the most well-known companies have received for their cultures, such as Facebook, Google, Nike, Southwest, and others. Though there is little disagreement about its importance, the culture

literature has recently undergone a heavy critique, even leading to the argument that researchers lack a unified approach to understanding the topic because of the many ways to define and measure the construct (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). While this may be true, most definitions of culture do include the following components: a shared collection of values, beliefs, and assumptions that guide behavior and define norms and expectations for the attitudes and behaviors that are appropriate, and implying a level of social control and influence (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Denison, 1996; Schein, 1990; 2010; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Additionally, most researchers accept Schein's (1985) three levels of organizational culture: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and underlying assumptions, and even recent support has continued to back it as a viable model (Hogan & Coote, 2014).

This multi-layered view of culture helps researchers and practitioners to not only understand the construct more completely, but it also aids in cultural analyses, with each facet differing on how it can be observed. At the most surface level lay artifacts, which represent the company's rituals, language, how people address each other, myths, dress, and the smell and feel of the place, including the physical aspects of the organization, such as its décor, space arrangements, and noise levels (Schein, 1990; 2010). Artifacts can be quite easy to observe, but at the same time they are difficult to analyze as they leave much up to the interpreter—an outsider (and even some insiders) has no way of knowing what artifacts represent culturally, if anything, especially if the connection to underlying assumptions is not clear.

The next layer, espoused beliefs and values, refer to documented values, norms, ideologies, charters, and philosophies that tell organizational members what is important in the organization and what deserves their attention (Schein, 2010). They can also be unwritten rules of behavior on what it is okay and not okay to do, as sometimes the written rules may or may not

reflect reality in the organization for members (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Generally, a culture's beliefs and values can be studied through interviews, questionnaires, or surveys, although there is some debate on which method is most appropriate, as later discussed.

Basic assumptions are the deepest level of cultural awareness, as they are often taken for granted, ingrained, and unconscious assumptions of why things are the way they are. They tell organizational members how to perceive, think, feel, and how to solve problems (Schein, 2010; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Because of the subconscious nature of these assumptions, they are usually not easily articulated, and they require intense and in-depth observation, with focused interviewing questions. However, once the assumptions are understood, it becomes much easier to go back and decipher the implicit theories behind the artifacts and observable behavior of culture.

Despite the work that has been done on Schein's layered approach to culture, and its general acceptance, it has been argued that culture theory in general has not been able to adequately develop over the past 30 to 40 years due to variations in definitions, construct validity issues, and measurement debates (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). There have been numerous calls to evolve the future research of culture, but to do this effectively, it is essential to first understand its complicated past.

Climate and Culture

When discussing the history of organizational culture, it is impossible to ignore its predecessor, and at times competitor, organizational climate. In fact, researchers have been struggling with both issues since the early 1980's, so it is important to discuss the difference between the two, why it matters, and why it perhaps does not. Fortunately, the literatures of both constructs have been thoroughly compared and contrasted on several occasions (e.g., Chatman &

O'Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2003; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013).

Referring to researchers' strong desire to differentiate the two constructs, Schwartz and Davis (1981) said, "one way to understand culture is to understand what it is not" (p. 32). This was particularly true as culture began its strong emergence into the literature in the 1980s, while climate had long dominated the early research in the 1960s and 1970s. For years, the histories of the two constructs haunted researchers, and set the tone on constantly differentiating and debating the two.

Climate's roots originally stem from Lewin's field studies of experimentally created social climates (Lewin, 1951; Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939), but it was Litwin and Stringer's (1968) paper that really birthed the construct by labeling *autonomy*, *organizational structure*, *conflict*, and *employee concern* as climate, in regard to how it affected motivation and behavior. More broadly, climate has been defined in the literature as shared perceptions of an organization's policies, practices, and procedures, and the behaviors that are rewarded, supported, and expected (Schneider, Erhart, & Macey, 2013). While it has been argued that perhaps the two constructs are more closely related than distinct (Denison, 1996; Schein, 2010; Schneider, et al., 2013), there are some important differences with how climate and culture are assessed. Both build a foundation on shared perceptions and meaning, but climate tends to focus more on collecting and aggregating individuals' own perceptions of their work and organization in order to create a shared meaning, whereas culture research is meant to focus on expected attitudes and behaviors (or norms) that are collected from informants asked to describe these attitudes and behaviors of organizational members, not just their own perception of certain aspects of work (Chatman, 1989; Schneider et al., 2013).

According to Denison (1996), “climate conveniently neglects the process by which the social environment is constructed by the individual members it comprises” (p. 635). Instead, climate places more emphasis on how social environments are *experienced* by actors (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968), rather than *created* by actors, as would be interpreted in culture research (Schein, 2010). In general, culture delves deeper than climate, and it has an element of social control in that it can tell people how to act or not act, whereas climate just describes the current situation and work attributes (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996). In other words, climate describes, and culture goes deeper to explain what you are seeing and why. In fact, climate has been viewed as both an artifact and an outcome of culture (Ehrhart, Schneider, & Macey, 2014; Schein, 2010), and Schein proposes that if the deeper cultural assumptions are not checked along with the surface level measures (climate), then it cannot be clear what any subsequent correlations are based on.

However, it has also been thought that climate can provide the behavioral evidence for the culture of a setting, such that those behaviors form the basis for employees’ conclusions about the underlying values and beliefs that characterize their organization. In fact, it has even been proposed that in order to fully understand what goes on in organizations and why, we need several constructs, and that climate and culture could act as building blocks to one another and that their literatures should be more explicitly integrated in future research (Denison, 1996; Schein, 2010; Schneider, et al., 2013).

The Complicated History of Defining and Studying Culture

Before the great debate of climate and culture took over much of the literature, culture came onto the scene and quickly gained an audience. Pettigrew (1979) introduced the topic to organizational studies by demonstrating how the field could benefit from studying beliefs, ideology, language, rituals, and stories, and this grew a large interest not only from researchers, but also from practitioners and managers. As it became more understood how important culture is to an organization, consulting businesses boomed with culture projects for clients, and soon followed by many books published on how to manage culture (e.g., Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Collins & Porras, 1994; Coyle, 2018; Peters & Waterman, 1982). However, as applied work ramped up, academics slowed down due to the literature becoming flooded with inconsistent definitions of culture (Chatman & O'Reilly 2016), and various measures that were often created as consulting tools, and not subjected to rigorous methods and testing (Schneider, Erhart, & Macey, 2013). Researchers felt like everything was being labeled “culture” (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Schein, 2010), and this only added to the confusion of studying it. Not only were researchers tasked with determining if they were studying culture or climate, but they now had to tease through the various definitions and measures of culture.

In fact, the variations in measurement may be the most salient issue in studying culture, spurring yet another debate in the literature. With its roots in anthropology, book-length ethnographies laid the initial foundation for studying culture before emerging in organizational studies, but few have appeared since (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996). As I/O psychologists and consultants started studying culture, more quantitative measurements emerged, consistent with the individual difference methodologies favored in I/O psychology. The major

difference in the ways to measure culture can be found in the differences of emic and etic view of cultures.

The emic view of culture (or any phenomenon) can be said as taking the native's view, or one that comes from a deep immersion into an organization, over an extensive period of time, in order to study its culture using qualitative methods, as was done in those early ethnographies (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996). This deep immersion and time-intensive approach is said to be necessary because each organization's culture is viewed as unique, and it takes time for these unique beliefs and underlying assumptions to surface and be understood through case and field studies. This type of design best unearths Schein's deepest layer of culture – underlying assumptions and beliefs (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).

There have been some periodic calls for the return to an emic view when studying culture. Denison (1996) called for a return to organizational life, as it is understood by those who actually experience it, using the natural language that organizational members use to describe it. Additionally, Chatman and O'Reilly (2016) said that using a qualitative approach to studying culture, "can be most effectively used to augment a more systematic science of organizational culture by providing richer details and illustrations of assumptions at a deeper level than behaviors at the more observable level associated with various norms and values" (p. 206).

Nevertheless, a large amount of the literature constitutes studies taking the etic view of culture, which use the researcher's point of view and quantitative methods to find commonalities that can be compared across studies and help generalize findings across organizations (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Denison, 1996). This type of design best assesses Schein's second layer of culture, norms and values, by focusing on the behaviors that are driven by norms and values, but it rarely attempts to unearth underlying assumptions or beliefs (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).

Most quantitative studies of culture measure it against typologies and dimensions, often pre-determined. This method has been so popular in the history of measuring culture, that in 2009, over 70 different cultural diagnostic instruments were reported to exist in the literature (Jung et al., 2009). Recently though, these various forms of quantitative measures have been scrutinized, and at times, criticized.

In fact, Chatman and O'Reilly (2016) recently critiqued the four major quantitative measurements at length: the *Denison Organizational Culture Survey (DOCS)*; Denison & Neale, 1996), the Competing Values Framework's *Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)*; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981), the *Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI)*; Cooke & Rousseau, 1988), and the *Organizational Culture Profile (OCP)*; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). The measurements all use multiple dimensions, types, or styles; the overlying theme of the critiques warn of psychometric issues for all four measurements, such as socially desirable items and double-barreled items, as well as issues with construct validity, and their relationships with organizational effectiveness have reported mixed results (Hartnell, et al., 2011; Sackman, 2011).

In their critique, Chatman and O'Reilly (2016) noted that many of the dimensions seem more like measures of organizational effectiveness rather than cultural norms or underlying assumptions, and they argue that perhaps this is why these measures have found predictive validity with performance, but that we have yet to prove construct validity. In addition, when culture is measured using quantitative methods, it has also been thought to take on a strong resemblance to climate dimensions (Denison, 1996). Ironically, Denison himself created a matrix of various culture and climate studies, demonstrated that both types of research could be

similarly mapped to the following dimensions, and often times had the very same original label: structure, support, risk, cohesiveness, and outcome orientation.

Overall, and on various occasions, it has been concluded that the different definitions and diverse measures of culture have failed to allow studies to be compared and used to collectively describe culture, and because they are often based on different theories, this has slowed the development of the construct and paradigm (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Sackman, 2011). It is important to note that it is fair to have competing measurements, but the issue being argued is that they are not always measuring the same construct, and so even in quantitative research, it has still been difficult to compare across studies.

In addition, when it comes to predetermined dimensions, there is no guarantee that a measurement can exhaust the full possibility of dimensions (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016), or that the fixed dimensions are even relevant, which cannot be concluded until one has examined the deeper levels of culture (Schein, 1990). In addition, the analyses often look at individual dimensions and their independent effects, rather than multiple dimensions working together as a complex system with interactions (Ostroff & Schulte, 2014). And as Czarniawska-Joerges (1992) noted, "The phenomena are complex, so why do we persist in studying them with such simple methods? Or worse yet, contorting the phenomena through selective definition and proscriptive repartee until it becomes that which can only be legitimately 'seen' through a very selective set of lenses." (p. 66).

Despite its popularity, measuring culture with predetermined dimensions can also be problematic for applied work as well, as the vocabulary and labels used in such measures may be very different from those used by organizational members when describing their culture (Denison & Spreitzer, 1991). One way to correct for this is to develop dimensions empirically by

utilizing the specific cultural variables of the organization, although these idiosyncratic measures of culture come with issues of bias and little validation (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016), and make it hard or impossible to generalize results across studies and organizations.

Another solution is to revert back to qualitative assessments of verbal and written explanations, and an advantage to using an ethnographic approach like this is that researchers can train themselves to minimize the impact of bias, and cast a wide net while forming dimensions later, inductively (Schein, 2000). Even though these biases can never be completely controlled, it at least expands the opportunity to discover new dimensions and to use the language of the culture and organization being studied.

Answering the Call to Evolve Culture Research

Along with the fascination of studying organizations, we have been just as consumed with trying to understand their cultures, from both research and applied perspectives. However, despite all the attention culture has received, the research-practitioner divide has failed to narrow the way one might expect it to, but instead it has only grown further apart. Despite the debates and frustration within the literature, there is still strong agreement that culture is important and is still worthy of study, and worth focus from organizations as a way to gain competitive advantage. For example, even though there is questioning over organizational culture's construct validity, there has been some evidence for its predictive validity for organizational performance (Boyce et al., 2015), as well as outcomes such as job satisfaction and financial performance (Denison & Mishra, 1995). However, several reviews found it difficult to find consistent relationships with organizational performance outcomes, although they acknowledge support is growing (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011; Sackman, 2011; Wilderom et al., 2000).

Despite its complicated past, culture researchers have tried to learn from their mistakes and have made calls to continue culture research with improved strategies and methods. To address the construct validity issue, Schein (1996) called for culture research to be based on observable behaviors and a consistent definition of the construct, but that culture research should be applicable to practitioners' needs. In regards to measuring culture, Denison (1996) proposed to end the debate over measurement, and stated that multiple data sources and strategies should be utilized, and that only "eclectic forms of evidence" can help us understand such a complex topic as culture. Twenty years later, Chatman and O'Reilly (2016) made another call asking that "culture researchers should consider engaging in more full cycle research (Chatman & Flynn, 2003), using the full spectrum of research methodologies, including lab and field experiments, surveys, regression discontinuity analyses, simulations, and the creative use of archival data" (p. 220).

Just as the early researchers and practitioners realized the importance of studying culture, measuring it, and applying practices to influence it, so did the author of this study, despite facing a challenging past about how to do so effectively. However, whether we are measuring culture or climate, some combination of the two, or something else entirely, it seems we can all agree that culture and measuring it is messy, as are most real organizations. Anyone who has been a part of an organization, particularly one faced with change, knows the feeling of the pendulum, where the vibe of the organization is up one day, and perhaps down the next, or how the hiring or firing of just one individual can change the feel of the organization entirely. These moments are often unpredictable, change frequently, and can affect everyone in the organization differently.

As playing both practitioner and researcher on this project, reading research articles and reviews on the topic, it eventually became clear that academics have spent a great deal of time

arguing back and forth over the construct and methodologies, while it appeared that practitioners forged ahead on their own because it was a need that required addressing and required work to begin. This spiral has clearly continued, and rather than getting caught up in the semantics of culture and the debates surrounding it, the current study instead focuses on how organizational culture can be impacted by organizational development, and ultimately shifting towards its aspirational state/goals. It will attempt to answer the above calls for future culture research, in that it takes a mostly emic approach to studying culture, and the study's author assumed the role of an embedded participant-observer within the organization over an extensive period of time. However, this study also applies both qualitative and quantitative methodologies in order to study culture in various ways and at multiple angles in order to tell its holistic story, and it defines culture utilizing Schein's (1985) three-layer framework of artifacts, beliefs, values, and norms, and underlying assumptions.

Organization Development

Much like organizational culture, organization development (OD) has a history of multiple definitions (e.g., Beckhard, 1969; Beer, 1980; Burke, 1982; French, 1969) and variation in theory development (e.g., Cooperrider, 1990; Lewin, 1951; Frohman, Sashkin, & Kavanagh, 1976). The present study uses Cummings and Worley's (2005) guidance to view organization development as a set of processes that help organizations build the capacity to change by teaching and enabling its members to better assess and diagnose issues, and to address those and future issues, ultimately leading to a more effective organization, including financial gains, quality of products or services, quality of work life, and other signs of effectiveness. OD focuses on planned change and views an organization as a system with many moving parts, that is affected by its environment, has multiple layers of interactions inside of it, and in return also

affects the environment within which it exists. It is important to note that OD does differ from related topics like change management projects within management consulting, or industrial engineering which often focuses on one part of the organization, both with a primary goal of financial performance or productivity (Cummings & Worley, 2005). OD's biggest differentiators are its focus on the long game, its willingness to be adaptive or change directions as more information is gathered, and its focus on coaching individuals to lead initiatives and adapt to change on their own.

The practice of OD has evolved from early work and several theories of change, all which have gradually shaped and impacted the field as it is practiced today. This influence began with Lewin's T-group and the formation of the National Training Laboratories (Marrow, 1967), as well as Rensis Likert's pioneering work with the development of his 5-point Likert Scale and his work on participative management (Likert, 1932; 1967). Later, the focus on quality-of-work-life (QWL) from Eric Trist at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London would give light to work designs, the power of autonomy, and the importance of the employee voice (Trist & Bamforth, 1951). Later, planned change started to be viewed more strategically and holistically, with Richard Beckhard's first examination of open systems planning (Beckhard & Harris, 1987). The history of OD is not necessarily a clear path, but rather has been adaptive and built upon over several areas of behavioral psychology, much like the practice of the process itself.

OD is focused on bringing about planned changes, and in addition to the works above, it has been influenced by three major theories of change. One of the earliest models of change is Lewin's (1951) planned change model which focuses on three steps: unfreezing, or acknowledging that there are discrepancies between the ideal state and the current state, and making the organization ready for change, moving or changing organizational structures or

processes to create behavioral change, and then refreezing or stabilizing the new desired behaviors and creating a new norm. A second theory of change is almost the opposite of Lewin's, focusing solely on what the organization is doing right, versus where it is discrepant. The positive model of change (Cooperrider, 1990) utilizes the concept of appreciative inquiry, where the organization examines where it is doing well, and leverages those behaviors and aspects of the organization.

While the present study incorporates aspects of both theories, it mostly aligns with the action research model of change, which is a more long-term, cyclical process where problems are identified and measured, and feedback and joint decision making are essential to adjusting next steps (Frohman, Sashkin, & Kavanagh, 1976). Typically, the process starts when a key executive in the organization notices there is a problem and enlists the help of an OD professional. The OD practitioner and the executive need to develop a frame of reference and share theoretical approaches before entering into a partnership and preliminary diagnosis. Then information is gathered often via multiple ways, such as interviews, process observation, questionnaires, and performance data. Interestingly, performance data are often overlooked as a data source according to Cummings and Worley (2005). The gathered data is then analyzed by both the key organizational members and the OD practitioner, and together they decide which identified areas need addressing, and how. The action plan is implemented, but is often long-term and must allow for transitions. Following any action, feedback is gathered, shared, and the process starts over. Mutual decision making is key to the process, and subscribes to Schein's (1999) warning against the doctor-patient model, where an expert consultant comes into an organization and prescribes actions based off their own solo work. In these cases, the "prescription" is often misunderstood by the client, and without the rich internal knowledge of organizational members, it may never

be implemented or truly aligned to the real needs of the company. In fact, OD practitioners often play a more activist role in the action research model, never dominating the process, even though it can be quite chaotic and conflictual (Cummings & Worley, 2005).

Despite its continuous evolution, OD and its models of planned change have been critiqued, perhaps most notably by Porras and Robertson (1992). They called for planned change initiatives to be more explicit when defining the specific outcomes of planned change, and what the causal mechanisms are behind that change, particularly at the individual behavior level. They claim that theories are vague and underdeveloped, even though the field does not suffer from a lack of OD techniques available to professionals and organizational members.

It is important to note that while OD is concerned with the whole organizational system, there are multiple levels of diagnosing, planning interventions, and measuring: at the organization level, the group level, and the individual level (Cummings & Worley, 2005). Each is affected by inputs (which theoretically trickle down through all subsequent levels), its own internal elements that interact with each other and with the inputs, and all have outputs or outcomes from interventions implemented at each level. For example, at the organization level, inputs are the external environmental factors such as the general environment, market, and industry, internal elements that can be changed include strategy, technology, structure, human resources, measurement systems, and culture, and its output is organizational effectiveness. The organization's design is the input at the group level, with internal group components of goal clarity, team functioning, group norms, group composition, and task structure, which result in team effectiveness. At the individual level, inputs include organization design, group design, and personal characteristics which feed into the effectiveness of task identity, skill variety,

autonomy, task significance, and feedback about results, which ultimately result in individual effectiveness.

As noted, various interventions are available and affect each level differently. For example, interventions like coaching, training, and team-building can improve internal processes. Redesigning an organization and focusing on work design can improve structural elements of a company. Goal setting, performance management, and development planning greatly affect human resources. And lastly, changes in strategies and culture change are examples of strategic interventions. In their meta-analysis, Neuman, Edwards, and Raju (1989) found that multi-faceted interventions have been more effective in improving employee satisfaction and attitudes than single intervention types. The present study and the rest of this review will primarily focus on the strategic intervention of culture change as a planned change initiative, but will also incorporate other interventions and at multiple levels, all while utilizing the action research model.

Changing Culture

Changing a culture is more than incremental change or altering some aspect of an organization, but instead is considered a quantum change or even an organizational transformation (Cummings & Worley, 2005). This kind of process entails major alterations to a company's strategy, led by a vision for the future with a structure, processes, and new norms and values that will support it. Even though culture change interventions have grown rapidly over the past few decades, transformational change of this magnitude requires massive amounts of learning and at all levels of the organization, which makes it extremely difficult and complicated, and it is often not attempted unless competitive forces require it.

In fact, changing a culture is often not prescribed, and there is some debate over whether it is even possible (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1985). This type of change is questioned not just because of its difficulty, but also because it is a long process, with estimates ranging from 6 to 15 years in order for the change to stick and to produce results (Cummings & Worley, 2005). The process is often so difficult, because the existing culture has its already deeply rooted underlying assumptions at work, and they are often taken for granted (Schein, 1990). For example, members may agree on the new set of values and norms, but have, perhaps unknowingly, competing underlying assumptions. These assumptions have often been established by founders and reinforced over decades by top executives, and if the organization has celebrated successes under them, they are more likely to firm commitment (Schein, 2000). This is why Schein recommends assessing the underlying assumptions prior to planning a change, and deciphering which ones would aid or inhibit the process, as well as studying the history of the organization to look for the events in its evolution that would have impacted shaping the assumptions.

Studying the company's history can also help identify if a sub-culture forms post-change from those unable to let go of the founding culture. Such commitment is often seen as desirable in organizations, but it can have an adverse effect when it comes to change, and the stronger the commitment, the more difficult it is to change (Brockner & Rubin, 1985; Staw, 1976). Members may have vested interests in maintaining the current culture if they hold power, personal gains, or even pride, which can invoke fear if change causes these to be lost (Cummings & Worley, 2005). New members coming into the group will bring in new beliefs and assumptions if hired under the newly created culture, and this will influence previously held assumptions by

providing constant pressure to evolve and grow, but this does not necessarily make the process any easier or shorter.

Organizational transformations such as culture change can happen as a response to or in anticipation of major changes in the environment or within the organization. There are generally three major reasons that force such a change: a sharp change in the market or industry that forces the company to change in order to stay competitive, changes in the product that require new strategies and vision, or internal changes, like growth or downsizing, or key executive or founder turnover, as is the present study's case (Schein, 2000; Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986). If the strategies formed to handle such changes are incompatible with the existing culture, the organization will need to change in order to adapt, but only the cultural assumptions that are a constraint; other cultural assumptions may actually help to achieve the new goals and should be leveraged during the process (Schein, 2000). In fact, an English football club found that routines and historical ways of working could still be maintained during times of innovation, risk-taking, and learning within team operations (Gilmore & Gilson, 2007). This is far more preferable to "changing" the culture, and may be thought of as evolving, improving, or shifting it, rather than changing it completely.

In today's ever changing environment, organizations are constantly needing to adapt to complex changes, and organizational development not only helps a company deal with them, but is now often being used to proactively create strategies and plan cultural changes rather than just responding to forces that will eventually require it (Cummings & Worely, 2005). By its very definition, planned change is meant to reframe shared perceptions, help an organization to adapt to external environmental changes, improve performance, and influence future change, and this can also be the case with culture change.

A key feature of organizational transformations is that they are typically driven from the top, and key executives are often involved in every step of the change process (Eisenbach, Watson, & Pillai, 1999). Leaders of the organization may recognize that they do not have either the time or talent to undertake such a large change process, and so they will recruit an organizational development practitioner to implement their new direction, mission, vision, and new values and behaviors (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Schein, 2000; Schneider, et al., 2013). As with any change process, the OD professional would work with the team to diagnose the existing culture, or cultural assumptions, and assess the fit with the proposed vision and strategy. The causes of discrepancies guide what kind of culture change program to launch to achieve greater organizational effectiveness (Schein, 2000).

Because the cultural assumptions are so deeply rooted, practitioners and researchers have often struggled to observe them fully, without having a disruptive impact on the organizational members (Schein, 2000). Taking note from anthropologists, it has been more common in recent years to embed OD professionals and teams within organizations in order to better draw observations and understand the influence and impact of underlying cultural assumptions. With the growth of OD inside organizations has come the opportunity to observe more areas and layers of an organization that have traditionally been closed off to researchers and practitioners, such as the highest level of leadership during the creation of vision and strategies, and the ability to observe the impact of them over time (Schein, 1990).

Stemming from diagnosis, effective cultural change should start with a clear vision of the organization's new strategy, and the structure, processes, and values and norms needed to make it work (Cummings & Worley, 2005). The new vision and ideology provide the purpose and direction for cultural change, and will be the main measurement tool to assess the evolution of

the culture over time towards its aspirational state. The mission, vision, and ideology should clearly lay out the organization's values in straightforward language that will be understood by organizational members, and this model should incorporate both the key features of the intervention(s) and the expected results with which effectiveness and change can be measured against over time.

Next, the change will require a supporting structure and processes to carry out the new strategies, as well as leadership expectations and employee goal setting and development to help orient people's behaviors towards the new culture, and a rewards system to encourage performance of those behaviors (Cummings & Worley, 2005). Teaching employees how to set specific and measurable goals to manage their performance (and development) does not only help reinforce desired behaviors, but it also provides employees and leaders with an important skill set. Performance management programs are becoming more participative and developmental in their design, offering the employee a voice in their goals and their own development, with a focus on the future and how one can improve both their skills and in the behavioral expectations set before them. Employee involvement coupled with a rewards system that reinforces behaviors can strengthen employee and leadership buy-in in the new organizational changes, especially when all are aligned around the same core foundation.

Simultaneously, leaders may create new rituals, symbols, and artifacts that emotionally affect the organizational members and create a sense of pride and excitement around the new cultural assumptions in order to enhance adoption (Schein, 2000). In fact, leaders need to create a constant pressure for change through their own behaviors, as their actions will create the symbolism for what is expected of followers. As part of these actions, leaders will often begin selecting and socializing newcomers based on their fit with the new cultural expectations, and

terminating employees whose actions hinder adoption of the new behaviors, and both actions are especially important in key leadership roles. It is during selection and on-boarding that new hires are most open to organizational influences and most likely to assimilate these influences into the culture. Terminations are more characteristic of “midlife” organizations that either have not adapted well to changing environments, or have not had to, which often led to a replacement of a large number of people who have grown up in the organization and struggle with changing assumptions (Schein, 1990).

Typically changing, or evolving, a culture is a continuous learning process over time, which requires the team of OD practitioners, key leaders, and managers at all levels to try new behaviors, assess their impact, and modify the process when necessary (Cummings & Worley, 2005). All OD activities require an understanding of how the culture and the changing environment affect the organization and its design elements, and the impact it has on its effectiveness. As Schein said, “the more we [OD researchers and practitioners] get involved with helping organizations to design their fundamental strategies, particularly in the human resources area, the more important it will be to be able to help organizations decipher their own cultures.” (1990, p. 117). Any change program is destined to fail if cultural forces are ignored, and so studying culture and how it changes over time through organizational development is essential to both practitioners and executives leading change in today’s complex environment.

The Present Study and Hypotheses

The present study will examine how OD interventions have helped evolve the culture of a professional sports team’s front office, in response to internal ownership changes, and to create a culture that will uphold a new vision, strategies, and values, all while leveraging existing strengths of a franchise with a long and storied history. This study will be examining archival

data from the organization, and in order to fully understand the hypotheses and the variables specific to the organization's change process, it is helpful to understand an initial overview of the study design and its history (the study's design is also depicted in Appendix A). A fully detailed procedure of the study and its measures are described in the Methods section.

In providing this brief overview, it is important to first understand the following events. Soon after the internal ownership changes took place at the beginning of the study, and the placement of a new executive leadership team, the new CEO created an ideology (Appendix B) that both supported the vision and direction of the company, but that would drive the needed cultural change to uphold it. The ideology outlined a set of 16 values with behavioral expectations; some of those behavioral elements were found to be existing strengths of the company, while others were obvious weaknesses and became the target areas for the subsequent OD interventions that would be implemented over the course of the study (approximately four years), and are hypothesized to improve.

Inherent in any change process is the goal that the process efforts will lead to changes, and the hypotheses about such changes are built around the various ways culture was measured in the current study, as cultural change, or the impact of the OD interventions, was measured in multiple ways over various points in time. For example, cultural artifacts were recorded at the beginning and the end of the study, an open-ended company-created diagnostic survey was administered at the beginning and the end of the study and cultural underlying assumptions were extracted from it, and the company's later-designed performance management and development planning form would measure the specific behavioral expectations outlined in the ideology (values and norms) over various points in time, as well as overall employee performance (the ultimate goal of the recent vision, strategic, and ideological changes).

Additionally, employee-written development goals from this form would be examined as an additional measure of extracting underlying assumptions from the goal content and examining how they change over time. These data help test the study's hypotheses, as organized around Schein's three-layers of culture. Lastly, one of the OD interventions, a customer service program, was implemented with the use of a culture survey. The survey is an additional way to measure norms and values, and even though the dimensions measured in the survey differ from the norms and values outlined in the company's ideology, these data may provide an additional perspective to how the culture changed over time, and will be examined in an exploratory manner.

Overall, and over the course of the study's four years, it was expected that organizational development interventions evolved the company's culture as observed across multiple periods of time and multiple methods of measurement, including improvements in quantitative assessments, as well as evolution in cultural themes observed in qualitative measurements. Using Schein's three layers of culture to define and measure culture and how it may shift over time, the following are hypothesized about the effects of OD interventions aimed at evolving the company's culture in the present study:

Hypothesis 1: Cultural artifacts, as evidenced by qualitative recorded observations, will change and evolve to reflect the company's new ideology by the end of the study.

Hypothesis 2: Cultural underlying assumptions, as evidenced by implicit qualitative assessments of both the company's diagnostic survey and employee-written development goals from the company's performance management and development planning form, will change and evolve towards the company's new ideology by the end of the study.

Hypothesis 3: Values and cultural norms, as evidenced by both quantitative and qualitative assessments of the company's new ideology, measured by the performance management and development planning form, will improve over time, specifically:

- a) Target areas of the new ideology, discovered in the cultural artifacts and the company's diagnostic survey, will gradually improve over each time period, following each set of OD interventions across the four-year study.
- b) Overall employee performance scores will gradually improve over each time period following each set of OD interventions across the four-year study.

Exploratory Question: One of the OD interventions, a customer service program, implemented a culture survey as part of the program, and even though it measures dimensions different from those outlined in the company's ideology, changes in the survey dimensions may offer another perspective on cultural norms, and they were examined in an exploratory manner.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Participants

The present longitudinal study took place in the front office of a professional sports team in the United States. When one thinks of a sports team, they often think of the players, coaches, and those visible on the court, field, or ice, but there is an entire organization that sits behind the scenes to support the business operations of both the sports team and the venue(s) where they play, and in the sports industry this is called the front office. In the current study, front office employees are described as full-time employees who support the sport and entertainment arms of the organization, and they sit in several major departments: marketing, sales, venue operations, team operations (the actual sport team personnel, like coaches, scouts, etc.), entertainment (responsible for all other events and concerts booked at the venue), and administration (i.e., finance, information technology, human resources, business strategy, and data and analytics).

It is important to note that this study does not include team operations, as they did not participate in the OD interventions or measurements. In the sports industry, it is common for team operations to have some separation from the rest of the front office, as their main goals differ from the business, and are instead solely focused on the sport, its players, and winning games. This is not indicative of the relationship between the sport team and the business teams of this organization, as both sides were supportive of each other and did come together to celebrate successes; it simply reflects a difference in focus, or a difference in prioritizing goals (i.e., the sports team must focus on winning games and the business teams must focus on effectively running business operations). It is also worth noting that the study does not include the part-time staff responsible for working events in roles such as parking attendants, housekeepers, ticket

takers, ushers, guest service representatives, etc. Even though this workforce serves an equally important role to executing successful events, it is not immersed in the everyday culture of the front office, although it may be indirectly affected by it.

At the beginning of this study, there were a total of 215 front office employees employed with the organization, however, because team operations did not participate (as referenced above), this leaves the true beginning population at 192 front office employees. Of these 192 employees, 87% were white, 61% were male, and 39% were people managers. The mean age of the sample was 41.38 years ($SD = 12.23$ years; range 21-68 years), and the mean organizational tenure of the sample was 8.97 years ($SD = 8.21$ years; range <1-38 years). In addition, 6% were vice presidents, 14% were directors, 19% were managers, and 61% were individual contributors, with 26% representing sales, 26% representing marketing, 28% representing venue operations, 3% representing entertainment, and 17% representing administration.

At the end of this study, there were a total of 275 front office employees employed with the organization, but with team operations removed from the study, this leaves the true final population at 203 front office employees. Of these 203 employees, 87% were white, 67% were male, and 37% were people managers. The mean age of the sample was 41.77 years ($SD = 12.69$ years; range 24-82 years), and the mean tenure of the sample was 9.16 years ($SD = 8.83$ years; range <1-27 years). In addition, 9% were vice presidents, 10% were directors, 18% were managers, and 63% were individual contributors, with 28% representing sales, 27% representing marketing, 25% representing venue operations, 3% representing entertainment, and 17% representing administration.

First Dataset: Diagnostic Survey

Over the course of the study, several different samples of front office employees were assessed, as culture was measured in several ways over various periods of time, as depicted in the study design in Appendix A. The datasets are not mutually exclusive in that employees represented in one dataset could be represented in others, and some may only be represented in one. For example, the first dataset consists of data from a company-created diagnostic survey (O2 in the study design) at both Time 1 (2011) and Time 4 (2015). In 2011, 192 front office employees received the survey, and 129 employees responded, with 68 choosing to voluntarily self-identify. Of those 68 employees who self-identified, 20 employees were still employed with the company in 2015 (Time 4), and received an invite to complete the survey again. Out of those 20 employees, 16 responded to the survey at Time 4. Within the final sample, 94% were white, 69% were male, and 75% were people managers. The mean age of the sample was 42.34 years ($SD = 10.57$ years; range 28-63 years), and the mean organizational tenure of the sample was 14.81 years ($SD = 8.33$ years; range 4-27 years). In addition, 50% were directors, 25% were managers, and 25% were individual contributors, with 38% representing sales, 31% representing marketing, and 31% representing venue operations.

Second Dataset: Performance Management and Developmental Planning Form

The second dataset consists of data from the company's performance management and development planning process (O3 and O4 in the study design) at Time 2 (2013), Time 3 (2014), and Time 4 (2015). In 2013, 191 front office employees were currently employed with the company and invited to participate in the process (Time 2 in the study design), and 190 completed it. By 2015, 97 of those 190 employees were still employed with the company, and had completed the process at both Time 3 (2014) and Time 4 (2015). Within this sample, 91%

were white, 58% were male, and 27% were people managers. The mean age of the sample was 38.74 years ($SD = 12.23$ years; range 24-69 years), and the mean organizational tenure of the sample was 9.65 years ($SD = 8.70$ years; range 2-28 years). In addition, 2% were vice presidents, 5% were directors, 20% were managers, and 73% were individual contributors, with 40% representing sales, 26% representing marketing, 15% representing venue operations, 2% representing entertainment, and 17% representing administration.

Third Dataset: Culture Survey

The third, exploratory dataset consists of responses from a culture survey implemented during the company's customer service program (O5 in the study design) at Time 3 (2014) and Time 4 (2015), and includes only aggregated group data due to the anonymity of the survey. At Time 3, 197 employees were currently employed with the company and invited to participate in the survey, and 113 employees responded. At Time 4, 203 employees were currently employed with the company and invited to participate in the survey, and 132 employees responded.

Procedure

After experiencing a change in ownership, and a subsequent change in CEO and the executive team, the new leadership team felt that the current culture was not aligned with the new desired direction of the team. During his first three months, the company's new CEO observed cultural artifacts of the existing culture and assessed cultural underlying assumptions with a company-created diagnostic survey (Time 1 and Time 4). The results of the artifact observations and the company-created survey were compared to a newly created vision and ideology (Appendix B) that would support ownership's new mission, and its implementation was the first intervention towards shifting the culture. Both strengths and discrepancies were

identified through these comparisons, and they would ultimately drive subsequent OD interventions. The CEO then hired an organizational development professional, the study's author, to help design a way to evolve the company's culture. Over the next four years she worked with a leadership team to implement OD interventions in attempts to shift the culture towards better alignment with the new goals. This team consisted of the CEO, the Vice President of Human Resources, as well as the heads of each business department: marketing, sales, venue operations, entertainment, and administration. The following interventions were implemented in sequential order over the next four years, and Schein's three layers of culture were measured with various methods to assess the shifts in culture following each group of interventions (see the study design in Appendix A). Specifically, cultural artifacts were recorded at Time 1 and Time 4, cultural underlying assumptions were measured at all measurement periods, and cultural norms and values were assessed at Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4. The following interventions occurred in sets of three, following Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3.

Treatment 1.1: Creation of New Company Mission, Vision, Structure, and Ideology

The new mission statement, created by the new CEO together with the new owner, was a strong, but concise statement focusing on the fans and community involvement for the team's city. The new vision aimed to create an experience for fans, regardless of the product on the floor, which focused on motivating fan segments with varying degrees of insider access and value, all within a venue that provided new, innovated technology in an atmosphere that had been renovated to feel new, fresh, and energized. For example, certain ticket packages granted fans access to exclusive and reimagined clubs within the arena, as well as admission to special events, like autograph signings, draft parties, and other community events. Ticket packages and access were not always a 'spend more, get more' scenario, but were designed to reflect what was

valued by a particular fan demographic, such as families with young children, to millennials, to corporate partners with business needs. The strategies necessary to hold this type of vision required highly collaborated departments, particularly between sales and marketing, as well as properly including the sub-department data and analytics to describe demographic preferences when designing and promoting packages. This varied greatly from past strategies, which relied heavily on the team's past championships and siloed, or independent approaches to work.

The new structure supported the needed collaboration with a flatter organization, designed by the CEO and Vice President of Human Resources. Using the new strategic vision as a guidepost, a new structure was created for each department, and then the current structure was mapped to it. Some jobs mapped well, some were quite different but the talent was in place to support them, others required new talent to be hired, and still others did not map at all, leaving some involuntary turnover to take place. The new structure was then accompanied by new artifacts such as an opened floor plan and office spaces, with collaboration areas and open meeting spaces on each floor, including a repurposed club space that served as a new café during the day for employees. In the past, employees were closed off from each other with private offices or high cubicles, and at lunch they would go out to eat or order food to be delivered to their desks. The new structure created ample opportunity to not only better socialize within one's team, but also to collaborate with others. The above changes were to be solidified with a new ideology, which described not only what was valued, but how everyone was expected to show up, treat each other, and work together. Altogether, the ideology consists of 16 values and expectations, and their names and descriptions can be found in Appendix B.

Treatment 1.2: Implementation of a Strategic Planning Process

As a way to reorganize business processes, guide communication and collaboration at the group level, and to teach the company about how the new vision and structure work together, the OD practitioner helped the leadership team design a strategic planning process. The process was designed to allow each sub-department's key leaders the chance to write department goals that would support the company's overall vision, with supporting strategic tactics, deadlines, individuals and teams that will serve as key interdependences during the collaboration process, and a metric against which success can be measured. When plans were complete, the key leaders of each department met to share and review plans and discuss and agree on points of collaboration and deadlines. Finalized strategic plans were published and shared with the entire organization, and progress was revisited each quarter.

Treatment 1.3: Implementation of a Performance Management and Development Planning Process

To continue the trickle-down process of the vision and strategic plans to the individual level, as well as to teach and reinforce the ideology, and guide communication between managers and employees, a performance management and development planning process was created and implemented. The three-part process was heavily focused on the individual employee's professional development, and it was more future-focused than retrospective. The employee began the process by completing the employee portion of the guide, first briefly reflecting on the past year's business goals and performance and then writing new business goals based on the team's strategic plan. In the next section, the employee would complete a self-assessment of how well they upheld the company's ideology and commit to focusing on one or two ideology elements in the next year. Lastly, the employee would set one to two

developmental goals focused solely on their own personal development in the next year. Upon finishing, the employee would then pass their work to their manager to complete the manager portion, or reviewing goals, writing comments, and completing manager assessments. Once the employee and manager finished working the guide, they came together to review the form and discuss future goals, strengths, and any discrepancies in assessments. In addition to serving as an intervention, the data from these forms were collected at Times 2, 3, and 4 in order to measure the culture evolution at the individual level and can be viewed in Appendix D.

Treatment 2.1: Implementation of a Customer Service and Recognition Program

Working with a vendor, the company implemented a customer service program along with a recognition program focused on providing world class customer service. Vendor instructors facilitated the implementation with training sessions for the key leadership team, then the front office staff, and lastly with the part-time staff. The leadership team and the front office members were encouraged to take over facilitation and embed the program into the organization in ways that make sense culturally.

Tools, resources, and past processes were available to adapt, and one of the first and major implementations of the program was a recognition program to reinforce the newly learned customer service behaviors. The program was based on spot recognition, where team members were encouraged to write on a company supplied card if they observed an employee “doing it right.” These cards were dropped in a box and delivered to the employee that week. The program’s leadership team voted on the top card stories each month, and winners received public recognition and various prizes, such as cash and gifts. In addition, the second major implementation, a culture survey, was used to measure the culture evolution at the group level at Times 3 and 4.

Treatment 2.2: Implementation of Hiring Practices and Employer Branding Representative of the Culture

As both voluntary and involuntary turnover caused more newcomers to enter the organization, the next focus of evolving the culture was to represent it in both employer branding and in hiring practices. The OD practitioner re-organized the company's career website, and job description content received overhauls to incorporate the new vision and ideology of the company. In addition, the candidate experience was evolved to include an education of the team's changes, goals, and what is needed to be successful as the culture continues to build and change. Interview questions were restructured to better assess collaboration, initiating and driving projects with various groups, and dealing with change and ambiguity.

Treatment 2.3: Implementation of Events and Programming to Celebrate Wins and Create Pride

By this point, the structure had changed, the physical environment looked different, and the way work was done had changed considerably after implementation of the strategic planning process and the performance management and development planning process. Because of all the recent changes, the leadership team wanted to maintain a feeling of pride and excitement, not only for the sports team, but also for what was being created inside the front office. This included a company fitness program and onsite gym, fitness groups, onsite yoga, an annual holiday party with catering and vendors, and elaborate raffle prizes, a spirit week leading up to the season's home opener, as well as a spirit week during playoffs. These celebrations and programs were implemented and became institutionalized, or annual activities that were anticipated and expected.

Treatment 3.1: Implementation of a Tightly Integrated Summer Internship Program

Implementing a summer internship program served several goals for aiding the evolution of the company's culture. First, it continued to build a future pipeline of candidates for entry-level roles – candidates who were socialized to the culture, experienced the business of sport, and were internally assessed on performance, fit, and growth during their internship. The program also allowed front office team members the chance to be ambassadors of the culture by teaching the vision and ideology to interns, and integrating it into their projects. This was not only a requirement of managers and those who worked directly with interns, but also for team members hosting weekly lunch-and-learns on various topics from each department. The program was mutually beneficial for interns and the company, but it was also a way for the organization to fulfill part of its mission to impact the community, while simultaneously building pride in its team members by welcoming outsiders in and teaching them about what is done and why it is done that way.

Treatment 3.2: Implementation of Company-wide Knowledge-Sharing Seminars

Once performance management and a development planning process were underway, and managers and employees were now trained on how to have meaningful coaching conversations, it was time to begin offering learning and development opportunities that would help fulfill their goals. Because learning and personal development was completely new to the company (other than the trainings on customer service, a subject very familiar to the organization), a program was designed to help ease the organization into this way of learning. Together with key leaders, the OD practitioner developed a format for knowledge-sharing seminars that would take place monthly; departments would take turns teaching the rest of the company on a topic or project that the department was currently working on, generally new projects or something cutting edge to

the industry. These seminars were turned into events, with videos, food and beverage, and sometimes hosted guest speakers. They also provided mid-level managers the chance to develop their presentation skills, and it offered the entire organization a chance to learn from key leaders about what was happening inside the organization, often before anyone else in the public. This intervention was the first phase of a longer plan that was intended to get the organization used to attending learning and development opportunities, and to associate a positive feeling with them versus something they “had to do”.

Treatment 3.3: Implementation of Meeting Structure and Process to Target Better Collaboration

After analyzing data from performance and development planning forms, it became clear to the team that the collaboration initiated in the strategic planning process might need modification to better enhance the communication and work across departments. This was especially true for the two largest departments that required the closest level of collaboration for the vision and supporting strategies to be effective: sales and marketing. Together with the leadership team, the OD team designed a meeting structure to better facilitate effective and efficient time together, and to produce both effective and timely communication. The purpose of the meeting grid was to put the right people in the right place and at the right time. Each meeting was designated a leader to keep the meeting moving, and a meeting agenda template was provided. Team members in the meeting knew they needed to send agenda items to the meeting leader ahead of time, so members were arriving prepared and aware of the meeting’s purpose. Generally, most of these meetings were reoccurring and needed to be, in order to adequately serve clients, partners, and to properly plan for promotions and ad campaigns. With so many elements and quickly approaching deadlines, the meeting structure was designed to prevent

details from falling through the cracks, but to also cover a lot of ground in an efficient way, and to give all departments an equal voice.

Measures

Cultural Artifacts

At both Time 1 and Time 4, cultural artifacts were observed and recorded, first by the CEO, and later by the OD practitioner together with the leadership team. As Schein's first layer indicates, artifacts represent the company's rituals, language, how people address each other, myths, dress, and the smell and feel of the place, including the physical aspects of the organization, such as its décor, space arrangements, and noise levels. The CEO took many handwritten notes, especially during the beginning phases of change, and shared many of these with the OD practitioner upon her onboarding. Within these notes, the CEO had recorded observations of artifacts, and the OD practitioner coded the notes into cultural artifact descriptions. At the end of the study, during an update meeting with the CEO and leadership team, current artifacts were recorded, and compared to those previously recorded.

Cultural Underlying Assumptions

At both Times 1 and 4, cultural underlying assumptions were measured with a company-created diagnostic survey. In this survey, underlying assumptions were measured with 5 open-ended items created by the CEO after his arrival to the organization with the intent to assess the current atmosphere of the company, as well as its readiness to change. The items were as follows, "What's going great today?," "What should we do more?," "What should we do less?," "What is the best tool to get directly to our customers?," and "How can we continue to thrill our customers?" They can also be found in Appendix C.

In addition, at Times 2, 3, and 4, cultural underlying assumptions were also extracted from employee-written development goals within the company-created performance management and development planning form (Appendix D). Development goals were constructed from the following prompts to help employees write development goals: goal content based on professional and career development, a metric to measure the goal's success, key interdependencies, or those who may help the employee achieve the goal, and a deadline.

Cultural Norms and Values

At Times 2, 3, and 4, cultural norms and values were assessed with front office employee performance ratings from both the employee and the employee's manager, and employee commitments made by the employee, and these were measured with the company-created performance management and development planning form (Appendix D). Performance was measured in two ways: a single score assessed the performance of the previous year, and 16 items assessed how the employee currently upheld the company's ideology, or behavioral expectations. Sample items from the ideology assessments are, "Accountability and Focus: Can be counted on to meet goals successfully, is very bottom-lined oriented, and steadfastly pushes self and others for the best results," "Disciplined: Understands how and when to apply their skills and knowledge domain, and when to involve others for their areas of expertise," and "Collaborate: Swims in their own lane while still seeking the input and insights of other stakeholders and encourages constructive and harmonious discussion and team-building." The items were assessed on 4-point scale, ranging from *Off Track* (0), *Underperforming* (1), *On Target* (2), *Outperforming* (3), and *Not Applicable*.

Following assessments on the ideology expectations, employees were asked to commit to one or two elements from the ideology that they will focus on in the next year and aim to

improve. The frequency with which employees make each ideology commitment will also provide information on how the cultural norms and values are changing over time, particularly within the target areas of the ideology.

At Times 3 and 4, cultural norms and values were also assessed with the customer service program's culture survey created by the vendor, along 5 dimensions and 30 items (vision clarity, leadership, communication, pride and recognition, and customer service). Because the survey is copyrighted, exact survey items cannot be shared, but the item format was similar to the following: "I know how the company defines achievement." The items were assessed on 5-point Likert scale, ranging from *Strongly Disagree* (1), *Disagree* (2), *Neither Agree nor Disagree* (3), *Agree* (4), and *Strongly Agree* (5). At the end of the survey, two open-ended questions were added by the company, "What is going well?" and "What can be improved?"

Demographics

The following demographics were provided by the company on each participant: gender, age, ethnicity, department, job position, people manager designation, and years at the organization.

Analysis

Analyses were conducted on several samples of employees, at varying times over the course of the longitudinal study, and utilizing preexisting data provided by the company being studied. Each hypothesis was tested with various methods specific to the type of data, such as coding of cultural themes from qualitative data, correlations, and one-way within-subjects ANOVAs. Each hypothesis and corresponding analyses are described here.

Hypothesis 1

Cultural artifacts were examined in the first hypothesis and compared across Time 1 and Time 4. The company's new CEO recorded artifacts at Time 1, and the company's OD practitioner recorded artifacts at Time 2. All recordings were shared with the project team and then placed into several artifact categories for comparison purposes. Artifact observations at Time 1 were compared to both the company's new ideology, in order to design future OD interventions, and to Time 4 observations, in order to assess changes in artifacts over time and draw conclusions about Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2

Cultural underlying assumptions were measured next to test Hypothesis 2, utilizing two types of measures over various points in time. The first, the company's diagnostic survey, was administered at Time 1 and Time 4, and like the artifacts, Time 1 survey results were compared to both the company's new ideology, in order to design future OD interventions, and to Time 4 observations, in order to assess change in underlying assumptions over time and draw conclusions about Hypothesis 2. All analyses were conducted on a sample of 16 employees, or those who were still employed with the company at Time 4. The company diagnostic survey responses at each time period were coded into themes, frequencies for each theme were calculated, and example responses were provided. Coding was conducted by the company's human resources team with all members receiving frame-of-reference training prior to the coding sessions, and each team member cross-coded a sample of each other's work to ensure consistency in coding. Themes and frequencies were then compared and contrasted with the company's ideology and the company's artifacts, and then also across Time 1 and Time 4 to assess change in underlying assumptions.

Hypothesis 2 was also tested by extracting underlying assumptions from employee-written development goals over Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4 as recorded in the company's performance management and development planning forms. Development goals at each time period were coded into themes, frequencies for each theme were calculated, and example responses were provided. All analyses were conducted on a sample of 97 employees, or those employed with the organization over Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4. Coding was again conducted by the company's human resources team. Themes and frequencies were then compared and contrasted across Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4 to further assess change in underlying assumptions.

Hypothesis 3

Values and cultural norms were examined at Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4 to test Hypothesis 3, or how performance scores changed over time on both cultural norms, represented by the target areas of the new ideology (Hypothesis 3a), and past performance scores (Hypothesis 3b). All analyses were conducted on a sample of 97 employees, or those employed with the organization over Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4. In addition, mean substitutions were used for all missing data. Correlations and one-way within-subjects ANOVAs were used to test the hypotheses, with the factor being time, and the dependent variable being the performance scores on the target areas of the ideology (as identified by the cultural artifact observations and the company diagnostic survey). For significant results, follow-up polynomial contrasts were conducted as the most appropriate follow-up test since the measurement periods were evenly spaced over time.

To further explore any potential effects of those who left the company prior to Time 4 or those who joined the company after Time 2, and how those employee groups may have affected

the overall culture, multiple one-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationship between employment length and the change in performance scores on the ideology. Analyses were conducted on a sample of 34 employees who left early and 23 employees who joined late.

Lastly, to further validate the performance scores of targeted ideology areas, employee-written commitments were examined from the company's performance management and development planning form, or the one to two elements of the ideology employees chose to focus on and improve in the next year. Employee commitments at each time period (Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4) were coded into themes, and frequencies for each theme were calculated. Coding was again conducted by the company's human resources team. Themes and frequencies were then compared and contrasted across Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4 to further assess change in values and norms over time.

Exploratory Question

One of the OD interventions, a customer service program, implemented a culture survey as part of the program, and changes in its cultural dimensions were examined in an exploratory manner as an additional way to study cultural norms. The data were only available as dimension means at the organizational level at Time 3 (sample size of 113) and Time 4 (sample size of 135), therefore only mean differences could be analyzed. In addition, employees were asked two open-ended questions and responses at each time period were coded into themes, frequencies for each theme were calculated, and example responses were provided. Coding was again conducted by the company's human resources team. Themes and frequencies were then compared and contrasted across Time 3 and Time 4 to further assess change in cultural norms.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

At the beginning of the study, cultural artifact observations and results from the company diagnostic survey were compared to the company's new ideology, and discrepancies between the current culture and the new ideology became the target areas for all future OD interventions designed in attempts to close those gaps. In addition, these early data were used to analyze proposed hypotheses, and all results are explained here.

Hypothesis 1

Cultural artifact observations were examined at Time 1 and Time 4 (Table 1), and observations from Time 1 were compared to both the company's new ideology, in order to design future OD interventions, and to Time 4 observations, in order to assess changes in artifacts over time. At Time 1, the physical spaces of the company were described by the CEO as outdated, dark, and closed off. The staff was described as a long-tenured workforce that had a corporate feeling and dress code and was experiencing a high rate of turnover. Language and the way employees communicated with each other was focused on maintaining the status quo, goals were set at the individual level versus the team level, and morale had an overall pessimistic feeling to it, although most employees also appeared very proud and committed to the sports team and its city. It was also observed that employees tended to follow a very strict work schedule in terms of arrival and departure times and tended to lunch alone at their desks. Lastly, work processes were very siloed and individually owned, with little knowledge sharing or cross-communication.

Table 1. *Cultural Artifact Observations: Time 1, Time 4*

Time 1 2011 Observations	Time 4 2015 Observations
Physical Space	
Outdated, Dark, Closed Off	Modern, Bright, Open
<p>Walk into front office surrounded by walls and feels closed off</p> <p>Front office reception, office floors, and arena all feel outdated, as if much hasn't changed since the 80s</p> <p>Colors are bright, neon, décor is old in offices, club spaces, and suites, photos of retired players and old concerts on wall</p> <p>44 No consistent branding within building, clearly focused on past championships</p> <p>Entering the office floors, it feels dark, high cubes, offices for leadership with solid walls and closed doors</p> <p>There are hardly any meeting spaces, two "conference rooms" with old tables and chairs, messy</p> <p>Arena and office technology is outdated - scoreboard, digital media, employee intranet all look 90s</p>	<p>Walk in to the front office and see an open, modern reception area with sleek lines, flatscreen TVs, current wall photos</p> <p>The reception, office floors, and arena are all upgraded with modern designs and a simple, smooth color pallet</p> <p>There is a standard branding, with specific paint colors, design, and approved photos, art, and fonts for signage</p> <p>There is limited décor, no clutter, but décor is simple and modern</p> <p>Office floors are recently renovated to have open offices with glass walls/doors producing light, low, open, modern cubes</p> <p>There are multiple meetings spaces on each floor, some as conference rooms, some as open drop-in areas</p> <p>Work spaces are designed with work in mind - e.g., graphic designers have a dark-lit area vs. open and bright areas of marketing</p> <p>Arena technology is upgraded and is now an industry leader for scoreboards and digital graphics</p> <p>Employee technology is fairly upgraded, but still lacks an updated intranet site to share information</p>

Note. Cultural artifact observations were recorded by the company's CEO in 2011, and the company's organizational development practitioner in 2015. All written observations are presented within artifact categories.

Table 1. *Cultural Artifact Observations: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Demographics, Dress, and Turnover

Long Tenured Workforce, Corporate, High Turnover

Substantial amount of employees with long tenures
Not very diverse: mostly white, mostly men in leadership positions
Everyone dresses business casual, but feels more corporate than sports
A lot of turnover has started after leadership transition

Young Workforce, Casual, Low Turnover

Very young workforce
Mostly white, some women in mid-level leadership positions
Employee dress is dependent on department/job: Sales dress business casual, but graphics designers wear jeans, t-shirts, tennis shoes
Departments are stable, and little turnover

Rituals

45 Strict Work Schedules, Lunch Alone

Employees either leave for lunch or eat at desk
Everyone arrives at 8 and leaves right at 5
Many employees talk about the summer BBQ they had every year

Flexible Work Schedules, Lunch Together

Employees eat lunch in one of the club spaces redesigned as an employee café during office hours
Employees arrive and leave work at various times, depending on their responsibilities, and many often stay late until a job is done
Employees come together often for events, celebrations, fitness activities, and company-wide meetings

Table 1. *Cultural Artifact Observations: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Language and Communication

Focused on the Status Quo, Independent, Pessimistic

There are a lot of emails, primary way to communicate, but few meetings
Departments seem very independent and don't cross-communicate on a regular basis to share ideas
Everyone thinks the team is the only way to sell tickets, and many are down on team's performance
Only talk about customer service as main strategy once fans are here
There is also a strong commitment to the team and city, despite poor performance, waiting to win again
46 Some employees seem afraid to talk to new leadership, or that they're not supposed to talk to leadership
Things are explained with "how we've always done it" mentality
Morale seems low, some are very pessimistic and uncertain, others are trying to be excited and want to stay
Overall, employees seem close to each other - talk about their families, old memories

Focused on New Ideas, Cross-communication, High Energy

There are many emails sent/received, many scheduled meetings, and a great deal of collaboration and over-communication happening
Employees speak-up more at meetings, and everyone seems to understand their role and place in the company
Language about strategy focuses a great deal around collaboration, customer service, and the linkage between sales and marketing
Employees often voice the need for a better raise and bonus structure/system
Commitment to the team and the city is strong
Renewed sense of energy as the team's performance starts to improve, especially with making Playoffs again
Meetings are high-paced and centered on new ideas, and how to be different and unique
Many employees, especially the younger team members, are friends outside of work, several known inter-office relationships

Table 1. *Cultural Artifact Observations: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Work Processes

Siloed and Individually Owned

Seem to have more positions than are necessary - redundant work or work that doesn't require its own position
Difficult to understand processes or why things are done the way they are
Work seems to get done in individual silos, with one person owning all internal knowledge, no succession planning

Collaborative and Clear

Regular scheduled meetings help drive collaboration, as work often gets done within teams than with individuals
Collaboration may be overused at times, sometimes slowing the decision making process by spending too much time on fine details
Goals are clearly defined and shared across the company

When compared to the new ideology, these original observations showed that there were elements of the current culture that resonated with ideology elements and should be leveraged, such as Commitment (dedicated employees) and Authentic (authentic in who they are and what they do). However, they showed discrepancies in areas like Team Improver, Proactive, Initiate, Resourceful, and Collaborate, as the workforce was very individually-focused, stuck in a routine of doing things as they have always been done, and did little cross-department communication or goal-setting. These areas became a focus for future OD interventions and would be assessed over the course of the study.

Time 1 artifact observations were also compared to Time 4 observations, as observed by the OD practitioner. It was found that the physical space had been transformed from an outdated, dark, and closed off space to a modern and bright space with an open floorplan that lends itself to easy collaboration and communication. It was also observed that the original long-tenured, corporate workforce with high turnover morphed into a young workforce with a casual, sports environment, with fairly low turnover. Similarly, the original focus on the status quo and individual projects and responsibilities changed into a focus on new ideas with a high amount of cross-communication and energy. Employees' schedules became more flexible by Time 4, and they now lunched together in a newly created employee café that also provided a space for lunch meetings and more collaboration opportunities. Lastly, the individual silos and outdated work processes from Time 1 eventually led to high collaboration and clearly defined goals and success at Time 4. The above observations and comparisons from Time 1 to Time 4 indicate support Hypothesis 1, that cultural artifacts would change and evolve to reflect the company's new ideology by the end of the study.

Hypothesis 2

The company's diagnostic survey results were examined at Time 1 and Time 4, and results from Time 1 were compared to both the company's new ideology, in order to design future OD interventions, and to Time 4 observations to assess changes in underlying assumptions over time (Tables 2 and 3). At Time 1, employees felt that the recent ownership and leadership changes brought in fresh and new ideas, which brought a renewed energy out in the staff. They also praised the organization's people as being talented, dedicated, and committed, with a strong focus on pride in their customer service abilities. Employees were down on the sports team's performance and impact on the fans, but were optimistic that a change was coming and would quickly revive the fan base. Within the front office, employees were discouraged with the inefficient work processes and meetings and the desire of many employees wanting to stay in the past and the way things used to be. They want to better work together and communicate so that it is understood how decisions at one level affects others at many other stages of a process. They also want to receive more recognition for jobs well done and feel this will be a way to re-energize the culture and overall morale.

When compared to the new ideology, these original results validated many of the cultural artifact observations, and also showed that there were elements of the current culture that would support the new ideology and should be leveraged, such as Commitment (dedicated staff) and Hard Work (hard workers that deserve recognition). In addition, they showed discrepancies in Team Improver, Proactive, Resourceful, Disciplined, Initiate, Collaborate, and Account as employees wanted more recognition and a renewed spirit and morale, were determined to try new and fresh ideas spurred by the transition, and they needed to understand how their roles

Table 2. *Diagnostic Survey Results: Time 1, Time 4*

Time 1 2011 Survey Results		Time 4 2015 Survey Results	
Question 1: What's going great today?			
2011 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Changes Bring Fresh Ideas	6	Collaboration/Communication	6
The People: Talented, Dedicated	5	The Culture/Work Environment	3
Renewed Energy in Staff	4	Consistent and Relevant Branding	2
Customer Service	3	Fresh Ideas, More Progressive	2
Motivating Leadership	3	Pride in Work/Company	2
Getting Leaner	2	Revived Excitement with Better Product on Floor	2
Teamwork	2	Company-wide Goals are Consistent and Shared	1
Changes Motivate Self and Team Improvement	1	Customer Service	1
Our Brand/Product	1	The Customer Service Program	1
The Work	1	Department Stability	1
Work Environment	1	Employee Recognition/Appreciation	1
		Everything	1
		New, Improved Work Processes	1
		Upgrading the Facilities	1

Note. $N = 16$. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses to survey items. Frequencies designate the number of times a theme appeared in the data.

Table 2. *Diagnostic Survey Results: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 2: What should we do more?			
2011 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Work Together/Communicate	8	Recognize, Reward Employees	5
Re-energize Staff/Build Culture of Recognition	4	Empower Employees with Clearly Defined Roles	3
Keep Focused on Business Goals	3	Learning Seminars	3
Understand How Decisions Affect All	3	Collaborate More Efficiently/Decision Making	3
Provide More Job Resources	2	Implement a Raise/Bonus Structure	2
Be An Industry Leader, Cutting Edge Technology	1	Continue to Promote Team-like Atmosphere	2
Empower Employees	1	Continue in the Same Direction	1
Generate and Share Ideas	1	Hire Additional Needed Staff	1
Hold Others Accountable	1	Manager/Supervisor Training	1
Learn From, Appreciate Each Other	1	New HR Programs	1
		Promote Creativity and Energy	1

Question 3: What should we do less?			
2011 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Have Inefficient Work Processes/Meetings	5	Have Meetings That Aren't Necessary	5
Preserving the Status Quo/Looking to the Past	2	Nothing	5
Undervalue Our Product	2	Spend Time on Initiatives Not Driving Business	3
Being Mysterious/Communicate Hiring/Firings	1	Game Entertainment: Outdated Halftime Acts	1
Downsizing	1	Send Emails Instead of Posting to Intranet	1
Focus on Individual Departments/Silos	1	Stalling Progress Due to Collaboration Overuse	1

Table 2. *Diagnostic Survey Results: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 4: What is the best tool to get directly to our customers?

2011 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Digital Marketing	5	Digital Marketing	7
The Best Fan Experience/Customer Service	5	Various Media	4
Facetime/Events/Provide VIP Experiences	4	Facetime/Events/Provide VIP Experiences	3
Have the Best Product on Court/Stage	2	Our Employees/Customer Service/Relationships	3
Be Equipped with Information/Answer Questions	1	Be Equipped with Information/Answer Questions	2
The Company's Website	1	The New Brand Campaign	1
Utilize All Forms of Media for Brand Awareness	1	Advertising & Promotions	1
Utilize Player Involvement in Campaigns	1	Utilize Strategies for Each Customers Segment	1

Question 5: How can we continue to thrill our customers?

2011 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Improve the Product on the Floor	12	Continue Great Customer Service, Front Line	7
Provide Best Customer Service	6	Create Fun Environment in Arena	3
Offer Unique Experiences/Special Moments	4	Revive Excitement with Better Product on Floor	3
Offer a Variety of Entertainment During Event	4	Total Fan Experience	2
Bring in More Premiere Events to the Stage	1	Continue to Improve Culture, Happy Staff	2
		Offer Unique Experiences/Special Moments	2
		Leverage Success to Grow More Business	1

Table 3. *Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4*

Question 1: What’s going great today?

2011 Top Themes	Example Responses
Changes Bring Fresh Ideas	<i>I think we have a great opportunity to take advantage of this transition period. It has given us a lot of time to begin evaluating what we’ve done for many years. There seem to be more ideas on the table and a sense that we should try some new and creative things.</i>
The People: Talented, Dedicated	<i>I think one of the strengths of our organization is the people. We have a lot of dedicated full and part time employees that love what they do.</i>
Renewed Energy in Staff	<i>I think the ownership transition has energized a group of employees who may have fallen into a set routine over the years. I know personally, I have been challenged the past several months to really think outside the box and push the limits of my creativity and forward thinking. It is a good thing to get people outside of their comfort zones every now and then.</i>
2015 Top Themes	Example Responses
Collaboration/Communication	<i>Increased communication across departments. Internally we have gotten much better at engaging the correct people in the decision making process.</i>
The Culture/Work Environment	<i>Culture has improved tremendously. Management has provided many opportunities to become more engaged and involved while making it a fun place to work.</i>

Note. $N = 16$. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses to survey items. Example responses are direct quotes taken from actual survey responses.

Table 3. *Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 2: What should we do more?

2011 Top Themes	Example Responses
Work Together/Communicate	<i>We should all have the same goals in mind. No hidden agendas. There are probably not as many “working together to get things accomplished” moments as there should be.</i>
Re-energize Staff/Build Culture of Recognition	<i>While we have started to do more of this, I think more employee morale building based around the positive successes that employees have accomplished should take place.</i>
2015 Top Themes	Example Responses
Recognize, Reward Employees	<i>Celebrating employee successes with rewards (bonus days, summer cookouts, concert tickets, happy hour, etc.). I think there are a lot of dedicated, hard-working employees here, but often times they don’t feel recognized or the appreciation.</i>
Empower Employees with Clearly Defined Roles	<i>At all levels of the company, I think we need to do a better job of respecting the positions that individuals were hired into and the roles they play. Too often, it seems like there is tension between departments because these lines and roles are not clearly defined by leadership.</i>
Learning Seminars	<i>I really like the [learning seminars]. These give us an hour to sit with the entire full time staff and be a team. There are so few opportunities that we get to get together, it’s a great way to showcase the many talents and attributes that the team has.</i>
Collaborate More Efficiently/Decision Making	<i>In a collaborative environment sometimes decisions get delayed waiting for everyone to weigh in.</i>

Table 3. *Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 3: What should we do less?

2011 Top Themes

Example Responses

Have Inefficient Work
Processes/Meetings

There are many meetings here that I believe can either be consolidated into one meeting or eliminated altogether. I oftentimes find myself in weekly meetings where the same topics are discussed and rehashed with no real progress being made. I love being apart of truly productive meetings, but become frustrated when involved in those where the wheels just keep spinning and I am being taken away from my other work.

2015 Top Themes

Example Responses

Have Meetings That Aren't
Necessary

Meetings. It's such a tough balance. Improving communication, but reducing meetings. It seems as though there are numerous days on everyone's calendars that are dedicated to meetings, and yet everyone is still trying to conduct their department focused initiatives as well.

Table 3. *Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 4: What’s the best tool to get directly to our customers?

2011 Top Themes	Example Responses
Digital Marketing	<i>Social network/mobile communications. Newspaper circulations are about zero now. Not many people stay on the same channel during commercials, but everyone looks at their phones 24/7.</i>
The Best Fan Experience/ Customer Service	<i>Providing world class service from top to bottom would go further with our guests than anything else we could physically provide.</i>
Facetime/Events/VIP Experiences	<i>Events. Yacht parties, luncheons, etc.</i>
2015 Top Themes	Example Responses
Digital Marketing	<i>In an increasingly connected world, I think the power of electronic media is hard to ignore. Email and social media are important tools to reach our fans who have already connected with us in some way.</i>
Various Media	<i>A well blended mix of owned, shared, paid, and earned media, through all our social, digital, and traditional channels.</i>

Table 3. *Diagnostic Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 1, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 5: How can we continue to thrill our customers?

2011 Top Themes	Example Responses
Improve Product on the Floor	<i>The easiest ways is to put out a winning team. If the team is winning, fans get behind it.</i>
Provide Best Customer Service	<i>It is so critical that the staff members are having direct contact on the night of an event or game with the highest level of customer service, and prompt with it.</i>
2015 Top Themes	Example Responses
Continue Great Customer Service, Front Line	<i>It would be helpful if when guest services, security, etc. are booking certain individuals in certain areas if we looked more closely at who is the right person to have in those areas. E.g., in the suite holder hallway, many times we have people with no energy or wanting to interact with clients.</i>
Create Fun Environment in Arena Revive Excitement with Better Product on Floor	<i>Creating a fun environment in the arena, for younger fans especially, on game nights. Continue to build a team that plays hard and has some toughness. The [championship team] struck a chord with this city and our team under [coach's] leadership can do the same.</i>

depended on and affected others and how to better work together. These areas became a focus for future OD interventions and would be assessed over the course of the study.

Time 1 survey results were also compared to Time 4 results (Tables 2 and 3). It was found that employees now felt one of the company's strengths was its high collaboration and communication, although it was noted that they are still working on doing this efficiently to not slow decision making and host too many meetings. There is still a great pride in the company and their work, but now the culture and work environment were praised as positive. Employees acknowledged recognition and appreciation had strengthened, but focus was now turned towards the rewards aspect of recognition, specifically wanting a consistent and fair raise and bonus structure. Customer service was still noted as a strength of the company, but at Time 4 it was also mentioned that the improvements to the culture have created a happy staff, and that a happy staff better serves the client and fan. The above results and comparisons from Time 1 to Time 4 indicate support for Hypothesis 2, that cultural underlying assumptions would change and evolve to reflect the company's new ideology by the end of the study.

In addition to the diagnostic survey results, employee-written development goals were also examined at Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4, and the development goal themes were examined to assess change in underlying assumptions over time (Tables 4 and 5). Over all three time periods, employees were setting development goals that would address the ideology discrepancies, such as Communication Skills and Building Relationships (Collaboration), Role Expansion (taking on more extra-role responsibilities) and Leadership Development (Team Improver), and Being Proactive (Proactive). Leadership Development showed the biggest spike in frequencies over time, being the second most frequent theme by Time 4. Likewise, Being Proactive, consistent with the ideology element, was a new theme that emerged at Time 4.

Table 4. *Employee Development Goals: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4*

Time 2 2013 Development Goals		Time 3 2014 Development Goals		Time 4 2015 Development Goals	
2013 Themes	Frequency	2014 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Job Specific Knowledge	53	Job Specific Skills	39	Job Specific Knowledge (1, 2, 1)*	33
Job Specific Skills	35	Job Specific Knowledge	38	Leadership Development (6, 3, 2)	26
Role Expansion	17	Leadership Development	24	Job Specific Skills (2, 1, 3)	24
Communication Skills	11	Role Expansion	14	Vertical Move (5, 9, 4)	13
Vertical Move	11	Building Relationships	9	Role Expansion (3, 4, 5)	12
Leadership Development	10	Industry Knowledge	8	Communication Skills (4, 7, 6)	8
Building an Effective Team	7	Communication Skills	6	Building Relationships (9, 5, 7)	7
Self Awareness	7	Process Improvement	6	Being Proactive	5
Building Relationships	7	Vertical Move	6	Strategic Skills	5
Project Management Skills	6	Self Awareness	3	Process Improvement	4
Time Management Skills	6	Team Building	3	Presentation Skills	3
Customer Service Skills	4	Negotiation Skills	2	Creativity	2
Organizational Skills	4	Technological Skills	2	Delegation Skills	2
Delegation Skills	3	All Others (9)	1	Networking Skills	2
Presentation Skills	3			Organizational Skills	2
Lateral Move	2			Self Awareness	2
All Others (5)	1			All Others (8)	1

Note. $N = 97$. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses in the development goal section of the company's Performance Management and Development Planning form. Frequencies designate the number of times a theme appeared in the data. *Designates ranking change over time.

Table 5. *Employee Development Goals – Top Theme Examples: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4*

Top Development Goal Themes	Example Responses
Job Specific Knowledge	<i>Take classes in HTML5, jQuery, and CSS3 to expand and improve my understanding of coding by years end.</i>
Job Specific Skills	<i>Develop into more of a “challenger” sales person by not being afraid to push on clients and ensure the best deals possible, learn to close and land deals closer to the dollar amount pitched by mid-year.</i>
Role Expansion	<i>To play a more integral role in special events planning and execution, being a main point person, in addition to current role responsibilities by mid-year.</i>
Communication Skills	<i>Improve my communication and writing skills, through leading meetings and financial reporting, obtain confidence in communication and writing skills by year end.</i>
Vertical Move	<i>Continue to develop skills required by the Partnership Development team in order to step into a Partnership Development Manager position from my current Coordinator role by year’s end.</i>
Leadership Development	<i>I look forward to developing my leadership skills this year to not only grow my skillset, but to also set me up for future goals, partaking in the hiring process and training new recruits and understanding the big picture goals of the department by year’s end.</i>

09

Note. $N = 97$. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses in the development goal section of the company’s Performance Management and Development Planning form. Example responses are direct quotes taken from employee’s actual development goals.

Development goal themes consistently mimicked the discrepancies in the new ideology, thereby indicating support for Hypothesis 2 that the cultural underlying assumptions would change and evolve to reflect the company's new ideology by the end of the study.

Hypothesis 3

Employee performance scores across the ideology elements were also examined at Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4 to assess changes in values and norms over time, specifically improving the target areas of the ideology. Means, standard deviations, correlations, and test-retest reliabilities for each single item ideology element are shown in Table 6. All test-retest reliabilities were significant at two or more time periods for all performance and ideology elements, with the exception of Self Improver and Collaboration. Test-retest reliabilities are to be considered tentatively in this study, because the study attempted to change these variables; if the change effort were successful, it is uncertain that test-retest reliabilities should actually be strong.

Performance Scores on the Target Areas of the Ideology

A one-way within-subjects ANOVA was conducted with the factor being time, and the dependent variable being performance scores on the target areas of the ideology, as identified by the cultural artifact observations and the company diagnostic survey, specifically: Team Improver, Proactive, Resourceful, Disciplined, Initiate, Collaborate, and Account. The means and standard deviations for the performance scores on each ideology element are presented in Table 7.

For Team Improver as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a nonsignificant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(2, 95) = .37$, $p > .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .01$. For Team Improver as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect,

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 People Manager ^a			--										
2 Gender ^b			.05	--									
3 Ethnicity ^c			-.19	.06	--								
4 Age	38.74	12.23	.05	-.11	-.07	--							
5 Level ^d	1.36	.68	.88**	.09	-.17	.12	--						
6 Org. Tenure ^e	9.65	8.70	.09	-.07	-.03	.77**	.12	--					
7 Past Performance T1 ^f	2.03	.34	.36**	.14	-.13	.04	.31**	.05	--				
8 Hard Work T1	2.35	.54	.30**	-.18	-.14	-.05	.22*	.04	.40**	--			
9 Accountability T1	2.12	.53	.26*	.16	-.14	.05	.22*	.10	.39**	.40**	--		
10 Commitment T1	2.25	.46	.08	.05	-.10	-.09	.01	-.07	.15	.36**	.22*	--	
11 Positive Attitude T1	2.14	.43	.12	.04	-.03	-.16	.10	-.13	.19	.27**	-.03	.19	--

Note. N = 97. ^a1 = No, 2 = Yes. ^b1 = female, 2 = male. ^c1 = white, 2 = non-white. ^d1 = Individual Contributor, 2 = Manager, 3 = Director, 4 = Vice President. ^eOrg. Tenure = Years spent at present workplace. ^fT1 = Time 1. ^gT2 = Time 2. ^hT3 = Time 3. Correlations are based on manager assessments. * p < .05. ** p < .01.

62

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12 Self Improver T1	2.08	.37	.12	.02	-.17	-.22	.13	-.24*	.14	.22*	.05	.25*	.18
13 Team Improver T1	2.13	.49	.03	-.06	.13	-.08	.01	-.04	-.02	.10	.06	.18	.30**
14 Proactive T1	2.02	.46	.18	-.05	-.17	-.07	.14	-.01	.27**	.39**	.34**	.08	.09
15 Authentic T1	2.31	.46	.05	-.01	.02	-.24*	.04	-.20*	.14	.19	.10	.18	.35**
16 Respectful T1	2.09	.41	-.20	.04	.02	.02	-.20	-.06	-.02	.04	-.05	-.01	.33**
17 Resourceful T1	2.08	.43	.16	.12	.02	-.08	.11	.09	.13	.24*	.23*	.06	.05
18 Disciplined T1	2.05	.36	.04	-.05	.05	.05	.05	.04	.33**	.28**	.13	.11	.15
19 No Victims T1	2.10	.44	.07	.01	.01	-.06	.05	-.10	.12	.15	-.01	.13	.35**
20 No Villains T1	2.05	.22	.18	.01	-.08	-.07	.16	-.15	.12	.11	.12	.18	.25*
21 Initiate T1	2.01	.55	.29**	.09	-.20*	-.19	.27*	-.19	.23*	.30**	.07	.11	.26*
22 Collaborate T1	1.99	.34	.02	-.15	-.10	.03	.06	-.02	.09	.13	.01	.02	.15
23 Account T1	2.12	.43	.11	-.12	-.17	.09	.11	.06	.19	.14	.26**	.33**	.03
24 Past Performance T2 ^g	2.20	.44	.23*	.03	-.21*	-.07	.14	-.12	.40**	.37**	.44**	.17	.09
25 Hard Work T2	2.34	.50	.19	-.12	-.15	-.17	.18	-.14	.18	.36**	.28**	.17	.01
26 Accountability T2	2.21	.52	.34**	-.02	-.27**	.06	.26*	.04	.26**	.37**	.36**	.18	.14

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
27 Commitment T2	2.32	.51	.07	.01	-.06	-.03	.08	-.01	.06	.38**	.20	.37**	.31**
28 Positive Attitude T2	2.19	.49	-.04	.03	-.05	-.15	-.05	-.12	.03	.18	.03	.26*	.42**
29 Self Improver T2	2.12	.38	.01	.10	.09	-.13	-.04	-.04	.22*	.21*	.25*	.07	.09
30 Team Improver T2	2.15	.46	.06	.00	.05	-.10	.03	-.07	-.10	.04	-.03	.23*	.26**
31 Proactive T2	2.17	.51	.35**	-.13	-.10	-.12	.27**	-.12	.09	.31**	.27**	.09	.13
32 Authentic T2	2.33	.47	.12	-.06	.00	-.12	.04	-.06	.13	.31**	.17	.15	.17
33 Respectful T2	2.09	.36	-.03	.11	-.09	-.04	-.06	-.15	.15	.10	.05	.18	.39**
34 Resourceful T2	2.16	.44	.21*	.02	-.12	-.05	.23*	.00	.11	.25*	.14	-.09	-.07
35 Disciplined T2	2.11	.38	.00	-.18	.09	-.04	-.04	-.04	.05	.16	.03	.08	.15
36 No Victims T2	2.14	.37	-.03	-.08	.08	-.11	-.07	-.20*	-.11	-.08	-.19	-.02	.14
37 No Villains T2	2.07	.26	.10	.08	.19	.02	.03	-.09	-.02	.04	.09	.20	.18
38 Initiate T2	2.14	.49	.26**	-.02	-.16	-.20*	.16	-.17	.23*	.29**	.30**	.17	.20*
39 Collaborate T2	2.07	.39	.07	-.16	-.06	.04	.10	.01	.06	.13	.06	.25*	.25*
40 Account T2	2.27	.51	.23*	-.12	-.10	.11	.23*	.03	.07	.26*	.30*	.29**	.10
41 Past Performance T3 ^h	2.16	.38	.07	.03	-.12	-.23*	.00	-.21*	.12	.18	.17	.13	.10

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
42 Hard Work T3	2.43	.49	.18	-.10	-.12*	-.15	.15	-.15	.17	.25*	.11	.12	.15
43 Accountability T3	2.19	.46	.16	-.19	-.13	.15	.08	.07	.10	.27**	.20*	.17	.28**
44 Commitment T3	2.31	.48	.10	-.02	.02	-.07	.07	-.08	.07	.31**	.10	.22*	.14
45 Positive Attitude T3	2.19	.44	.22*	.04	-.06	-.16	.22*	-.07	.17	.07	-.06	-.08	.46**
46 Self Improver T3	2.12	.38	-.07	.04	-.01	-.16	-.09	-.21*	.05	.21*	.29**	.37**	.02
47 Team Improver T3	2.18	.50	.06	.22*	-.04	-.31**	.05	-.27**	-.09	-.08	-.17	.22*	.36**
48 Proactive T3	2.18	.43	.18	.06	-.14	-.02	.20	.04	.03	.17	.27**	.10	-.03
49 Authentic T3	2.36	.47	.24*	.01	-.02	.04	.18	.02	.06	.08	.07	-.01	.21*
50 Respectful T3	2.14	.34	-.04	-.03	.18	-.08	-.09	-.13	-.04	.07	-.10	.19	.29**
51 Resourceful T3	2.20	.45	.09	.06	.01	-.08	-.01	.03	-.04	.05	.11	.02	-.10
52 Disciplined T3	2.05	.30	-.03	-.27**	.06	.12	-.05	.07	.19	.20*	.16	-.02	.02
53 No Victims T3	2.17	.40	.03	-.11	-.05	.09	.00	.00	-.12	-.04	-.05	.12	.10
54 No Villains T3	2.11	.34	.30**	.02	-.21*	-.02	.25*	-.03	.06	.08	.04	.17	.24*
55 Initiate T3	2.12	.40	.34*	-.12	-.10	-.07	.18	-.04	.20*	.19	.18	.13	.14
56 Collaborate T3	2.09	.42	-.23*	-.03	-.07	-.04	-.18	-.09	-.16	-.22*	.00	.00	-.01
57 Account T3	2.23	.44	.06	-.14	-.25*	.34**	.07	.23*	.02	.06	.24*	.09	-.06

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
12	--															
13	.11	--														
14	.24*	.13	--													
15	.21*	.32**	.27**	--												
16	.15	.25*	-.07	.23*	--											
17	.09	.10	.48**	.03	-.04	--										
18	.05	.25*	.12	.21*	.18	.11	--									
99 19	.20	.51**	.20	.30**	.40**	.06	.29**	--								
20	.08	.13	.09	.15	.18	-.05	-.03	.26**	--							
21	.35**	.19	.54**	.27**	.13	.44**	.15	.25*	.26*	--						
22	.17	.13	.20*	.02	.31**	.15	.26*	.29**	.01	.28**	--					
23	.00	.37**	.10	.13	-.06	.00	.17	.26**	.15	-.06	-.07	--				
24	.12	-.15	.25*	.13	.08	.18	.08	.12	.22*	.22*	.10	.17	--			
25	.18	.02	.34**	.12	-.06	.31**	.13	.07	.12	.25*	.08	.11	.43**	--		
26	.18	.13	.25*	.16	.15	.21*	.33**	.18	.27**	.32**	.25*	.32**	.52**	.45**	--	
27	.35**	.20	.29**	.23*	.20*	.21*	.19	.31**	-.05	.29**	.26**	.12	.31**	.30**	.26*	--

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	.14	.11	.03	.25*	.23*	.03	.12	.20	.01	.11	.08	.05	.13	.21*	.13	.34**
29	.15	.03	.29**	.15	.06	.27**	.11	-.01	.05	.30**	.02	-.09	.31**	.40**	.31**	.19
30	.05	.42**	.04	.18	.21*	.26*	.33**	.28**	.13	.24*	.15	.07	.01	.24*	.31**	.29**
31	.25*	.12	.39**	.09	.12	.32**	.07	.11	.20*	.47**	.19	.06	.37**	.35**	.46**	.23*
32	.20	.17	.21*	.52**	.27**	.23*	.14	.18	.03	.27**	-.04	.11	.14	.09	.23*	.07
33	.18	.11	.05	.33**	.30**	.02	.12	.20*	.20*	.16	-.08	-.01	.22*	.17	.23*	.18
34	.12	.05	.40**	.06	-.08	.43**	-.05	.08	.03	.29**	.08	-.05	.12	.18	.08	.24*
35	.08	.08	-.14	.03	.13	.07	.26*	.30**	.05	.00	.17	-.01	.12	.07	.25*	.19
36	.07	.07	.11	.12	.12	-.01	.10	.36**	.17	.05	.09	-.02	.10	.20	.18	.10
37	.05	.17	.08	.24*	.13	.04	.07	.20*	.11	-.01	-.11	.11	.06	.05	.20	.14
38	.22*	.27*	.41**	.27**	.20	.30**	.25*	.27**	.22*	.57**	.26*	.08	.42**	.36**	.42**	.28**
39	.10	.28**	.17	.28**	.15	.09	.19	.20	-.04	.05	.09	.32**	.11	.19	.13	.30**
40	.32**	.14	.25*	.21*	.13	.09	.20*	.24*	.16	.21*	.20	.33**	.34**	.37**	.42**	.39**
41	.14	.00	.16	.14	.09	.10	-.07	.09	.17	.18	-.07	.02	.32**	.20	.16	.17
42	.17	.19	.22*	.16	-.05	.25*	.05	.17	.27**	.34**	.00	.16	.26*	.45*	.30**	.10
43	.28**	.07	.12	.12	.13	.04	.07	.21*	.21*	.14	.13	.15	.40**	.26*	.40**	.31**

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
44	.34**	.22*	.19	.10	.07	.12	-.03	.25*	.25*	.32**	.07	.03	.19	.21*	.24*	.36*
45	.11	.17	.07	.13	.02	.02	.13	.06	.01	.15	.00	-.22*	-.11	.13	.01	.05
46	.01	.14	.10	.16	.06	.06	.11	.11	.18	.08	.08	.17	.25*	.23*	.19	.13
47	.15	.33**	-.07	.22*	.22*	.12	.18	.29**	.11	.17	-.06	.10	-.06	.21*	.22*	.22*
48	.05	.08	.13	-.02	-.10	.25*	-.19	.01	.23*	.23*	.00	.23*	.20*	.24*	.15	.02
49	.09	.24*	.00	.18	.15	.20	-.05	.17	.03	.18	-.07	.02	.09	.28**	.21*	.14
50	.25*	.20	.04	.26*	.13	-.09	.03	.18	.04	.03	.00	-.02	-.03	-.04	.01	.17
51	.04	-.08	.33**	.00	-.05	.39**	-.07	.00	.10	.18	.14	.05	.24	.20	.26**	.13
52	.06	-.05	.22*	.03	-.13	.12	.07	-.04	-.04	.05	.10	.12	.16	.15	.33*	-.04
53	-.01	-.07	.14	.23*	-.10	.09	.01	.08	.02	.02	-.08	.03	.05	.12	.03	.14
54	.19	.29**	.18	.19	.14	.00	.04	.27**	.20*	.31**	.09	.21*	.01	.15	.11	.16
55	.22*	.03	.15	.25*	-.01	.18	.03	.22*	.16	.21*	.08	.18	-.04	.11	.06	.07
56	-.04	.14	-.12	-.03	.01	.01	-.03	.06	-.05	-.15	.00	.18	-.04	.11	.06	.07
57	.03	.10	.23*	.02	.06	.05	-.07	.09	-.01	.05	.21*	.26*	.23*	.12	.25*	.15

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
28	--															
29	.22*	--														
30	.30**	.20*	--													
31	.04	.33**	.07	--												
32	.23*	.25*	.26*	.20*	--											
33	.44**	.31**	.24	.03	.31**	--										
34	-.14	.02	-.12	.30**	.01	-.16	--									
35	.17	.20	.21*	.22*	.20	.15	-.10	--								
36	.32**	.11	.31**	.05	.04	.30**	-.13	.19	--							
37	.22*	-.09	.26**	.07	.23*	.26**	-.01	-.09	.44**	--						
38	.11	.31**	.24*	.65**	.30**	.11	.19	.25*	.07	.00	--					
39	.43**	.16	.41**	.10	.27**	.25*	-.07	.01	.22*	.26*	.17	--				
40	.22*	.22*	.14	.42**	.23*	.21*	.04	.16	.14	.24*	.31**	.37**	--			
41	.16	.39**	-.07	.23*	.35**	.28**	-.03	.08	.08	-.12	.22*	-.02	.00	--		
42	.18	.18	.04	.27**	.14	.24*	.19	.01	.08	.00	.38**	.00	.03	.27**	--	
43	.26*	.23*	.16	.30**	.23*	.27**	-.11	.23*	.15	.14	.24*	.21*	.40**	.31**	.15	--

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
44	-.03	.15	.08	.29**	.05	.47	.20	.15	.06	.07	.21*	-.01	.17	.10	.29**	.26*
45	.37**	.18	.22*	.03	.09	.15	.05	-.01	.16	.06	.16	.16	.00	.08	.11	.08
46	.22*	.34**	.14	.11	.13	.31**	-.06	.20	.18	.02	.19	.16	.16	.32**	.18	.05
47	.29**	.11	.57**	.08	.10	.26*	.00	.11	.15	.22*	.19	.25*	.14	.02	.16	.04
48	-.01	.12	-.03	.32**	.11	.02	.12	.06	-.09	-.03	.11	-.07	.11	.15	.32**	.04
49	.27**	.12	.34**	.17	.26*	.30**	.06	.18	.14	.21*	.12	.22*	.09	.04	.29**	.27**
50	.35**	.12	.20*	.10	.36**	.23*	-.16	.20	.34**	.35**	.12	.17	.15	.25*	.08	.16
51	-.03	.24*	.21*	.30**	.07	-.06	.25*	-.02	.21*	.14	.14	.05	-.01	.15	.12	.02
52	.01	.40**	-.06	.27**	.24*	.15	.01	.31**	.03	-.05	.15	.15	.11	.29**	.13	.38*
53	.22*	.01	.20*	-.05	.02	.18	-.05	.01	.47**	.38*	-.03	.33**	.03	.03	.05	.22*
54	.07	.86	.37**	.07	.16	.09	-.05	-.18	.13	.27**	.21*	.35**	.14	-.04	.10	.20*
55	.05	.12	-.09	.45**	.17	-.01	.12	.11	.10	.21*	.44**	.09	.20*	.08	.27**	.21*
56	.23*	.07	.26*	-.07	.06	.15	-.13	.26**	.12	.04	-.02	.16	.04	.18	.07	.08
57	.06	.10	-.10	.15	.09	.00	.02	-.03	.13	.13	.22*	.22*	.25*	.06	.13	.20*

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Variables (Continued)

Variable	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57
44	--													
45	-.07	--												
46	-.08	.06	--											
47	.12	.32**	.06	--										
48	.15	-.18	.45**	-.10	--									
49	.10	.18	.12	.31**	.20*	--								
50	.20	.17	.12	.22*	-.03	.16	--							
51	.06	-.09	.23*	.03	.30**	.06	.09	--						
52	.11	.00	.31**	-.13	.17	.02	.23*	.15	--					
53	.06	-.07	.01	.16	.01	.18	.21*	.22*	.10	--				
54	.19	.14	-.02	.26*	.08	.16	.23*	.07	-.06	.25*	--			
55	.20	.06	.05	.06	.18	.17	.11	.09	.21*	.07	.14	--		
56	-.07	.03	.26**	.37**	.20*	.32**	.14	-.04	.13	.16	.01	-.11	--	
57	.18	-.11	.16	-.18	.18	.08	.07	.20	.15	.14	.12	.15	.12	--

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for Performance Scores on Ideology Target Areas

Performance Scores from Manager Assessments	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Team Improver Time 2	2.13	.49
Team Improver Time 3	2.15	.46
Team Improver Time 4	2.18	.50
Proactive Time 2	2.02	.46
Proactive Time 3	2.17	.51
Proactive Time 4	2.18	.43
Resourceful Time 2	2.08	.43
Resourceful Time 3	2.16	.44
Resourceful Time 4	2.20	.45
Disciplined Time 2	2.05	.36
Disciplined Time 3	2.12	.38
Disciplined Time 4	2.05	.31
Initiate Time 2	2.01	.55
Initiate Time 3	2.14	.49
Initiate Time 4	2.12	.40
Collaborate Time 2	1.99	.34
Collaborate Time 3	2.07	.39
Collaborate Time 4	2.09	.42
Account Time 2	2.12	.43
Account Time 3	2.27	.51
Account Time 4	2.23	.44
Past Performance Time 2	2.03	.34
Past Performance Time 3	2.20	.44
Past Performance Time 4	2.16	.38

Note. *N* = 97. Ratings were based on a 4-point rating scale. 0 = Off Target, 1 = Underperforming, 2 = On Target, 3 = Outperforming.

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for Performance Scores on Ideology Target Areas
(Continued)

Performance Scores from Self-Assessments	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Team Improver Time 2	1.98	.52
Team Improver Time 3	2.10	.42
Team Improver Time 4	2.11	.42
Proactive Time 2	1.95	.49
Proactive Time 3	2.05	.46
Proactive Time 4	2.07	.41
Resourceful Time 2	1.98	.54
Resourceful Time 3	2.08	.45
Resourceful Time 4	2.14	.42
Disciplined Time 2	2.00	.32
Disciplined Time 3	2.09	.41
Disciplined Time 4	2.00	.29
Initiate Time 2	1.90	.51
Initiate Time 3	2.05	.47
Initiate Time 4	2.03	.39
Collaborate Time 2	2.02	.29
Collaborate Time 3	2.05	.39
Collaborate Time 4	2.08	.30
Account Time 2	2.00	.41
Account Time 3	2.05	.33
Account Time 4	2.13	.36
Past Performance Time 2	1.98	.29
Past Performance Time 3	2.21	.38
Past Performance Time 4	2.05	.33

Wilks's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(2, 95) = 3.72$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .07$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 2.23$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant.

For Proactive as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .91$, $F(2, 95) = 4.74$, $p = .01$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .09$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 7.43$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant. For Proactive as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(2, 95) = 3.39$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .07$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over each time, $F(1, 96) = 6.55$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant.

For Resourceful as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(2, 95) = 3.42$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .07$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 6.24$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant. For Resourceful as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .91$, $F(2, 95) = 4.90$, $p = .01$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .09$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 9.78$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant.

For Disciplined as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a nonsignificant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .97$, $F(2, 95) = 1.41$, $p > .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .03$. For

Disciplined as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a nonsignificant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .95$, $F(2, 95) = 2.35$, $p > .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .05$.

For Initiate as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(2, 95) = 3.21$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .06$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a nonsignificant linear effect even though means increase over time, $F(1, 96) = 3.10$, $p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were also nonsignificant. For Initiate as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .91$, $F(2, 95) = 4.81$, $p = .01$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .09$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 6.36$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$, and a significant quadratic effect with means increasing and then decreasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 4.96$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Means increased from Time 2 to Time 3, and then decreased from Time 3 to Time 4, indicating that employees rated themselves higher at Time 3 than Time 2, but slightly lower at Time 4 than Time 3.

For Collaborate as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a nonsignificant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(2, 95) = 1.96$, $p > .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .04$. For Collaborate as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a nonsignificant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .97$, $F(2, 95) = 1.12$, $p > .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .02$.

For Account as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .92$, $F(2, 95) = 4.21$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .08$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 4.04$, $p = .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$, and a significant quadratic effect with means increasing and then decreasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 3.79$, $p = .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Means increased from Time 2 to

Time 3, and then decreased from Time 3 to Time 4, indicating that managers rated their employees higher at Time 3 than Time 2, but slightly lower at Time 4 than Time 3. For Account as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(2, 95) = 3.60$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .07$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 6.55$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Higher-order polynomial contrasts were nonsignificant.

Overall, Proactive, Resourceful, Initiate, and Account significantly changed over time according to both manager and self ratings; Team Improver significantly changed over time according to self ratings; however, Disciplined and Collaborate did not significantly change over time, indicating partial support for Hypothesis 3a.

Past Performance Scores

In addition, a one-way within-subjects ANOVA was also conducted with the factor being time and the dependent variable being past performance scores. The means and standard deviations for the past performance scores are presented in Table 7. For Past Performance as rated by manager, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .87$, $F(2, 95) = 7.42$, $p < .01$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .14$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a significant linear effect with means increasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 6.81$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$, and a significant quadratic effect with means increasing and then decreasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 6.60$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Means increased from Time 2 to Time 3, and then decreased from Time 3 to Time 4, indicating that managers rated their employees higher at Time 3 than Time 2, but slightly lower at Time 4 than Time 3. For Past Performance as rated by self, the results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks's $\Lambda = .92$, $F(2, 95) = 4.10$, $p <$

.05, multivariate $\eta^2 = .08$. Follow-up polynomial contrasts indicated a nonsignificant linear effect, $F(1, 96) = 2.30, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, and a significant quadratic effect with means increasing and then decreasing over time, $F(1, 96) = 4.56, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Means increased from Time 2 to Time 3, and then decreased from Time 3 to Time 4, indicating that employees rated themselves higher at Time 3 than Time 2, but slightly lower at Time 4 than Time 3. Because means on performance scores increased and then decreased over time according to both manager and self-assessments, it can be concluded that Hypothesis 3b was partially supported.

Attrition and Accretion

As a follow-up to better understand how those who left the company prior to Time 4 or those who joined after Time 2 may have affected the overall culture, multiple one-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationship between employment length and the change in performance scores on the ideology, but no significant interactions were found with the dependent variables, or the target areas of the ideology.

Lastly, to further validate the performance scores of targeted ideology areas, the frequencies of employee commitments were examined, or the one to two elements of the ideology employees chose to focus on and improve in the next year (Table 8). Team Improver, Collaborate, and Proactive were consistently the most frequent commitments; Initiate, Resourceful, and Disciplined were somewhat frequent across all three time periods, but Account never appeared within Employee Commitments, therefore it can be concluded that the frequency of employee commitments partially supported Hypothesis 3a.

Table 8. *Employee Commitments: Time 2, Time 3, Time 4*

Time 2 2013 Commitments		Time 3 2014 Commitments		Time 4 2015 Commitments	
2013 Themes	Frequency	2014 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Team Improver	55	Team Improver	51	Team Improver (1, 1, 1)*	42
Collaborate	48	Collaborate	41	Collaborate (2, 2, 2)	32
Proactive	22	Self Improver	27	Proactive (3, 4, 3)	27
Accountability & Focus	11	Proactive	14	Self Improver (5, 3, 4)	20
Self Improver	11	Initiate	12	Positive Attitude (8, 7, 5)	12
Hard Work	10	Accountability & Focus	10	Accountability & Focus (4, 6, 6)	10
Initiate	10	Positive Attitude	10	Disciplined (10, 10, 7)	7
Positive Attitude	10	Resourceful	7	Hard Work (6, 9, 8)	6
Resourceful	4	Hard Work	4	Initiate (7, 5, 9)	6
Disciplined	3	Disciplined	3	Resourceful (9, 8, 10)	4
No Victims	2	Commitment	2	No Villains (14, 12, 11)	3
Authentic	1	No Villains	2	No Victims (11, --, 12)	1
Commitment	1				
No Villains	1				
Respectful	1				

Note. N = 97. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses in the commitment section of the company's Performance Management and Development Planning form. Frequencies designate the number of times a theme appeared in the data.

*Designates ranking change over time.

Exploratory Question

Dimensions from the culture survey, administered as part of the customer service program, were examined at Time 3 and Time 4 in an exploratory manner as an additional way to study cultural norms. Because means and standard deviations were only available at the organizational level, mean differences were examined between Time 3 and Time 4 (Table 9). Of the five dimensions, Communication, Pride and Recognition, and Customer Service improved over the two time periods. Vision Clarity and Leadership did not change.

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations for Culture Survey Dimensions

Culture Survey Dimensions	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Vision Clarity Time 3	4.19	.73
Vision Clarity Time 4	4.16	.82
Leadership Time 3	3.61	1.01
Leadership Time 4	3.61	1.09
Communication Time 3	3.72	.91
Communication Time 4	3.93	.91
Pride & Recognition Time 3	3.62	.96
Pride & Recognition Time 4	3.77	1.00
Customer Service Time 3	3.99	.73
Customer Service Time 4	4.19	.79

Note. $N = 113$ for Time 3, $N = 114$ for Time 4. Ratings were based on a 5-point rating scale. 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

In addition to the survey results, employees were asked to answer two open-ended questions (Tables 10 and 11). When asked what was going well, employees most frequent responses in 2014 were focused on the themes of Collaboration, The Fan Experience, and the Arena Upgrades, whereas in 2015, the most frequent themes were focused on Recognition, the

Customer Service Program, and Collaboration, indicating that the recognition piece of the customer service program and the program itself has a positive impact on the company's culture. However, when asked what could be improved, employees tended to agree that Recognition & Rewards and Communication could still be further fine-tuned and made better within the organization. Overall, the culture survey indicated that Communication, Pride and Recognition, and Customer Service improved over the year, but that Communication and Recognition still have room for further improvement in future years.

Table 10. *Culture Survey Results: Time 3, Time 4*

Time 3 2014 Survey Results		Time 4 2015 Survey Results	
Question 1: What's going well?			
2014 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Collaboration	17	Recognition (13, 1)*	20
The Fan Experience	15	Customer Service Program (--, 2)	17
Arena Upgrades	15	Collaboration (1, 3)	17
Company's New Vision	15	Department Strength (--, 4)	7
Leadership	12	Arena Upgrades (3, 5)	6
The People	10	Customer Service (11, 6)	6
The Product On the Floor	9	The Fan Experience (2, 7)	6
Culture	7	Culture & Morale (8, 8)	6
Performance & Development Planning	6	Leadership (5, 9)	4
HR's Care for Employees	6	Revenue (--, 10)	4
Customer Service	5	The People (6, 11)	4
Work Environment	5	Company's New Vision (4, 12)	3
Recognition	2	The Product on the Floor (7, 13)	3
All Others (6)	1	Career & Development Opportunities (--, 14)	2
		All Others (6)	1

Note. $N = 113$ in 2014, $N = 135$ in 2015. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses to survey items. Frequencies designate the number of times a theme appeared in the data. *Designates ranking change over time.

Table 10. *Culture Survey Results: Time 3, Time 4 (Continued)*

Question 2: What could be improved?			
2014 Themes	Frequency	2015 Themes	Frequency
Recognition & Rewards	25	Communication (2, 1)	29
Communication	19	Recognition & Rewards (1, 2)	25
Leadership	16	Career & Development Opportunities (5, 3)	4
Collaboration	12	Power Struggle Between Departments (--, 4)	4
Career & Development Opportunities	9	The Fan Experience (--, 5)	3
Decision Making Speed	7	Leadership (3, 6)	3
Business Processes	5	Business Processes (7, 7)	2
Work Life Balance	4	The Customer Service Program (--, 8)	2
∞ Customer Service	3	Lean Staff, High Workload (13, 9)	2
Product on the Floor	3	Turnover Stalling Momentum (--, 10)	2
Accountability	2	All Others (5)	1
Lack of Togetherness	2		
Lean Staff, High Workload	2		
Morale	2		
Work Environment	2		
All Others (3)	1		

Table 11. *Culture Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 3, Time 4*

What's Going Well Top Themes	Example Responses
Collaboration	<i>The collaboration between departments is better than ever. It has helped improve the success of our company as a whole and is helping to take us to new heights.</i>
The Fan Experience	<i>The organization is focused on our consumers, trying our best to thrill them through our many assets.</i>
Arena Upgrades	<i>Updated building - best sports complex in [state] ... People want to be a part of the best show in town.</i>
Company's New Vision	<i>Top leadership has a clear vision for where the organization is headed and has begun to rebuild a culture that empowers employees to succeed and make a difference.</i>
83	Leadership
	<i>Great leadership and vision from our President and CEO. There's passion and focus that is passed along.</i>
The People	<i>We have a very talented workforce with a lot of individuals that are among the best in the sports industry at their particular job.</i>
Recognition	<i>We have been able to recognize employees who have gone above and beyond with the recognition program, which brings a sense of pride to those honored and becomes contagious throughout the organization as others see these inspirational stories.</i>
Customer Service Program	<i>The focus on the Customer Service Program being implemented as part of our culture.</i>

Note. $N = 113$ in 2014; 135 in 2015. Themes were coded from written qualitative responses to survey items. Example responses are direct quotes taken from actual survey responses.

Table 11. *Culture Survey Results – Top Theme Examples: Time 3, Time 4 (Continued)*

What Could Be Improved Top Themes

Example Responses

Recognition & Rewards

Pay employees accordingly and provide annual pay raises to help retain good employees that earn and deserve them.

I believe there should be a system of recognition within the organization, for those who have accomplished goals, achieved tenure, donated significant time to the community, etc. Recognizing merit is far more important than punishing shortcoming.

Communication

Our biggest opportunity is communication. Things move very quickly around here, we have to do a better job of keeping team members up to date with information, as well as tailoring messages to fit our different team members. Also encourage team members to share their views more often.

84 Leadership

Find a way to get buy-in from our 20+ year leaders who refuse to be a part of our new culture. More discipline and accountability when leaders make bad decisions. Some executives act as if they're better than other team members and abuse company practices.

Collaboration

When people immerse themselves in their job title, they think too much about 'me' and less about 'we', which then makes it more difficult for the company as a whole to execute certain initiatives.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study began as a result of a major change happening within a professional sports franchise, and to a team that had in its recent history not dealt with a great deal of change, particularly on a large scale. An ownership change, subsequent executive leadership changes, and a new way of life fueled the current study to examine how organizational development interventions could shift an organization's culture to better align with a new vision under new leadership. Even though the team in this study had not experienced radical change in the memory of its employees, the sports industry itself is generally no stranger to change; yet, organizational development has not been utilized as a way of dealing with change or planning future changes in the industry and across teams, making this study one of the first.

At the completion of the ownership transition and the hiring of a new leadership team, the new CEO first sought to measure the current culture by recording cultural artifact observations and administering an open-ended diagnostic survey to employees in order to capture their voice. Although these measures were used for evaluation in the present study, they were conceived and used as part of the intervention in an action research approach (Frohman, Sashkin, & Kavanagh, 1976). Simultaneously, the CEO was working with the new owner to develop a new vision, with new strategies, a structure, and an ideology that would sustain it. The new ideology (Appendix B) would set the tone for the way employees were expected to work and work together, and it would become the foundation of the new culture, or the one needed in order to be successful. The new CEO first set out to compare the existing culture to the new ideology in order to determine where the current culture could be leveraged and where it would need to be changed or improved.

The cultural artifacts and the diagnostic survey results painted a picture for the CEO, one that would lay forth the target areas of his new ideology when transitioning the culture. After comparing them to the company's new ideology, results show that there were several elements of the ideology that would continue to be strengths of the company: Hard Work, Commitment, and Authentic. They also showed where there were gaps or discrepancies, and these would become the target areas for later designed OD interventions: Team Improver, Proactive, Resourceful, Disciplined, Initiate, Collaborate, and Account.

At this time, the CEO hired an organizational development professional, the study's author, to help build the current study by implementing OD interventions designed to address the target areas and study their changes over time. The OD interventions included the implementation of the new company mission, vision, structure, and ideology, implementation of a strategic planning process, implementation of a performance management and development planning process, implementation of a customer service program and a recognition program, implementation of hiring practices and employer branding representative of the culture, implementation of events and programming to celebrate wins and create pride, implementation of a tightly integrated summer internship program, implementation of company-wide knowledge sharing seminars, and implementation of a meeting structure and process to target better collaboration.

Utilizing Schein's three layers of culture to organize the measurements of the organization's culture over time, the study examines the changes of cultural artifacts, underlying assumptions, and values and cultural norms over the course of the study and to test hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 predicts that cultural artifacts will evolve from Time 1 to Time 4 to become more characteristic of a culture influenced by the new ideology, specifically looking for improvements

in the target areas. Indeed, cultural artifacts did transform from an environment of dark, outdated and closed off spaces that limited collaboration to one that was modern, open, and provided plenty of spaces for easy collaboration. Additionally, the original focus on maintaining the status quo morphed into a high amount of communication and generation of new ideas and initiating new projects. Overall, cultural artifacts did evolve over time to become more represented of the new ideology, and Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2 utilized both the diagnostic survey and employee-written development goals to assess how cultural underlying assumptions change over time. The diagnostic survey results showed that employees' responses changed from Time 1 to Time 4 in that at the start of the study, employees were discouraged with inefficient work processes and many employees wanted to stay in the past of how things used to be, but by the end of the study employees felt one of the culture's strengths was its collaboration and communication. Overall, the change in survey results supported Hypothesis 2, that the cultural underlying assumptions would evolve to become more represented of the new ideology. The employee-written development goal themes also supported Hypothesis 2, as over all three time periods, employees were setting development goals that would address the ideology discrepancies or target areas.

Hypothesis 3 utilized performance scores on the new ideology and employee commitments from the performance management and development planning form to assess if values and cultural norms evolved towards the new ideology, and if performance scores increased as a result. Hypothesis 3a, that the target areas would improve over time, was partially supported, as all target areas showed some improvement, with the exception of Disciplined and Collaborate. To further test this hypothesis, employee ideology commitments were examined, and all target areas were represented within the commitments, with the exception of Account,

again partially supporting Hypothesis 3a. Hypothesis 3b was also partially supported, as past performance scores increased significantly from Time 2 to Time 3, but decreased slightly from Time 3 to Time 4.

It is surprising that Collaborate did not significantly improve over the course of the study according to the performance scores, as this was a primary target area and goal of the company, however, Collaborate was one of the few variables with a nonsignificant test-retest reliability, so it is possible the item was not a reliable assessment of Collaboration performance. Also, because Collaborate was such an obvious goal within the company, perhaps employees felt pressured to either show they do well in the area, or assume this is always an area they should be working on and getting better, which could have led to inconsistent results. Even though the performance scores of Collaborate did not significantly change over time, there was evidence that it improved at other layers of culture and along other measures, such as the cultural artifact observations, the company's diagnostic survey, and employee development goals.

It is also interesting that there were several quadratic relationships discovered that showed an initial spike in performance from Time 2 to Time 3, but then a slight dip at Time 4. However, it is important to note that Time 4 performance scores never dropped below their initial levels at Time 2. It is possible that manager and self performance standards became higher over time, or the OD interventions prior to Time 4 were not as effective at influencing performance and change.

Lastly, dimensions from a culture survey provided by the company's customer service program were examined in an exploratory way to see how they may further explain how cultural norms changed over time. It was found that Communication, Pride and Recognition, and Customer Service dimensions all improved over the course of a year, providing some additional

support for targeted areas like Collaboration (Communication) and Team Improver (Pride and Recognition). In addition, themes from two open-ended survey questions further supported that Recognition and Collaboration were going well, but still had room for improvement.

While there was some obvious evidence that the company's culture did begin to evolve over the course of the study (four years), the partial support for some targeted areas and hypotheses indicated that the cultural evolution is not yet complete, and perhaps it should never be considered complete but always an on-going shift to accommodate new goals and strategies. Regardless, there is evidence that the implementation of OD interventions significantly impacted an organization, specifically by the evolution and shifting of its culture, and because this is the first study of its kind in the sports industry, there is plenty of future research to be explored.

Future Research

Even though the company in the current study was not familiar with transformational change, that is not the case for many other professional teams and the sports industry alike. Owner transitions happen, leadership changes occur, and on average, there tends to be frequent job movement within sports as there is not always an abundance of room for growth on sports teams, and sometimes the only way to grow or make a vertical move is to take a role with another team. Sports teams and the sports industry could benefit from OD practices, and it would be interesting to see other sports organizations studied in this way. To date, this is the only study that examines the effects of OD on changing a culture in the front office of a professional sports team. There have been other studies of culture at the collegiate level (e.g., Baily, 2007; Weese, 1996), and within sports organizations in other countries (e.g., Gilmore & Gilson, 2007; Tojari, 2011), but none that have examined professional sports leagues in the US.

In addition, there is still room for further research on changing an organizational culture, specifically in terms of evolving or shifting it, rather than completely transforming it altogether. It would be interesting to see how other organizations leverage existing strengths, select target areas to focus on and improve, and how a company can close the gaps between existing cultures and aspired states. Despite the abundance of OD techniques and interventions available, there are still opportunities to study the processes with robust methods, especially in real organizations dealing with real OD issues (Cummings & Worley, 2013).

It would also be interesting to further explore why some targeted areas of the current study only received partial support. It could just be a factor of not enough time (e.g., Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1985), or errors or biases within ratings or coding, or in the initial diagnosis. Perhaps it could be due to the level of congruence between employees and the culture that was being created. For example, O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) reported that the greater the correspondence between an individual's values and the organizational culture, the higher the level of performance, the longer the organizational tenure, and the greater the expressed commitment to the firm. This factor was not studied in the current study, but may have been possible to assess retroactively via exit interviews or perhaps proactively with other employee assessments of their own values and motivations. Either way, it would be worth exploring why culture change does not happen, or some of it happens more slowly than other parts, and this should be considered by future researchers.

Limitations

Perhaps the most obvious limitation in the current study is its design, or a quasi-experimental design with no control group. This design is generally not sufficient for strong tests

of causal hypotheses as one cannot rule out many threats to internal validity such as history, maturation, bias, and multiple treatments (Cooke, Campbell, & Peracchio, 1990). Even though this design is not ideal for scientific purposes, creating a control group is not always feasible for real organizations (Cummings & Worley, 2013). For example, organizational culture is an organizational level variable, and holding some of the organization out of the interventions (as a control group) would mean the independent variable would lose some construct validity. Also, if the company in the current study would have created a control group, it would have likely been more detrimental to the culture and morale of the staff than the benefits of the study. This was especially true in the beginning of the study, when employees were sensitive and scared, morale was low, there was a lot of turnover, and the workforce itself was small and it would be very difficult to keep contamination from happening between groups. To combat this issue, the study did have a decent sample size, it implemented continuous measures, the same person implemented measures and interventions over the course of the study, and the data were still able to tell a story over time.

A second set of limitations could be considered regarding the performance scores on the ideology elements. For example, the mean shifts were relatively small over time, even though most target areas reported a significant change. It may also be considered that manager and/or employee standards changed over time, perhaps becoming higher standards as the culture and organization started to improve. This may also be influenced by the rating scale, which does not allow for much variance over a 4-point anchor. Lastly, it should be noted that performance scores on the ideology were based on single item measures of each ideology element, and that there are reliability and validity issues with this type of measurement. However, even though scale reliabilities did not exist, test-retest reliabilities were possible to assess since the same item

was measured over two or more points in time and with the same sample. All items were significantly correlated at two or more periods in time, with the exception of Self Improver and Collaborate. There is also evidence that supports the use of single-item measures in research, especially with repeated measurements (e.g., “diary” studies; Hülshager, Lang, Schewe, & Zijlstra, 2015), and in recent years arguments have been made to continue utilizing them as a form of measurement (Bergkvist, 2014; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997).

Implications

Beyond contributing to a new area of research and introducing OD interventions to a new industry, the biggest implication of the current study is the framework it provides for utilizing OD in sports, or perhaps in any cultural change process. Specifically, it lays out a process for identifying a new vision, and the strategies, structure, and ideology that would be required to uphold it. It is then necessary to identify the existing culture and understand it from numerous angles and with various measurement methods. This study answered calls to utilize multiple methods, as well as a return to the emic perspective and the use of qualitative data. It is important to note that had the current study only measured cultural norms with quantitative data, one of the major variables, Collaborate would have appeared to not improve at all, but by examining it at other layers of cultures and with other measurements, it was clear it did in fact improve over time, supporting the need to study culture from multiple angles, with multiple lenses, and over time.

The present study also demonstrated how to find the discrepancies between the existing culture and the desired state, and how to measure these gaps at all levels of culture. Lastly, the study design demonstrates the building of interventions specific to an organization’s needs, or

initiatives that will leverage strengths of the existing culture and close the targeted gaps in order to evolve the culture over time, rather than to change it completely and rapidly. On the whole, the current study introduced OD to the sports industry, and there is evidence that it not only has a place in sports, but that it is still a useful tool and process to identify and shift a culture as a means to adapt, grow, and strengthen as not only a company, but also as individuals.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STUDY DESIGN

Time 1 2011	Time 2 2013	Time 3 2014	Time 4 2015
O1 O2	X1 O3 O4	X2 O3 O4 O5	X3 O1 O2 O3 O4 O5

O1 = Cultural Artifacts Observation (artifacts)

O2 = Diagnostic Survey (underlying assumptions; Appendix C)

O3 = Performance Ratings and Employee Commitments (cultural norms; Appendix D)

O4 = Development Goals (underlying assumptions; Appendix D)

O5 = Customer Service Program's Culture Survey (cultural norms)

X1 = OD Interventions

1. Implementation of New Company Mission, Vision, Structure, and Ideology
2. Implementation of a Strategic Planning Process
3. Implementation of a Performance Management & Development Planning Process

X2 = OD Interventions

1. Implementation of Customer Service Program and Recognition Program
2. Implementation of Hiring Practices and Employer Branding Representative of the Culture
3. Implementation of Events and Programming to Celebrate Wins and Create Pride

X3 = OD Interventions

1. Implementation of a Tightly Integrated Summer Internship Program
2. Implementation of Company-wide Knowledge-Sharing Seminars
3. Implementation of Meeting Structure and Process to Target Better Collaboration

APPENDIX B

COMPANY IDEOLOGY

Individual Expectations

1. **Hard Work:** Is motivated and full of energy for the things he/she sees as challenging, seizes opportunities, and is not afraid to act fast and work hard.
2. **Accountability & Focus:** Can be counted on to meet goals successfully, is very bottom-lined oriented, and steadfastly pushes self and others for the best results.
3. **Commitment:** Is dedicated to the mission of the company, to department goals, and to individual goals, and demonstrates this through unwavering support.
4. **Positive Attitude:** Has a willingness to learn new ways to work, faces challenges head-on, and helps to defuse conflicts and views uncertainty and change with optimism.
5. **Self Improver:** Is personally committed to and actively works to continuously improve him / herself, works to leverage strengths and compensate for weaknesses.
6. **Team Improver:** Creates strong morale and spirit in his/her team, empowers others, shares wins and successes, and creates a feeling of belonging in the team.
7. **Proactive:** Shows initiative, identifies opportunities, and takes preemptive actions against potential problems and threats.

Individual Code of Conduct

8. **Authentic:** Is genuine and possesses extraordinary integrity, with a sense of purpose to live according to their core values.
9. **Respectful:** Is professional and respects others' work, yet is capable of communicating constructive feedback in an honorable way.
10. **Resourceful:** Invents quick and clever ways to find solutions to problems or issues.
11. **Disciplined:** Understands how and when to apply their skills and knowledge domain, and when to involve others for their area of expertise.
12. **No Victims:** Faces adversity head-on, takes accountability for mistakes, and has the ability to quickly rebound after experiencing difficulty, without blaming others.
13. **No Villains:** Guards the Ideology, appreciates individuality, and works quickly to defuse threats of gossip by focusing on the strengths and value of others.

Teamwork Code of Conduct

14. Initiate: Seeks out and drives ways to contribute or explores opportunities that will help grow the company without being prompted.
15. Collaborate: Swims in their own lane while still seeking the input and insights of other stakeholders and encourages constructive and harmonious discussion and team-building.
16. Account: Owns the successful completion of initiated projects and sees them through to the end.

APPENDIX C

DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY

Thanks for your help! To get started, think about what it is like to work here now, and then complete the following questions. Please know all answers will only be shared as consolidated feedback without any names associated with responses. We appreciate and value your input!

First and Last Name: Enter your first and last name.

Note: We only ask for your name to link your responses to future or past responses. Remember, responses will be kept confidential and no individual responses will be shared.

1. What's going great today?
2. What should we do more?
3. What should we do less?
4. What is the best tool to get directly to our customers?
5. How can we continue to thrill our customers?

APPENDIX D

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FORM

Employee Demographics

Employees: Complete the following fields by entering your name, your manager's name, and select your department, sub-department, and fiscal year.

Employee Name: Enter your first and last name.

Manager Name: Enter your manager's name.

Department: Enter your department's name.

Sub-department: Enter your sub-department's name.

Fiscal Year: Enter the current fiscal year.

Section 1: What You Do

Employees: Reflect on last fiscal year and rate your overall goal performance by entering a score in the Self-Assessment box using the rating scale below. Provide any comments about your achievements by typing inside the Employee Comments text box.

Managers: Rate your employee's overall performance on last fiscal year's goals by entering a score in the Manager Assessment box using the rating scale below. Give your employee feed forward on how to enhance accountability and focus on next year's goals by typing inside the Manager Feed Forward text box.

Off Track	Underperforming	On Target	Outperforming	Not Applicable
0	1	2	3	N/A

Overall Rating for Last Year

Self-Assessment: Select Self-Assessment.

Manager Assessment: Select Manager Assessment.

Employee Comments: Summarize your achievements and add any additional comments that will help describe how you performed your goals.

Manager Feedforward: Provide feed forward based on observations and examples of how the employee delivered their goals last year, and what they can do to get focused for next year.

Set New Business Goals for Next Year

Employees: Draft your business goals for next fiscal year by typing into the text boxes below, including the goal description, the metric you will use to measure it, and any key interdependencies that you need to collaborate with when working on the goal. Choose a deadline for each goal by clicking on the calendar icon. To add another goal, copy and paste one of the goal sections and insert it below the rest of your goals.

Managers: Review and edit your employee's goals by typing directly into the text boxes below. If you wish, you can make your comments stand out by formatting your text just as you would with any other document, such as using a different font color or highlighting text.

Goal: Enter SMART business goal contents here, including what you will initiate, or how you will deliver business results and help grow the company.

Metric: Describe how you will know when you have successfully achieved this goal.

Key Interdependencies: List the names of individuals or the key department that you will need to collaborate with in order for the goal to be successfully completed.

Deadline: Click here to enter a date.

Section II: How You Do It

Employees: Rate yourself on each attribute of the Ideology by entering a score in the Self-Assessment box using the rating scale below.

Managers: Rate your employee on each attribute of the Ideology by entering a score in the Manager Assessment box using the rating scale below.

Off Track	Underperforming	On Target	Outperforming	Not Applicable
0	1	2	3	N/A

Individual Expectations

1. **Hard Work:** Is motivated and full of energy for the things he/she sees as challenging, seizes opportunities, and is not afraid to act fast and work hard.
2. **Accountability & Focus:** Can be counted on to meet goals successfully, is very bottom-lined oriented, and steadfastly pushes self and others for the best results.
3. **Commitment:** Is dedicated to the mission of the company, to department goals, and to individual goals, and demonstrates this through unwavering support.

4. **Positive Attitude:** Has a willingness to learn new ways to work, faces challenges head-on, and helps to defuse conflicts and views uncertainty and change with optimism.
5. **Self Improver:** Is personally committed to and actively works to continuously improve him / herself, works to leverage strengths and compensate for weaknesses.
6. **Team Improver:** Creates strong morale and spirit in his/her team, empowers others, shares wins and successes, and creates a feeling of belonging in the team.
7. **Proactive:** Shows initiative, identifies opportunities, and takes preemptive actions against potential problems and threats.

Individual Code of Conduct

8. **Authentic:** Is genuine and possesses extraordinary integrity, with a sense of purpose to live according to their core values.
9. **Respectful:** Is professional and respects others' work, yet is capable of communicating constructive feedback in an honorable way.
10. **Resourceful:** Invents quick and clever ways to find solutions to problems or issues.
11. **Disciplined:** Understands how and when to apply their skills and knowledge domain, and when to involve others for their area of expertise.
12. **No Victims:** Faces adversity head-on, takes accountability for mistakes, and has the ability to quickly rebound after experiencing difficulty, without blaming others.
13. **No Villains:** Guards the Ideology, appreciates individuality, and works quickly to defuse threats of gossip by focusing on the strengths and value of others.

Teamwork Code of Conduct

14. **Initiate:** Seeks out and drives ways to contribute or explores opportunities that will help grow the company without being prompted.
15. **Collaborate:** Swims in their own lane while still seeking the input and insights of other stakeholders and encourages constructive and harmonious discussion and team-building.
16. **Account:** Owns the successful completion of initiated projects and sees them through to the end.

Define Teamwork Commitments for Next Year

Employees: Choose 1 – 2 elements from the Ideology and define how you will improve upon them in the next year by typing into the Teamwork Commitments text box below.

Managers: Give your employees feedforward on how to improve on the Ideology by typing inside the Manager Feedforward text box. Reflect on their Teamwork Commitments and make suggestions on how they can uphold them, or suggest other aspects of the Ideology they should commit to.

Teamwork Commitments: Commit to 1 - 2 elements from the Ideology that you will work to improve upon in the next year (e.g., Proactive, Positive Attitude, Collaborate, etc.), and how you will work on them.

Manager Feedforward: Provide feedforward describing observations and examples of how well the employee upholds the Ideology, and how they can better commit to these actions next year.

Section III: Where You're Going

Employees: Draft your development goals for next year by typing into the text boxes below, including the goal description, the metric you will use to measure it, and any key interdependencies, or key individuals that can help play a role in your development. Choose a deadline for each goal by clicking on the calendar icon. To add another goal, copy and paste one of the goal sections and insert it below the rest of your goals.

Managers: Review and edit your employee's goals by typing directly into the text boxes below. If you wish, you can make your comments stand out by formatting your text just as you would with any other document, such as using a different font color or highlighting text.

Goal: Enter SMART development goal contents here, including how you will improve a development area that is critical for your role, or a potential future role.

Metric: Describe how you will know when you have successfully achieved this goal.

Key Interdependencies: List who might be influential in your development, who you could learn from, or who you should start building relationships with to aid in your career development.

Deadline: Click here to enter a date.

Section IV: Pass & Shoot

Managers: Review the form together. Then, print the final version of the form, sign and date it, and ask your employee to do the same in the spaces provided below.

I acknowledge and agree that I have discussed the above content with my employee:

I acknowledge and agree that I have discussed the above content with my manager:

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N., Herriot, P., & Hodgkinson, G. P. (2001). The practitioner-researcher divide in Industrial, Work and Organizational (IWO) psychology: Where are we now, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*, 391-411.
- Bailey, E. J. (2007). Playing the culture game: Organizational culture in collegiate athletics (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Central Michigan University.
- Beckhard, R. (1969). *Organizational development: Strategies and models*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beckhard, R., & Harris, R. T. (1987). *Organizational transitions*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M. (1980). *Organization change and development: A systems view*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Bergkvist, L. (2014). Appropriate use of single-item measures is here to stay. *Marketing Letters*, *26*, 245-255.
- Boyce, A. S., Nieminen, L. R. G., Gillespie, M. A., Ryan, A. M., & Denison, D. R. (2015). Which comes first, organizational culture or performance? A longitudinal study of causal priority with automobile dealerships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 339-359.
- Brockner, J., & Rubin, J. Z. (1985). Entrapment in escalating conflicts: A social psychological analysis. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Burke, W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2008). Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 1062-1081.
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organizational fit. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*, 333-349.
- Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. (2003). Full-cycle micro organizational behavior research. *Organization Science*, *16*, 434-447.
- Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2016). Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 199-224.

- Collins, J., & Porras, J. I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T., & Peracchio, L. (1990). Quasi Experimentation. In M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology* Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A qualitative approach to the assessment of culture. *Group & Organization Management*, 13, 245-273.
- Cooperrider, D. (1990). Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis for organizing. In *Appreciative management and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coyle, D. *The culture code: The secrets of highly successful groups*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2005). *Organization development and change* (8th edition). Mason, OH: South-Western.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1992). *Exploring complex organizations: A cultural perspective*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 619-654.
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6, 204-223.
- Denison, D. R. & Neale, W. (1996). Denison Organizational Culture Survey, Ann Arbor, MI: Aviat.
- Denison, D. R., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1991). Organizational culture and organizational development. In *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, ed. R. W. Woodman, W. A. Pasmore, 5, 1-21, Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2014). *Organizational culture and climate: An introduction to theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Eisenbach, R., Watson, K., & Pillai, R. Transformational leadership in the context of organization change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 80-89.
- French, W. (1969). Organization development: Objectives, assumptions, and strategies. *California Management Review*, 12, 23-34.
- Frohman, M. A., Sashkin, M., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1976). Action research as applied to organization development. *Organization and Administrative Sciences*, 7, 129-142.

- Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lundberg, C., & Martin, J. (1985). *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gilmore, S., & Gilson, C. (2007). Finding form: Elite sports and the business of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20, 409-428.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 677-694.
- Hogan, S. J. & Coote, L. V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1609-1621.
- Hülshager, U. R., Lang, J. W., Schewe, A. F., & Zijlstra, F. R. (2015). When regulating emotions at work pays off: A diary and an intervention study on emotion regulation and customer tips in service jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 263-277.
- Jung, T., Scott, J. T., Davies, H. T. O., Bower, P., Whalley, D., McNally, R., et al. (2009). Instruments for reviewing organisational culture: A review of the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 69, 1087-1096.
- Katzell, R. A., & Austin, J. T. (1992). From then to now: The development of industrial-organizational psychology in the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 803-835.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1-55.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School, Division of Research.
- Marrow, A. (1967). Events leading to the establishment of the national training laboratories. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 3, 145-150.
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neuman, G. A., Edwards, J. E., & Raju, N. S. (1989). Organizational development interventions: A meta-analysis of their effects on satisfaction and other attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 461-489.

- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, cults, and commitment. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 157-200.
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487-516.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, ed. W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski, 12, 565-593, New York: Wiley.
- Ostroff, C., & Schulte, M. (2014). A configural approach to the study of organizational culture and climate. In B. Schneider, & K. M. Barbera (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational climate and culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from American's best run companies*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-581.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). Understanding organizations: Concepts and controversies. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and D. G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology*, Vol. 1, Fourth Edition (pp. 733-777). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Porras, J. I., & Roberstson, P. J. (1992). Organizational development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.), 3, 719-822. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1981). A competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. *Public Productivity Review*, 5, 122-140.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A special model of effectiveness criteria: Toward a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Managerial Science*, 29, 363-377.
- Sackman, S. A. (2011). Culture and performance. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F., eds. (2011). *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2nd ed, 188-224.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*, 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45, 109-119.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Schein, E. H. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F., eds. (2000). *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, xxiii-xxx.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 4th ed.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 361-388.
- Schwartz, H., & Davis, S. (1981). Matching corporate culture and business strategy. *Organizational Dynamics, 10*, 30-38.
- Staw, B. M. (1976). Knee-deep in the big muddy: A study of escalating commitment to a chosen course of action. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 27-44.
- Tagiuri, R., Litwin, G. H., & Barnes, L. B. (1968). *Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept*. Boston, MA: Harvard University.
- Tojari, F., Heris, M. S., & Zarei, A. (2011). Structural equation modeling analysis of effects of leadership styles and organizational culture on effectiveness in sport organizations. *African Journal of Business Management, 5*, 8634-8641.
- Trist, E., & Bamforth, K. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations, 4*, 1-38.
- Tushman, M., Newman, W., & Romanelli, E. (1986). Managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution. *California Management Review, 29*, 29-44.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 247-252.
- Weese, W. J. (1996). Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 197-206.
- Wilderom, C. P. M., Glunk, U., & Mazlowski, R. (2000). Organizational culture as a predictor of organizational performance. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F., eds. (2000). *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 193-209.