Change Capacity Profile

Research & Studies Alignment v1.0

STATUS: Research-informed framework under pilot testing. Not yet scientifically validated.

Table of Content

1. Purpose and foundational principles 2
   1.1 Research Foundations and Scientific Validation 2
2. Scientific and theoretical foundations 3
   2.1 Dynamic Capabilities 3
   2.2 Psychological Safety and Team Learning 3
   2.3 Employee Voice and Silence 3
   2.4 Information Sharing and Team Performance 3
   2.5 Coordination in Organizations 4
   2.6 Organizational Readiness for Change 4
   2.7 Organizational Learning 4
   2.8 Group Decision-Making and Conflict 4
3. Overall Research Assessment Alignment 5
4. The distinctive methodological contribution of Change Capacity Profile[JB] 6
   4.1 Six Interconnected Organizational Capabilities 6
   4.2 Capacity and Change Friction 6
   4.3 Insufficient Insight as Diagnostic Information 6
   4.4 From Measurement to Exploratory Dialogue 6
5. Overall conclusion 7
6. Scientific references 8

Change Capacity Profile

Research & Studies Alignment v1.0

1. Purpose and foundational principles

The purpose of this document is to describe the scientific and theoretical foundations of the **Change Capacity Profile**[JB], identify which aspects of the assessment are supported by established research, highlight areas requiring further research, and outline the methodological questions to be investigated during the pilot.

The **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] is designed to explore how people experience their organization's capacity to deal with change as part of how it operates.

The assessment explores six organizational capabilities:

1. Sense
2. Dare
3. Collaborate
4. Align
5. Enable
6. Learn & adapt

Each capability is examined from two complementary perspectives.

- **Change Capacity:** The reported strength and presence of organizational capabilities that enable people to deal with change.
- **Change Friction:** Organizational conditions that may make those capabilities more difficult to practice or make change unnecessarily difficult.

The assessment also captures **Insufficient Insight**, indicating that a respondent does not have enough information or experience to assess a particular statement.

Change Capacity and Change Friction are treated as separate perspectives. They are not automatically considered opposites and should not be combined into a single score.

The assessment is not intended to provide a definitive organizational diagnosis or an overall maturity rating. Its purpose is to identify patterns, differences in experience, and potential constraints that warrant deeper exploration.

The guiding methodological principle is:

> **"The assessment tells us where to look. The next step is to understand what is creating the pattern before deciding what to change."**

1.1 Research Foundations and Scientific Validation

It is important to distinguish between three levels of scientific support.

- **Research-informed:** The framework has been developed with reference to established research concepts and theories.
- **Empirically tested:** The assessment has been systematically tested with respondents and empirical data.
- **Scientifically validated:** The relevant measurement properties of the assessment have been examined using appropriate scientific methods.

> **At this stage, the Change Capacity Profile[JB] should be described as a research-informed organizational assessment under pilot testing.**

Established research supports the relevance of several organizational mechanisms explored by the assessment. However, this does not mean that the specific statements, six capabilities, or scoring approach have already been scientifically validated.

2. Scientific and theoretical foundations

The following research areas are particularly relevant to the **Change Capacity Profile**[JB]

2.1 Dynamic Capabilities

Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997), and subsequently Teece (2007), describe how organizations develop capabilities to recognize changes, respond to opportunities, and reconfigure resources and ways of working.

This research provides an important theoretical foundation for the **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] as a whole, particularly SENSE and LEARN & ADAPT.

However, there is an important distinction between the strategic organizational capabilities examined in this research and the **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] which explores how organizational conditions and capabilities are experienced in everyday practice.

2.2 Psychological Safety and Team Learning

Edmondson (1999) examined the relationship between psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams.

The research highlights the importance of conditions in which people feel able to raise concerns, ask questions, and acknowledge mistakes without fear of negative interpersonal consequences.

This provides a particularly strong conceptual foundation for DARE and relevant aspects of LEARN & ADAPT.

2.3 Employee Voice and Silence

Morrison (2014, 2023) examines why employees choose to express or withhold ideas, concerns, and suggestions. This research is relevant to DARE and certain aspects of SENSE.

An important distinction is that being able to express a perspective is not the same as having that perspective meaningfully considered during decision-making.

2.4 Information Sharing and Team Performance

Mesmer-Magnus and DeChurch (2009) conducted a meta-analysis examining information sharing and team performance.

Their findings indicate positive associations between information sharing and several aspects of team effectiveness.

This supports the relevance of sharing and using information and expertise, particularly within SENSE and COLLABORATE.

2.5 Coordination in Organizations

Okhuysen and Bechky (2009) describe how organizational coordination depends on conditions including common understanding, predictability, and accountability.

This research is particularly relevant to COLLABORATE and ALIGN.

It also provides a theoretical foundation for examining how organizational structures and ways of working influence people's ability to act together.

2.6 Organizational Readiness for Change

Weiner (2009) describes organizational readiness for change through collective change commitment and shared confidence in the organization's ability to implement change.

Holt and colleagues (2007) developed a measure of individual readiness for organizational change.

Both provide relevant research foundations for ALIGN and ENABLE.

However, an important distinction must be maintained.

The **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] explores an organization's more general capacity to deal with change, while much of the research on organizational readiness concerns readiness for a specific planned change.

2.7 Organizational Learning

Crossan, Lane, and White (1999) introduced a framework describing how learning develops across individual, group, and organizational levels. Their framework includes four processes:

- Intuiting
- Interpreting
- Integrating
- Institutionalizing

This research is particularly relevant to LEARN & ADAPT. It helps distinguish between individual learning, shared understanding, and changes that become embedded in organizational practices.

2.8 Group Decision-Making and Conflict

Research on group decision-making and conflict is relevant to DARE.

It is important not to assume that constructive disagreement and conflict in general are equivalent.

De Dreu and Weingart (2003) found negative average associations between both task conflict and relationship conflict and several group outcomes in their meta-analysis.

DARE should therefore be linked primarily to research on how decision-making processes enable or constrain information processing and the exploration of different perspectives, rather than to a general assumption that more conflict improves decisions.

3. Overall Research Assessment Alignment

Capability	Research Alignment
SENSE	High theoretical relevance
DARE	Very high for central components
COLLABORATE	High
ALIGN	High
ENABLE	High theoretical relevance
LEARN & ADAPT	Very high

These assessments refer to conceptual alignment with established research and the relevance of underlying mechanisms. They should not be interpreted as statistical evidence of the assessment's validity.

4. The distinctive methodological contribution of Change Capacity Profile[JB]

The **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] should be described as an **integrative, research-informed framework**.

Its potential contribution lies primarily in how several established research perspectives are combined into a practical structure for organizational development.

4.1 Six Interconnected Organizational Capabilities

The framework combines strategic adaptability, openness, collaboration, shared direction, enabling organizational conditions, and learning.

The six capabilities are intended to represent complementary perspectives on an organization's capacity to deal with change.

4.2 Capacity and Change Friction

The assessment explores both the reported presence of organizational capabilities and the conditions that may constrain their use. This enables the exploration of situations in which strong reported capability coexists with significant organizational obstacles.

4.3 Insufficient Insight as Diagnostic Information

By treating insufficient insight separately, the assessment can highlight differences in organizational visibility and experience without automatically interpreting them as weaknesses.

4.4 From Measurement to Exploratory Dialogue

The assessment is intended to support understanding and development. It is not a self-contained organizational diagnosis.

The profile identifies patterns that warrant further investigation through dialogue, qualitative analysis, and an understanding of organizational conditions. This is a central element of the framework's methodological positioning.

5. Overall conclusion

The **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] has clear and relevant connections to several established research fields.

Its conceptual foundations are particularly strong in Psychological Safety, Employee Voice, Organizational Coordination, and Organizational Learning. Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Readiness for Change also provide important overarching theoretical foundations.

All 42 statements in the profile questionnaire (24 Capacity statements and 18 Friction statements) have identifiable research connections, although the strength and directness of these connections vary.

The **most important areas for further research** are Organizational Sensemaking, Participation in Organizational Change, Structural Empowerment, and the relationship between organizational culture, systems, and behavior.

The critical next step is to examine empirically whether the statements, capabilities, and analytical principles function as intended.

> The **Change Capacity Profile**[JB] should therefore currently be ***described as a research-informed organizational assessment under pilot testing.***

Its central value does not lie in reducing organizational change capacity to a single score. It lies in helping leaders identify patterns, understand organizational conditions, and create more informed dialogue about what the organization needs to develop.

> ***"The assessment tells us where to look. The next step is to understand what is creating the pattern before deciding what to change."***

6. Scientific references

Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 522–537. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 741–749. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.741

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*(2), 232–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & DeChurch, L. A. (2009). Information sharing and team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(2), 535–546. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013773

Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 173–197. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328

Morrison, E. W. (2023). Employee voice and silence: Taking stock a decade later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 79–107. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-054654

Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. (2009). Coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*(1), 463–502. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047533

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science, 4*, Article 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67