

Available online at <http://www.ijims.com>

ISSN - (Print): 2519 – 7908 ; ISSN - (Electronic): 2348 – 0343

IF:4.335; Index Copernicus (IC) Value: 60.59; UGC Recognized -UGC Journal No.: 47192. 1st July

Assessment of a Healthcare Biotechnology Firm’s Safety, Health, & Environmental Department through an Organizational Development Lens

Anton Shufutinsky

DHSc, PhD(c), MSPH, CHMM, REHS/RS, CFSC, IHSL-C^{a, b}

^aChangineering Global, Cheltenham, PA

^bAcademy of Interdisciplinary Health Science Leaders, Elkins Park, PA

Abstract

There have been several articles printed in the peer-reviewed literature regarding the use of organizational development methods or combination of organizational development and applied behavioral sciences methods in organizational safety. However, there is a gap in the literature of case study assessments and evaluations of organizational safety and environmental health departments. There are numerous reasons given by researchers, subject matter expert practitioners, and authors for effective or ineffective occupational safety and health programs. We posit that organizational occupational safety programs, including safety culture programs, cannot be maximally effective if the Safety, Health, and Environment (SHE) departments in the larger organizations are not effective themselves. As such, this paper discusses a case study during which an organizational assessment was performed via action research on an SHE department in a large biotechnology manufacturing and research firm. The results exhibit organizational flaws and failures identified during an organizational design and effectiveness assessment using established organizational development tools and methods, and makes recommendations for interventions. It is evident in the assessment results that SHE departments suffer identical organizational problems as other organizations, thus themselves affecting organizational effectiveness in general. The lessons learned from this assessment, including the tools used for assessment, can be used by other SHE departments and by I/O Psychologists or Organizational Development professionals to perform similar organizational assessments and interventions.

Keywords: Organizational Development, Organizational Culture, Safety Culture, Industrial Safety, Organizational Effectiveness, Action Research

Introduction

Organizations strive to create and maintain competitive advantage in order to succeed and survive in today's hypercompetitive industrial complex. Organizations create and maintain competitive advantage through innovation and creation of value in their products, processes, or services (Magretta, 2012). Faced with competition, an organization achieves superior performance and unique, valuable products, processes, or services through strategy (Magretta, 2013). It is no longer enough to evaluate external positioning of the organization in the industrial environment. Leaders must now manage both external and internal factors in order to remain competitive in the marketplace. Strategic change is traditionally defined to occur through effective alignment of organizational structure and process. However, it has been shown that the more complete means of achieving effective strategic change is through the integration of strategy and organizational development (Worley, Hitchins, & Ross, 1996). In order to ensure that the organization can plan and strategize appropriately and make the right decisions, organizations must be able to accurately diagnose the firm's strategic orientation, including strategy, organizational structure, organizational processes, and organizational behavior (Worley, Hitchins, & Ross, 1996). This is accomplished through organizational assessment.

Purpose

Safety, Health, and Environmental departments in organizations are charged with promoting a safe and health work environment and preventing to the utmost ability exposures to hazardous chemical, physical, and biological agents that can cause injury or illness in the workplace. This requires a great deal of interaction with organizational

departments, processes, and people, and clearly necessitates relationship building, training, observation, decision-making, emotional intelligence, and cultural competence. These are necessities of managing most organizations, and the potential struggle of SHE departments is that they must do this not only within their own departments, but across entire companies. The question is asked, how can an SHE department be effective at instilling effective safety culture and driving effective safety and environmental strategies and programs in a corporation if the SHE department struggles from internal organizational design and effectiveness problems? The authors posit that organizational effectiveness and development assessments and interventions are critical in SHE departments for the effective management of internal departmental effectiveness because that effectiveness is primarily critical for the SHE department to effectively support the business and for overall company SHE performance.

This action research study performs an organizational assessment on a site SHE department in a large global biotechnical firm that reports exemplary SHE performance compared to industry competitors, reporting top quartile incident rates when compared to similar organizations. The assessment on the SHE department was performed by employing numerous assessment methods and tools in conjunction with the use of Jamieson's Strategic Organization Design (SOD) Model, and providing guidance on interventions for organizational re-design and effectiveness.

Literature Review

Need for Organizational Change

We are currently in the midst of seeing dramatic change in the way organizations and businesses evolve and remain competitive. This is not a new concept, but rather one

that has evolved over the recent decades, as globalization in trade and information transfer have changed the way corporations, governments, compliance agencies, and international organizations do business and interact with one another. In the wake of these challenges, advancements in technology, economic systems, changing lifestyles, and worker knowledge and capabilities have caused restructuring of organizational societal demands and forced organizations to evolve in their management models in order to meet modern expectations (Jamali, Khoury, & Sahyoun, 2006). As a result, organizations are becoming increasingly complex, and a focus has been on adapting to complexity, uncertainty, ambiguity, and volatility (CUAV), driving a reliance on integrated, versatile, and complex teams with varying degrees of skill and capability (Baker, Day, & Salas, 2006; Eoyang & Holladay, 2013). Today's complex contexts make uncertainty, and CUAV as an aggregate, difficult to understand. Likewise, this environment makes understanding how to deal with it even less transparent across industry (Eoyang & Holladay, 2013). Therefore, organizations of the past that were built to perform are no longer equipped to meet today's challenges in the way they once were. In today's highly competitive industrial environment, organizations must be able to deal with uncertainty and change. Thus, instead of being built for performance, they must be built to change. Organizations have to be ready to change, and to change continually (Lawler & Worley, 2006).

Organizational Assessment

Change in industry has driven an increase in the necessity for change in organizations (Lawler & Worley, 2006). The problem, then, is that organizations have to know what to change. When a problem is more than transient or casual, the business

needs to be able to understand what caused or continues to cause the problem before trying to fix it (Lowman, 2005). A problem cannot be fixed without understanding the root causes for said problem, and root causes cannot be identified without competent assessment. It is that competent assessment that provides any sense of assurance that interventions address what ails the organization. Without it, you can achieve change, but not sustainable, effective change (Lowman, 2005).

Organizational leaders need to have verifiable data as evidence before making decisions on action. Pfeffer & Sutton (2006) contend that evidence-based practice in corporate settings is a critical means to organizational success. Like in medical practice, evidence-based management (EBM) has to do with how people think and what they use to make decisions. For whatever reason, the research shows that managers and leaders simply do not often subject their business practices to the same level of rigor that they would if it were a medical procedural issue (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). Pfeffer & Sutton (2006) comment that managers should not always try new things in place of practicing true things, and that new ideas that managers have are most-likely old ideas that have already been attempted by others (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). Data analytics are critical in making organizational decisions. Data are evidence and it is critical to making business decisions based on them. Data collected through research and experience serve as evidence, and this collected evidence can be vital for decision-making in real-time action and in strategic planning (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006). The evidence necessary for effective EBM in an organization can be at least partially collected through organizational assessment. However, it is critical that organizational leaders do not confuse evidence-based practice with metrics. Metrics are critical, but it is the right metrics that make the

necessary changes in practice. People often hire informaticists, statisticians, mathematicians, and data professionals to perform the work. Metrics without guidance through assessment can result in wasted time, effort, and resources with no effective outcome. Organizations today understand that data analytics is critical in order to drive business decisions, but without the correct assessment, the data analysts often perform data mining in order to pull any and all existing data and study the data for trends,. Although this can sometimes be effective at identifying problems, it can also be very detrimental. When scientists and researchers perform studies, good studies are those in which data collection and methods are informed by pre-existing evidence, previous studies, experience, and an understanding of the science behind the research. From there, theories, hypotheses, and correct methodology are established, and data is collected from the analysis. These are evidence-based analytics. In short, metrics can be important, but the wrong metrics can be useless, and guide organizations down the wrong path. Furthermore, not all data are quantitative. Organizational leaders and analysts must understand that everything cannot be resolved through quantitative metrics. Qualitative analysis, assessments, and studies are often equally or more important for organizational success.

Many organizations define organizational assessment as a means of or attempt to identify the present and potential competitive advantage of an organization. While this is a part of the purpose of organizational assessment, effective strategic management calls for understanding resources and competencies that contribute to the formation of the organization and thus the organization's health, rather than just the ability to maintain industrial competitive advantage (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998). Internal

organizational assessments are much more functional and must include assessment of human resources among other aspects, and their strengths and weaknesses (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998). While strategic change generally aligns strategy, structure, and process within an organization, assessments should focus not only on changes in products, structures, and number of people laid-off in the workplace, but also on the reasons behind those lay-offs, and how management make those difficult decisions (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996). There should be some focus on cultural values, relationships, and intra- and inter-departmental interactions, among other factors (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996), providing a part of an internal assessment.

External environmental analysis is accomplished by monitoring the industrial environment, forecasting, and assessing opportunities and threats. Internal organizational analysis should be conducted in very much the same way, through surveying, categorizing, and evaluating the internal environment of the organization (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998), including the people and their behaviors, because it is critical to understand an organization's functional dynamics (Courtney, Joe, Rowan-Szal, & Simpson, 2007). Changing the function or functioning practices in an organization are ways to increase productivity and innovation transfer (Courtney, Joe, Rowan-Szal, & Simpson, 2007). However, an organization must first understand what is dysfunctional and what needs to be changed. This is where organizational assessment comes in, and feedback provided from assessment is critical to those who are in positions to make changes and improvements (Courtney, Joe, Rowan-Szal & Simpson, 2007).

According to Lowman (2005), organizational assessments are generally conducted to address either organizational dysfunction or organizational well-being and

optimization, and there is no single correct way to conduct organizational assessments (Lowman, 2005). They must be conducted customized to the organization, and well-trained, experienced, and educated professionals know how to make the assessment fit the organization.

Methods

Organization Description

This case study provides a thorough organizational assessments of an organization internal to a large global biotechnology firm. The internal organization assessed was a safety, health, and environmental protection (SHE) organization located at the large manufacturing and research site. The organization provides (a) environmental, (b) environmental health, (c) industrial safety, (d) process safety, (e) industrial hygiene, (f) human factors engineering, (g) sustainability, (h) health promotion, and (i) radiation health physics services to a manufacturing and research and development corporate site consisting of more than 5000 employees.

The SHE Department consists of four Site Directors, and a Lead Area Director. The Lead Area Director is responsible for all Site Directors that lead the site's SHE activities, including provision of services to multiple laboratory and manufacturing facilities and locations. At the time of the assessment, each of the four Site Directors managed a particular group within the SHE department responsibilities. The groups were divided into (a) SHE site support professionals, (b) SHE program coordinators, (c) SHE strategists, and (d) radiation health physicists. The site support professionals provide end-to-end professional response to the manufacturing, research & development, administrative, and facilities and utilities engineering divisions on the site,

in addition to smaller divisions such as medical, sales, and regulatory affairs. The professionals in the program coordinator group manage and update policies and programs and ensure all regulatory compliance reports and permits are completed. The SHE strategy group manages injury record-keeping, injury reporting, injury and incident metrics, maintenance of SHE management system software, and the department website. The radiation health physics team provides radioactive monitoring services and maintains the radiation dosimetry program on the site. Including the Directors, there were a total of 28 members of the organization at the time the assessment was performed. At the time of the observation and assessments, the organization consisted of (a) five Directors, (b) two administrative assistants, (c) one technician, (d) nine site support professionals, (e) six program coordinators, (f) two radiation health physicists, (g) one SHE strategist, and (e) two SHE consultants. The consultants are generally employed half-time to support very specific field projects, and do not generally interact on all activities or attend department meetings.

Organizational Assessment Methods

The organizational assessment was performed using a combined approach of methods, from an action research point of reference. The action research was performed with the use of qualitative-inductive methods, conducting ethnographic observation research through an interpretivist approach and the use of coding tools for action research data analysis (Bryman, 2016). Observations were conducted throughout numerous full work days and intra- and inter-organization interactions were observed during projects and meetings. Questions were designed for interviews to be asked of all members in the department during one-on-one interviews. However, in order to protect anonymity and to

reduce fear of retaliation, questions were transferred to print prior to distribution, and answers were collected in a similar fashion, creating a blind interview environment, ensuring that all questions were asked through a random non-identifier process. Blank questionnaires were distributed on paper at a department gathering and instructions stated that all answers were to be typed and placed in a mailbox, with no identifying marks from the respondents. Furthermore, because of the anonymity, the expectation is that the results reside in the social realities of the employees interviewed, and it is their assessments and actions that make the data meaningful. Therefore, it is the job of the researcher to bracket the quasi-ethnographic experience and knowledge and to interpret and make sense of the thoughts and perspectives of the study subjects from their world perspective (Bryman, 2016), cognizant of the constructionist reality of the expected yield.

Organizational Assessment Action Research Questions. Three open-ended questions were posed to non-management SHE professional employees, excluding consultants. Consultants were not included because they are not permanent employees and there is no specification in their contracts that permits them to participate in surveys. Additionally, hourly rates paid to consultants are for work performed, and do not include organizational assessment questionnaires or interviews.

Once responses were received, the questions were read, interpreted, ordered, and coded. The following questions were asked of employees.

The first of the three questions distributed was a question developed and to be collected from a quasi-appreciative inquiry lens. Although this was not appreciative inquiry directly related to what they appreciate in their current employ, the questions resounded around the appreciation of ideal work environments in general. The other two

questions were not driven through any particular lens. Despite being blind, action research questions were broadly positioned, with sufficient room for participant's interpretation and creativity in response.

Appreciative inquiry question.

1. If you were to take a new job in an organization that is an ideal workplace, what elements and attributes would that workplace environment have?

Action research employee perception questions.

1. From your current perspective, what are the positive attributes of your workplace today?
2. In your view, what can be improved in your current workplace environment?

Because the study was phenomenologically-based and quasi-ethnographic, the researcher remained actively aware of the personal individual role and attempted to be as unbiased and conscientious of the survey takers as possible, ensuring objectivity while simultaneously remaining aware of interpretation and the constructivist ontology of this type of action research, including awareness of constructivism and paying close attention to both the antitheses to objectivism and to realism (Bryman, 2016).

Action research data organization and analysis. After the questionnaire data were collected, they were combined for each question. An interpretivist, phenomenologically-based SOD categorical sorting and coding was performed. The data were sorted, coded and labeled (Bryman, 2016) using a tabular method relative to the Jamieson SOD framework categories. Upon organizing the data into a collective format, the researcher made sense of the responses through categorization based on a schema that arose from

the collective responses. The analyzed data yielded multiple categories, and responses were tabulated accordingly into the elements of the SOD model that they aligned with.

Organizational Assessment Model. The organization was assessed according to Jamieson's Strategic Organizational Design(SOD) model (Figure 1). Organizational design is a deliberate process to configure organizational elements including structure, processes, and human resources, among others (Kates& Galbraith, 2007). There are numerous models, including the popular Star Model, which accounts for organizational strategy, capabilities, structure, people, processes, and awards systems (Kates& Galbraith, 2007). However, there are critical elements which it was felt are missing from the Star Model that needed to be addressed for this organization. Therefore, Jamieson's SOD model(Figure 1) was used to capture those elements. This model consists of (a) organizational environment, (b) organizational mission, (c) organizational strategy, (d) organizational vision, (e) organizational leadership, (f) organizational structure, (g) organizational systems, (h) organizational and individual behavior, and (i) organizational culture (Jamieson, 2017).

In order to assess the organization and the elements found in Jamieson's SOD Model, the organization's mission statement, vision statement, and strategy were assessed by evaluating the written documents related to these. Strategy was also assessed using Porter's 5 Tests of Good Strategy. Furthermore, the organization has a published values and culture statement. That statement was assessed using quasi-ethnographic organizational participant observation, in comparison to what was described in the written statement.

Figure 1: Jamieson's SOD Model

Additionally, action research was performed through interview questionnaires based on appreciative inquiry and employees' workplace perception questions. These research tools were used to determine organizational interactions, values, understanding, employee alignment, and culture, and to understand the perception regarding leadership skills and attributes of the organizational managers. The organizational structure was assessed by (a) reviewing and analyzing the organizational chart, (b) responsibility charting, and (c) stream analysis. Organizational systems were analyzed using programs and practices in existence within the organization, including (a) communication practices, (b) reward programs, (c) employee development programs, (d) hiring practices, and (e) talent management. Programs in place were analyzed to establish an understanding of organizational systems. Leadership was assessed through observations, and by data gathered regarding leaders from the action research survey question responses. Likewise, the behavior element was assessed the same way as leadership.

Results and Discussion

Organizational Assessment Results

The overall interpretation of the organization is one of dysfunction and a need for organizational design and development intervention is highly evident. There were particular problems identified with the organizational structure and processes, as well as with the infrastructure behind the mission and vision of the organization. Likewise, the organization's strategy is not ideally aligned with the mission, vision, and purpose of the organization. Additionally, there is a pronounced disparity behind the perspectives of the leaders that drive the organization to perform. Combined, these dysfunctional categories appear to have an effect on organizational members' behaviors with respect to work and the organizational mission, and with leader-member exchange (LMX).

Jamieson's Strategic Organizational Change

The organization was assessed according to Jamieson's SOD model, evaluating (a) environment, (b) mission, (c) vision, (d) strategy, (e) leadership, (f) systems, (g) structure, (h) behavior, and (i) culture, yielding the results discussed in the text of this section.

Environment

The organization does not provide a product or service to the business or the industry that can be easily, financially valued or compared from the perspective of competition in industry. The exception is the potential for outsourcing SHE services across the site instead of retaining a full department of professionals. The company has evaluated the possibility of doing this, and, from experience, decided that it was not a good idea. The SHE Department will continue to remain on the site providing the

necessary services. The competing environment, on the other hand, is internal to the corporation, but external to the SHE organization. The competing factor is production and productivity. Maintaining safe and environmentally safe practices in laboratories and manufacturing plants, as well as the powerplant and buildings, can be burdensome requirements. If they are not integrated appropriately into the work, which they often are not, the competing interest to safety and environmentally-sound work practices is time, and businesses often tend to take shortcuts to cut costs or meet production deadlines. The company is made up of three major divisions on the site. The Manufacturing Division has become the most involved and best at integrating SHE into operations. Although they continue to have accidents and incidents, the rate has steadily decreased, and the leadership ensures that production does not compete with SHE.

The other two divisions are complex. The Facilities Management Division is SHE-averse, and the middle management in the organization continuously rejects active participation in SHE initiatives as preventive measures to protect employees and the environment. The management in this division of the business often complains about the costs related to maintaining clean technologies as well as the time constraints of taking safe measures. Likewise, this organization is most averse to spending quality time performing effective root cause investigations when injuries or incidents occur. This competes with the SHE Department's mission, and causes a disproportionate amount of time to be spent coaching, monitoring, and correcting staff and processes in the Facilities Management Division.

The Research and Development Laboratories are a mixture of the other two if described with regard to competing environments. The research being conducted in the

facility is world class, and it is this very research that drives the business. The Research and Development Laboratories are made up of 13 major research groups that all maintain their own individual leadership chains, and some of the leadership do not reside or rarely appear on the site campus. This makes communication and influence more difficult for those organizations. The SHE staff that supports research spends more than 50% of their time and attention on three Research and Development groups. Those groups are the ones that have higher rates of injuries, illnesses, incidents, and near misses, and have SHE less integrated in their research operations.

This environment is definitely complex to operate in, and it is up to the leadership of the SHE Department to collaborate with these other divisions to ensure SHE success. Currently, it is less than a functional collaborative relationship overall, although improving in some laboratory areas, and considerably in Manufacturing.

Mission and Vision

The mission and vision statements currently used by the department are a single combined statement that says “We are a team of highly skilled SHE experts partnering directly with customers to anticipate and meet regulatory requirements and keep employees and the surrounding community healthy.” In no way does this statement completely satisfy either the mission or vision of the organization, let alone both. Most accurately, this is a description of what the organization does, and even lacks the element of occupational safety despite the fact that it is approximately 70% of what we encounter in our daily operations. The statement does not describe in any facet what the organization envisions to be. There is also no independent vision statement separate from the one exhibited above. If there is no organizational vision, it is difficult to understand where

the mission is leading the organization. Certainly the employees understand their purpose as part of their role descriptions. However, the statement does not identify an ideal state, nor the direction to get there. Without a clear vision, it is difficult to have a clear mission. Likewise, without a clear mission, a strategy to achieving the mission is not easily realized.

Strategy

At the time of the action research, there was no strategy statement for the SHE organization independent of the entire company. There was a corporate strategy that was focused around three general requirements that are interlinked in a pictorial figure of interconnected circles, driving the organization to innovate, execute, and adapt in the order to drive development of highly competitive medical products and devices. However, there was no particular underlying description or a direct link between this corporate strategy and the mission of the Corporate SHE departmental mission statement. This exhibits the potential link between the lack of clear vision statement and the failure to yield a description of a functional mission for the organization, which in turn potentially results in the non-existence of a SHE strategy and a failure to link the corporate strategy as a means to accomplish the mission.

Despite the lack of a strategy statement, the organization does perform work towards achieving injury and incident reduction goals. The manner of action taken to accomplish these goals can be loosely defined as a strategy using strategy assessment tools. In general, the organization does look at high-risk activities, including process safety, high risk work, and environmental incidents in the facilities group as top priorities. These are the scenarios or locations where people can become seriously

injured, die, or where operations can result in environmental contamination or regulatory non-compliance. These are the situations that can shut operations down, and affect the business, and these are the strategic priorities of the SHE organization. Despite a lack of strategic statement, Porter's 5 Tests of Good Strategy was used in order to evaluate the strategy of the organization.

Porter's 5 Tests of Good Strategy.

Distinctive tailored value proposition. This is the element of strategy that looks outward at the customer and at the demand side of the business (Jamieson, 2017; Magretta, 2012). The main customer for this organization is the business itself. SHE services are provided directly to the major divisions on the site. Thus, it is only natural that the main portion of the time, services, and strategy is directed at the customer. The entire purpose for the organization is to ensure health and safety and to prevent environmental pollution for the site.

Unfortunately, although the organization is a site SHE organization, it does answer to an above-site corporate entity, and approximately 25-30% of organizational time is spent working on projects and demands that do not immediately benefit the site or prevent site accidents and incidents, but are required by the SHE corporate entity. As a result, attention from the direct customer is often taken away by political and potentially unnecessary non-site initiatives.

Tailored value chain. As discussed above, the organization focuses mainly on the business. When the business demands assistance with SHE, whether it is by request or by decline in SHE performance, the organization redirects assets to focus on those areas that have the highest demand, and provide the biggest supply of resources and

SHEassistance to those areas. Thus, the organization ties supply and demand together and applies the valuable resources where the value is mostly needed, with the exception of those assets that are re-diverted to corporate needs and requirements.

Making trade-offs.For the site business element, trade-offs are made based on urgency and necessity. There are business priorities and there are organizational priorities. However, the organization exists to provide a service to the site. The organization does well trading off items of lower priority for items of higher priority when supporting the site. However, the highest organizational leadership does not effectively trade off corporate demands for site demands, even if site demands have the highest urgency. In the end, the employees end up working harder and more hours in order to meet both sets of demands, and spend considerable time catching up on items missed as a result of trade offs. Furthermore, the site SHE human resources receive criticism for tardiness on priority projects that results from re-prioritized corporate initiatives.

Strategic fit and creating capabilities through unique interdependencies.This is a subject in which the organization struggles. Much of the problem has to do with a lack of time spent on innovation. The organization has a considerable number of tasks that are required either by regulatory requirements, site requirements, corporate requirements, customer needs, and organization members' needs. However, it is noted that there are numerous major activities that not only require a great deal of time, but do not integrate other activities that can be integrated to reduce effort. For example, if safety inspections identify trends in specific incident types, those trends, findings, and corrections can be used in order to either make decisions on or provide training, communications, and procedural changes. Instead, either because of corporate requirements or due to

leadership resistance, the items are performed separately, resulting in redundant work, continuously. Thus, although activities are aligned with value propositions, they do not often compliment or reinforce one another, and although they can, some activities do not eliminate others simply because the processes have not been updated or integrated. Furthermore, the above-site corporate organization has lagged on purchase and implementation of new management systems software, leaving the organization stuck with obsolete technology that prevents integration of tasks and data, and the site senior leadership has not taken the necessary measures to push for a site upgrades, thus exacerbating the problem of not effectively utilizing interdependent projects or processes.

Continuity over time. This test of effective strategy identifies whether an organization is able to maintain advantage through operational effectiveness and adaptability. Although the organization has learned to adjust and adapt, the human resources element of the organization is overworked and tired, and as a result of the elements listed in the other tests of a good strategy, it is clear that continuity over time cannot be sustained, and talent will, as exhibited over a period of six months prior to and during this action research study, withdraw from the company.

In short, with regard to organizational strategy for accomplishing the mission, it is apparent that, although there are numerous beneficial and effective attributes, they mostly exist in and of themselves, separate from a functional strategic design, and there is no structured effective strategy for the organization. Porter's 5 Tests of Good Strategy exhibit that the organization does not have a clear and effective way of figuring out its appropriate responses to the demands of a changing environment, and no effective condition under which it can sustain that which it does possess.

Leadership

The leadership for the department includes an above-site Regional Executive Director, and 4 Site Directors, including a Director for SHE Programs, a Director for Site SHE Support, a Director for Radiation Safety, and a Director for SHE Strategy. Each of the leaders serve as managers for a portion of the department staff, with the Director for Site SHE supporting the largest group, equaling nearly 50 percent of the operational staff in the department and supporting the majority of the site's corporate leaders. The role of the organization is to support the corporation's largest research and manufacturing site in the world. Nevertheless, many of the duties of the department are a requirement for the above-site leadership initiatives.

The leaders in the group tend to differ in perspective of leader and group responsibilities. One of the interpreted disparities between the leaders is the understanding and realization of the need for change, resulting in resistance to change. It is no secret in the literature and in business practice that there must first be a readiness to change (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996). If there is no felt need for change then change, at least strategic substantive change, simply will not occur (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996). The Directors all serve different roles, and as such, have different responsibilities and different staff, which also have differing workloads and requirements. Thus, there is an unbalanced distribution, and what is hidden is the unbalanced necessity to manage personnel and their work. So even though the leadership continually discusses the need to restructure and integrate processes, the response always boils down to time and whether this is the right time for it to occur. This exemplifies the CUAV aspect, because the need for change is identified, but the process of change is complex and the result

uncertain, so there is a purposive and blatant avoidance of the complexity, ambiguity, and potential organizational volatility that may come with the change. Thus, the leaders fail to lean into discomfort (Katz & Miller, 2014), and the problem with organizational leadership and structure persists.

There were additional observed problems with regard to the leadership. One such finding observed was that a number of the managers have particular problems communicating with one another because of apparent silos between the groups and responsibilities that they support. Instead, there is some manipulation of information and complaint to the senior leader from another with an attempt to degrade or criticize efforts of or programs managed by other managers. This is a problem not only with the leadership element, but bleeds directly into the culture category of the SOD model.

Furthermore, there is a problem with the managers being aligned with one another on priorities and on behaviors, as well as authority. The lead Director on the site often assigns items directly to team members that work for one of her direct report managers, without notifying the manager. That often causes confusion, interrupts work deadlines, interferes with current priorities, and sometime causes redundant work if the manager was either working on the same project or had someone else assigned to completing it. Furthermore, the lead Director often permits employees to go directly to her to discuss problems, ideas, concerns, or actions, sometimes without informing their direct managers. This becomes a problem in a number of ways. First, it permits the disregard of the direct managers. Second, it creates a setting for poor communication. Third, it results in the lead Director assuming that the direct manager knew about the topics discussed, and creates potential conflict. Furthermore, the senior Director sometimes

praises individuals without first discussing with their direct managers whether the job was complete, completed on time, or if there were related problems. If there were problems, this kind of behavior negates those problems and reward poor performance. These problems are supported by the findings (Table 3) in the action research questionnaires.

If the organization is not prepared to modify processes, the likelihood of any meaningful change from organizational chart restructuring is low. Thus, if senior management is not ready for strategic change, results will likely be sub-optimal (Worley, Hitchins, & Ross, 1996), which is reportedly and observably what has occurred in previous organizational restructuring in the past two years within this organization.

Observations and reflection on leadership exhibited that two of the five Directors are very closely modeled behind a Theory X leadership style. They believe that the people in the department are lazy and that they need to be monitored, controlled, and tasked at every step. The comments they make are usually resolved around why certain individuals cannot meet deadlines and how they will need to get involved to make sure that this happens. These are also the leaders that tend to micromanage individuals in the department. They exhibit an authoritarian leadership style, and although they speak out against it, and make themselves appear to be fair and democratic leaders, they are not. The action research results show comments regarding these leaders. Specifically, individuals answered that (a) they are “not given room to innovate;” (b) their manager “speaks to us like” children or like dogs; and that (c) “there is a lot of criticism and no praise.” Other comments had to do with numerous persons constantly being in search mode for new employment. Although the action research questions were answered

anonymously and it cannot be accurately determined which leader the comments were regarding, the researcher chooses to make the assumptions based on ethnographic knowledge and observation of the leadership phenomena. It can be interpreted that a good portion of these comments originate regarding the two authoritarian leaders.

The action research comments regarding interaction and relationships between managers and subordinates also indicate a potential problem with emotional intelligence (EI) and understanding how and with what type of manners they speak to individuals. An increasing body of research in the workplace shows that EI is a major factor in successful performance (Walton, 2012). The poor LMX, micromanagement, and statements regarding speaking to employees “like dogs” exhibit a problem with leader emotional intelligence and organizational behavior, and exhibits a need for EI improvement.

Structure

Organizational Structure.The organization, although consisting of 28 people, is not evenly distributed across the structure. Of the 19 SHE specialists, ten are assigned to one Director.Those ten are the ones that have the most interaction with the site Manufacturing, Research & Development, Administrative, and Facilities Management divisions and have the most change to deal with on a daily basis. They are also the individuals that perform the most diverse work in the organization (with exception of the Directors) and conduct practically all of the root cause investigations, audits, inspections, ergonomic assessments, and hazard evaluations. From a people and project management perspective, it was apparent that the workload and responsibility was not evenly distributed among the Directors.

Stream Analysis. In change management, Stream Analysis is a common method used for graphically displaying problems and concerns in an organization. This method allows for the evaluation of the interconnections between problems, and the follow-on graphical tracking of corrective and preventive actions for those problems. Within work settings, this method allows separation and evaluation of the different classes of variables, including organizing arrangements, social factors, technology, and physical settings (French & Bell, 1999). In many cases, stream analysis is used to display efficiencies and inefficiencies, as well as waste, in the effort of staff.

Here, value stream analysis was used in order to evaluate the amount of effort placed on certain activities (Table 1). It was determined that the group spends considerably more than 100% of their general working hour requirements (40-hour work weeks) on work-related tasks. In other words, the employees exceed 40 hours of work per week, which is why the percentages listed in the value stream table exceed 100%. Some of the activities that are generally performed together were separated in the stream analysis table, providing some lack of clarity in the analysis. However, understanding this from an ethnographic approach, it is apparent that the organization spends approximately 14% of the monthly work time on low priority tasks, and more than 51% of their time on medium priority tasks, leaving only 35% of their work time for high priority responsibilities.

Table 1: Task Stream Analysis on SHE Department

Stream Mapping - Run the Business Activities		
Activity	% Time	Value
	% time (of 40 hrs)	Avg
Researching questions or findings in regulation or standard	8%	med
Conferring with Program Subject Matter Experts (SME)	7%	med
Field Inspections	12%	med
Program Audits	5%	med
Tracking CAPA status	3%	med
Verifying CAPA completion	3%	high
Incident Investigations	7%	high
Hazard Analyses	6%	high
Change request review and approvals	5%	high
Industrial hygiene sampling and analysis	3%	high
Annual environmental compliance certification	6%	high
PHAs Haz Ops	3%	high
High Risk Work permit reviews	1%	high
Environmental Data Collection (for air water waste reports)	1%	high
Supporting agency inspections	1%	high
Standard Operating Procedures Review	5%	med
Responding to client questions	11%	med
Responding to employee complaints	4%	xlow
Injury Mgmt – data management system/writing communications	5%	med
Personal professional training	4%	high
Business “quarters” meeting attendance	4%	med
Training clients	3%	med
SHE Committee meetings	3%	med
SHE Department “quarters” Meetings	3%	med
Staff meetings	2%	med
Loss Prevention CAPA tracking	0%	med
Medical Surveillance Meetings	1%	xlow
Supporting other sites	1%	xlow
Follow up on Leadership Team meeting outcomes	9%	low

Thus, when observing high-priority tasks not completed within deadlines or without appropriate level of attention, it was because items were not being properly

prioritized throughout the workdays. Prioritization was ineffective in the organization, and was a potential cause of conflict and ineffectiveness for the entire organization.

Responsibility charting. During reflection and observation of the interactions between groups within the organization, animosity and conflict were identified, primarily between two groups. These conflicts arose partially due to arguments regarding responsibilities and assignments that are relayed from above-site on a regular basis. When these assignments are delegated down the organizational chain of command for completion, all teams across the four-group department end up with additional duties. These additional duties often vary by area or subject, and sometimes interfere with other responsibilities. As a result, the groups which provide direct SHE support to the business and which manage programs and regulatory reports often argue about who has the responsibilities for particular duties. These arguments sometimes surpass the topic of additional assignments and employees compare and contrast each group's work, challenging that they are overloaded while competing groups have fewer responsibilities. As a result, responsibility charting was used in order to evaluate designated work (Table 2).

The creation of the Responsibility (RACI) tables helps define the responsibility and accountability of actions between the groups (French & Bell, 1999). The table spells out which employee or group of employees is responsible to initiate action, which employee or group has approval or accountability, which have veto authority for the project, and which employee serves in consultant functions and supporting roles (French & Bell, 1999).

Table 2. Modified RASI Document for SHE Department

Activities	SME	Business Support	Radiation Safety
General			
Approve SOP's, CR's, batch records, SHE change requests (includes capital projects), technical protocols, etc requiring Safety/Environmental review	AC	AC	I
Respond as needed to emergency pages as on-call person	RA	RA	RA
Field questions, address day to day needs and connect with the right SME members (if needed) for efficient response	CI	RA	RACI
Update and implement site procedures / manuals / SN's /etc as needed for regulatory or corporate compliance.	RA	RA	RA
Manage contractor time	RA	RA	RA
Work with SHE individuals/teams to develop tools and communications that support site programs	RA	RA	CI
Safety Communications			
Create and initiate communication of bulletins/alerts to Business Unit	R	R	RACI
Business Unit to Cascade SHE bulletins/alerts to Site	C	C	C
Provide Metrics	I	I	I
Develop Action Plan/Take action in response to metrics	C	C	C
Incident Investigation			
Incident (Injury/Environmental) Classification	I	I	I
Assembly of the incident investigation team (perform Gemba)	C	C	C
Facilitation of the enhanced root cause analysis (i.e 5Why) for incident investigations	RC	RC	RC
Document Incident investigation completely into data systems	RAC	RAC	RAC
Per Site Team, Review and Approve Investigations and CAPAs	C	R	R
Incident Investigation CAPA completion	CI	CI	CI
Hazard Assessment			
Execute and document the hazard assessment per area	CI	RA	CI
Perform task specific risk assessments (i.e. Ergo assessments, IH evals, etc.)	CI	RA	RA
Actions resulting from risk assessments and hazard assessments	RAC	RAC	RAI
Management of Change			
Data management System change request review and Approvals	CI	RA	CI
Facilitate change requests and ensure correct approvers are identified	CI	CI	CI
Identify and ensure completion of pre and post change action items	CI	CI	CI
Complete process safety reviews, equipment safety reviews, pre-occupancy and pre-start-up reviews.	CI	CI	CI
Environmental, Safety Regulatory & Corporate Requirements			
Specify and document Environmental Requirements (ERM) per area	RACI	RA	R
Implement ERM (Including sewerage requests and waste matrices)	CI	CI	RCI
Providing environmental data as requested (AIMS, HAPS, Title V)	A	R	I
Prepare and submit regulatory reports as required for their SME subject	RA	CI	RA

Revise, renew and apply for permits as required for their SME subject	RA	CI	RA
Support permit conditions (evaluate data, do calculations, etc) for their SME subject	RA	CI	RA
Review proposed and new regulations and SHE Standards to determine site impact and implementation	RA	CI	RA
Regulatory Advocacy	RA	CI	RA
Approve waste matrix requests	RA	CI	RA
Approve soil disposal requests	RA	I	I
Approve sewer requests	RA	I	I
Safety & Environmental Committees			
Spearhead Corporate SHE Representation on Business Committee	-	R	R
S&E Representation on Business Committee	I	CI	CI
Meeting participation - topic based	RCI	R	R
Sub committee participation	CI	CI	RCI
Site Injury Reduction Work Streams			
Incident Investigations	I	CI	I
Ergonomics	C	C	I
Case Management	I	CI	I
Visible Leadership	I	I	I
Standard Work Process	CI	CI	CI
Leadership Meeting			
Represent SHE @ Tiers 1 - 5 (or equivalent, e.g., MRL...)	I	R	I
Audits / Inspections			
External inspections and audits (EPA, OSHA, etc) (i.e tour of area)	RA	CI	RA
Internal (SHE Department) Audits	RA	RA	RA
Inspection and audits (EPA, OSHA, SHE) CAPA development of corrective actions	RA	RA	RA
Inspections and audits (EPA, OSHA, SHE) CAPA development of preventative actions	RA	RA	RA
Inspection and audits (EPA, OSHA, SHE) CAPA completion	AC	AC	RA
Conducting program audits (HEC, confined space, 90-day waste areas)	RA	RCI	RA
Leadership inspections	-	CI	-
Monthly Inspections	-	CI	-
Action Item / Inspection Entry into data management system	CI	CI	-
Track Action Items to Completion	CI	CI	-
Seek guidance and involve SME for development of action/solutions	C	RA	-
Perform Field Surveys	RA	RA	RA
Prepare Field Survey Reports	CI	RA	RA
Medical Surveillance			
Determine appropriate Surveillance in data management system	C	RA	I
Meeting for discussion with HS	C	C	I
Prepare Medical Surveillance Grids	I	I	I
Safety Training			
Determine appropriate training in data management system	C	RA	RA

Develop Training Programs	RA	CI	RA
Track Training to Completion	-	I	RA
Plan and Deliver training in priority programs	RC	RA	RA
Manage Exclusions	-	CI	RA
SHE Assessments			
Performing Industrial Hygiene sampling	RC	RC	RA
Performing ergonomic assessments	RC	RC	I
Communication of results	R	R	R
Implementing recommendations	C	C	C
Perform/Review BioriskAssesments	I	RACI	I
IH & Equipment			
Maintain or coordinate maintenance on IH equipment	RA	I	RA
Develop and maintain overall site IH plan	RA	CI	RA
Radiation Safety			
Receiving Radioactive Packages	-	RA	RA
Responding to Radiological Emergencies	-	RA	RA
Performing Radiation Safety AuditsAudits	-	RA	RA

R=Responsibility

A=Accountability

C=Consult/Support

I=Inform

Thorough work evaluation identified that the RACI chart that was being used at the time of the study identified roles and responsibilities, but the work and duties identified were inaccurate and the work was not currently being performed according to the RACI, with some groups being assigned significantly more work to cover the gaps of others' weaknesses. Furthermore, the organization spelled out the specific roles of each group in a task list separate from the RACI, which was created during a 2014 organizational restructure, and has not been retired after the RACI was created. This was a source of confusion for the employees, particularly for those that were hired in the previous two years. Although all employees had been told to use the RACI as a guideline several months prior to the study, two Directors continued to go back to the 2014

document. Therefore, some employees use the RACI and other employees use the responsibilities list. This created a scenario of conflicting interests and direction, because the two documents did not match. This affected the work being done, as well as the interaction of the employees and the organizational culture.

Systems

In order to evaluate the systems in the SOD model, the assessment investigated rewards programs, development opportunities, hiring, and performance management.

Rewards. There are numerous rewards programs available through the corporation and the site. Site SHE professionals sometimes are given awards for excellence by the business areas that they support. However, the organization itself is limited financially with regard to awards that are granted. There are quarterly awards of excellence that can be provided from a budget that is released to the organization. However, these awards usually total \$400, and are generally distributed to two people at \$200 each. However, it is more than fair to say that there are specific performance events, not to mention collective performances over a quarter that deserve rewards, but do not receive any due to the limitation. This may be problematic, but it is not the essence of the rewards problem.

The failure is not the lack of monetary rewards, but the inability of leaders within the organization to provide other awards, creatively, to their employees. Even cards, announcements, E-mails, or other forms of recognition could be appreciated as rewarding to employees who strive to perform. Furthermore, the action research questionnaires express the LMX and the interactions in which employees are verbally abused or mistreated by their leaders, proving an antithetical culture regarding award systems.

Development. Professional development is critical for employees because it can help them in promotion applications, but generally pays off to the business as a result of gain of knowledge. Within the organization, opportunities for development has been at a steady decline. At the time of the study, budget availability for professional development courses and conferences was decreased by approximately 30% from the previous year. This means that fewer people were able to take credential preparation courses or professional continuing education, which could help them perform at work. Additionally, many employees may see this benefit as a part of a corporate reward structure. If this benefit continues to decline, high-performing talent might begin looking for other avenues of employment.

Furthermore, in a recent leadership team meeting, the Regional Director stated that "...employee development is not the responsibility of the manager," implying that it is up to the employees to develop themselves. Organizational leadership literature states otherwise, and points to success of leaders who ensure that they aid in the development of their employees to make the employees better at what they do, and to drive them to want to work harder for the organization (Yukl, 2013).

Annual Bonus. One strong system that may help drive performance and talent retention is the annual bonus. Depending on rank, employees are rated among different percentages of annual pay. The assigned percentages are multiplied by a factor based on the annual evaluation. Employee performances are ranked and normally distributed based on a Poisson distribution. So a bottom rated employee would have that percentage multiplied by a numeral between zero and 50 percent, yielding no or lower bonuses. Middle rated employees would have a multiple of between 50% and 100%, and higher-

rated performing employees could have a multiple between 100% and 130%. When these factors are multiplied by the annual salary, it becomes a fairly high, although taxable, monetary annual incentive. Added to a generally high salary for the SHE professional in the United States, this makes for a good benefit. This benefit is an organizational strength. Unfortunately, these determinations are made based on personal assessment from leaders who do not necessarily value attributes fairly, but do it based more on personal perception and perhaps favoritism.

Hiring. The leadership attempts to hire highly qualified and skilled individuals, with academic degrees and certification necessary for high performance within the organization. Unfortunately, that sometimes means that there is considerable external competition for these positions with the internal candidates, and it is occasionally, if not commonly, the case that external candidates are better qualified for some of the positions than the internal candidates currently holding positions in SHE. One of the challenges with hiring is that the leaders can only make decisions based on the candidates received. Nevertheless, the staff have caught on to some disparities that occur during the hiring process, with the observation being made that majority of the hired professionals over recent times happen to be White. There may very well be denial of this, as not as many diverse candidates have come across or qualified for the positions. Nevertheless, it cannot be missed that mainly White candidates have been selected for jobs, particularly for leadership roles. This has been identified and commented upon in the action research questionnaire. This is a potential problem with diversity, and often is a result of implicit bias a potentially implicit racism.

Furthermore, decisions were made, despite hiring manager and Human Resource Department recommendations, to not offer interviews to internal candidates because the organizational leaders believed it would be more complicated to fill their current roles with other candidates, thus not making room for opportunities of growth and promotion in an organization that advertises such growth and promotion opportunities to all individuals who apply for positions. Employees view this as unfair and disingenuous, and it violates corporate human resources policies, indicating that the organizational systems are not effectively functioning.

Culture

As indicated earlier in structure and systems, there are some difficulties that exist in the organizational culture, and there were definitely some observed tensions between the Directors and between employees in different groups.

The organization has values and culture listed off as part of the organizational slides that discuss vision, mission, and values. The culture statement speaks of striving to uphold the highest professional standards, respecting people in the workplace, valuing teamwork and ideas, accepting honest feedback, accountability, flexibility, being educators, and respect for decision-making. However, just based on the assessment of systems such as development and rewards, among other items, it is evident that the organization is not living by this culture statement.

Part of the challenge with culture has to do with acceptance and inclusion of diversity, meaning diversity of people, ideas, and thought. It is no secret that diversity and inclusion in the workplace environment is important and critical to organizations. Diversity management is a central issue in human resource programs today (Barak,

2000). In industry altogether, social science research has shown that right before the turn of the century, Black employees were treated more poorly than their White colleagues (Brief, Buttram, Reizenstein, Pugh, Callahan, McCline, & Vaslow, 1997). Although blatant racism in the American workplace is not as common as it was at that time, the underlying beliefs and behaviors persist (Brief et al., 1997). The industrial complex has generally accepted that diversity is critical for organizational success (Greene & Berthoud, 2007; Joplin & Daus, 1997; Plummer & Jordan, 2007). Increasing employees from different populations, ethnically, culturally, and internationally, has the potential to lead to an increased market share (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004).

Katz & Miller (2013; 2013b; 2014) touch on the importance of civil rights and social justice and speak of the mission of OD being both to create an environment in which all people are treated fairly, respectfully, and are allowed to participate fully and influence their work experience (Katz & Miller, 2014). It is vital to promote difference and diversity in organizations in order to create workplaces where people and their individual talents, ideas, and thoughts are valued (Katz & Miller, 2013; 2014).

Unfortunately, the organization does not appear to truly value diversity and inclusion. Prior to and during the study, the researcher witnessed directly, numerous remarks regarding race and age from senior leadership, and the organization, despite a high turnaround, has not done much to hire a diverse workforce, despite the availability of diversity in the applicant pool and in surrounding geographical areas. At the time of the study, the organization of 26 full-time corporate employees (excluding consultants) that worked in SHE consisted of 46% male, 54% female, 4% Black, 4% Asian, and 8% Jewish. That is from an ethnic and gender perspective, and is a fair representation of

what the SHE organization has looked like over the previous two years, based on records. However, the majority of the recent hired employees have been White, although the applicant pool was not predominantly so. Furthermore, it was evident through observation that the pool of leaders in the overall global EHS organization were predominantly White, although consisting of a majority percentage of women managers. Nonetheless, the absence of People of Color or diverse ethnicity was apparent, with the exception of the few in global locations. Additionally, employees reported overhearing at least one leader making race-related discriminating remarks on a few occasions.

Furthermore, there was limited attention given to employees that had disabilities, and particular remarks were made regarding hiring applicants who reported service-connected disabilities and applied for positions, with specific mention of the potential for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) “flare ups” as a means for consideration during hiring meetings, as well as an overall view of veterans as having a trait of “overbearing confidence” that may result in failure to follow orders in corporate settings.

There was additional identification of culture concerns in this organization. Artifacts are an important part of the culture of any organization. Artifacts can be many things, but much of it has to do with the set up of furniture, space, and tools in the workplace. Part of the concerns with the organization is the workload that leads to some of the Directors closing and locking their doors and not answering when there are questions. This was not an uncommon practice among several of the leaders, and it created a “closed off” culture, placing a physical and potentially psychological barrier between the SHE professionals and their managers. Additionally, the SHE professionals

sit in closed-off cubicles. These artifact examples do not lend to the best cultural environment in the organizational workspace.

That said, there is no policy particularly covering creative, and employees certainly appeared to find ways to decorate their cubicles and work areas surrounding the cubicles to make them interesting and “their own.” Furthermore, the organization did spend resources and money designing and buying improved lunchroom furniture with comfortable chairs and tables that allow people to sit and eat while socializing during their lunch and break periods. The employees boasted about that area and reported it to be an important artifact in their work environment, stating that it was a “nice place to get away from the cubicle and have a little social release, as long as the managers aren’t there.”

Behavior. Behavior was not a common topic of observation or identified problems during this assessment. The group generally met their obligations, and achieved a great deal with regards to the purpose of the organization. There appeared to be a lot to be proud of. Nevertheless, there were problems identified in the organizational assessment. With regard to behavior, the main problem identified was discussed in the action research survey with regards to problems in the current state of the organization. The second set of behavioral problems was identified through observation.

Through observation, one individual consistently did not pull the necessary weight in the organization, regarding workload and completion. As a result, other team members ended up having to step in and cover the missed or inadequate work of the individual. This individual was on performance management, but the observation was made nonetheless. However, the lack of consistency of performance was never addressed

through the individual's annual performance evaluations, although leaders that were present in the organization reported years of supposed suboptimal performance. This was an indication of avoidance, ambiguity, complexity, and volatility, and the failure of organizational leadership to deal adequately with conflict.

Further evidence of behavior problems appeared to be noted at the leadership level. Two senior leaders were identified as individuals that constantly and consistently denigrate their employees, and creating hostile workplace environments. Employees also indicated an environment of exclusion and muted discrimination against race and ethnicity of employees or general populations. Furthermore, employees also identified that at least one manager uses deflection tactics including blaming other employees or managers, or consistently bringing forward other group's or individual's challenges in order to avoid discussion of her own individual or team flaws, failures, or challenging scenarios. These behaviors, particularly from people in positions of power, show poor judgment and bad leadership practices that can affect relationships, trust, respect, and have a definitive negative effect on organizational culture.

A major portion of the organizational assessment was the action research questionnaires because it provided the majority of the data that was evidence of the organization's performance and culture drawn directly from the employees. The questionnaire provided phenomenological data of intra-departmental culture, interactions, and group dynamics, and their perspectives on the management of the organizations and the promise of the organization moving forward.

The resulting statements from the action research questionnaires can be seen in Table 3. The responses were analyzed for trends and similarities between responders.

The trends are identified by numbers in parentheses, showing how many times similar remarks were made. The response data was sorted and coded for categories, based on the questions asked and the organizational principles potentially affected. The data in the table are shown as sorted and coded, and they are exhibited as categorized by the researcher, based on major topics as well as the affected elements of the SOD assessment model that those statements identify with.

Table 3: Tabulated Action Research Questionnaire Results

Ideal Condition (Appreciative Inquiry) Positive Attributes Needs Improvement	Main Topic of Response	Key Element of SOD Model Where Response Falls	Other Affected/ Related Elements of SOD Model Affected
Response			
Good working hours (5)	Economic	Systems	Structure
Flexibility in work schedule (6)	Economic	Systems	Leadership
Advancement opportunities (8)	Economic	Systems	Leadership; Structure
Performance Rewards (13)	Economic	Systems	
Professional Development Opportunities (11)	Economic	Systems	Leadership; Structure
Advanced Technology (5)	Economic	Systems	
Effective SHE Management Software (14)	Economic	Systems	Structure
Ability to make human errors without punishment (7)	Non-toxic environment	Systems	Culture; Leadership
Recognition and praise for work (15)	Rewards	Systems	Culture; Leadership
Equal distribution of work (8)	Workload	Systems	Structure; Leadership
Senior leaders beyond our site visiting, observing, and understanding our work and effort (4)	Leadership	Systems	Leadership; Structure
Allowed room for innovation of work (4)	Innovation	Systems	Leadership; Culture
Strong employee relationships (15)	Culture	Culture	Structure
Good workplace culture (5)	Culture	Culture	
Not to fear being terminated (5)	Stability	Culture	Systems
Diversity and Inclusion (3)	Diversity	Culture	Systems
Feeling able to share ideas (4)	Inclusion	Culture	Systems; Leadership; Strategy
Less judgment and more acceptance (3)	Inclusion	Culture	Leadership
Trust of and from co-workers (4)	Relationships	Culture	Behavior
Non-hostile environment (2)	Relationships	Culture	Leadership
Workplace free of toxic bosses (8)	Culture	Culture	Leadership
Fun activities as a department	Teamwork	Culture	Leadership; Systems; Strategy
Manager's open door policy (4)	Leadership	Leadership	Culture

Allowance to be able to prioritize own work (5)	Inclusion	Leadership	Systems; Culture
Aligned leadership message (9)	Leadership	Leadership	Systems; Structure; Culture
Leaders and managers who listen (3)	Relationships	Leadership	Culture
No silos between working groups (8)	Relationships	Structure	Culture; Systems
Ability to move between jobs in the department (5)	Workload	Structure	Systems; Strategy
Clarity of priorities and expectations (7)	Work Priorities	Mission	Vision; Strategy
Co-workers accountable for their work (2)	Workload	Behavior	Leadership; Culture
My boss gives me recognition for a job well done (4)	Rewards	Systems	Leadership, Culture
My manager is flexible with hours although other department leaders aren't (2)	Economic/ time	Systems	Leadership; Structure
My manager challenges me so I can learn and progress (4)	Work/ development	Systems	Leadership
My boss helped me find a new position or promotion (3)	Economic	Systems	Structure; Leadership
Tier meetings for communication of responsibilities and priorities (8)	Communication	Systems	Strategy
Pay and health benefits are good. (7)	Benefits	Systems	
Opportunity for certification at company's expense (6)	Development	Systems	
Annual incentive pay (13)	Economics	Systems	
My boss defends me against other managers. (2)	Relationships	Culture	Leadership; Structure
Co-workers have a lot of subject matter expert knowledge. (10)	Work/ development	Structure	
Leaders in manufacturing are supportive of SHE (4)	Leadership	Environment	Structure; Leadership
I love working for a company that saves lives and makes a difference (3)	Corporate Meaning	Vision	Mission; Culture; Environment
SHE Management System is old and obsolete, and does not work well or meet needs (15)	Work systems	Systems	Structure; Strategy
We have no iPads or other tools to improve ways we do our field work (5)	Work systems	Systems	
Too few rewards or awards for performance (6)	Rewards/ economic	Systems	Culture
Lack of recognition for work or for a job well done (10)	Rewards	Systems	Leadership; Culture
We do a lot of redundant work (8)	Work systems	Systems	Structure; Strategy
Our priorities are unclear (7)	Work priorities	Systems	Leadership; Strategy
Work priorities are always shifting (4)	Work priorities	Systems	Leadership; Strategy; Leadership
This micromanagement needs to stop (8)	Culture; Trust	Leadership	Culture; systems;
Dwindling opportunities for professional conferences and courses (4)	Professional development	Systems	Leadership
Promotions are not based on performance, but instead on manager's opinions (2)	Economic; Rewards	Systems	Leadership; Culture; Structure
Almost no opportunities to promote. (4)	Economic; Rewards	Systems	Structure; Leadership; Culture
No room for ideas, only leaders innovate. (5)	Innovation	Systems	Leadership; Structure; Culture; Strategy
Too many unnecessary tasks from above site that interfere with normal responsibilities, and become high stakes. (9)	Work systems	Systems	Leadership; Structure
Not everyone is equally included in corporate events, conferences, and training. (4)	Employee development	Systems	Structure; Leadership

Our team culture is not good. (10)	Culture and Teamwork	Culture	Structure
Managers favor certain workers. (3)	Rewards; Equity; Work	Culture	Leadership
I can't trust my boss and can't relate to her. I go to another manager for mentorship. (2)	Culture	Culture	Leadership; Structure
There's definitely favoritism. Some people get busted or even fired for something that others do the same. Unequal treatment. (3)	Equity; Work	Culture	Systems; Leadership; Behavior
My manager speaks to us like children. (4)	Culture	Culture	Leadership
My manager speaks to me like a dog. (1)	Culture	Culture	Leadership
They only seem to hire white people. (2)	Hiring	Culture	Leadership; Structure
My manager's a closet racist. I've heard her say things and she doesn't even realize she said them openly. (3)	Diversity & Inclusion	Culture	Leadership; Systems
There are silos between our groups, although it was worse before. (6)	Workload; Relationships	Culture	Structure; Systems
We fear punishment if we innovate, and we are always on edge about being criticized. (5)	Fear; Relationships	Culture	Leadership; Systems; Strategy
Always being criticized from my manager in front of colleagues. (2)	Rewards; Criticism	Culture	Systems; Leadership
Managers keep their doors closed. (6)	Artifacts	Culture	Leadership
These cubicles are terrible, they should be open so we can see each other. (2)	Artifacts	Culture	
Leaders don't spend enough time in the field with us. (10)	Manager's Work	Leadership	Culture; Systems; Structure
Managers sometimes ruin relationships with other departments and leave us to have to clean it up (3)	Manager's Work; Relationships	Leadership	Culture; Systems
I don't feel there is an open door policy. (2)	Leader-worker relationship	Leadership	Culture; Systems
All except two managers are unaware of their own deficiencies or don't care about them. (6)	Use of Self	Leadership	Culture; Structure
Our senior manager doesn't stand up for us when questioned by above site leaders. (5)	Leadership	Leadership	Culture; Structure
Our manager's are afraid to stand up to the North America Executive Director and VP when it's necessary. (4)	Leadership	Leadership	Culture
Our managers have contradicting priorities. (3)	Work priorities	Leadership	Culture; Systems; Strategy
Everyone working for my manager is looking for another job. That says it all. (2)	Leader-worker Relationship	Leadership	Culture; Structure
My manager takes no accountability. She deflects everything, especially when she knows she's incompetent at something. (3).	Manager's Work	Leadership	Culture; Systems
Leaders are all different with different styles of leading. It's hard to keep up. (3)	Leadership Styles	Leadership	Structure; Systems
Unequal work because of our organizational chart set-up. (7)	Workload	Structure	Systems; Culture; strategy
One manager has very little SHE experience and doesn't understand our responsibilities. (4)	Manager's work	Structure	Leadership; Culture
There is too much work but our department is understaffed, so we never catch up. Then we're criticized for tardy work. (6)	Workload	Structure	Systems; Culture; strategy
There is high staff turnover (3)	Workload	Structure	Culture; Systems
Sometimes it's hard to figure out if my work supports my customer or not. (2)	Work systems	Strategy	Systems; Leadership
The work we are forced to do, such as consequences, sometimes degrades the site safety culture. (3)	Systems	Strategy	Systems; Culture; Structure; Leadership; Behavior
Business and operational leaders often stifle our	Cross-division	Environment	Leadership;

efforts. (3)	relationships		Culture; Structure
One or two employees are always late or don't pull their weight, and we are expected to cover for them.	Workload; Relationships	Behavior	Systems; Structure; Leadership
Because of the work environment, I come to work with no enthusiasm and do the bare minimum requirement because anything more doesn't get recognized anyway. (1)	Work Practices	Behavior	Leadership; Systems; Culture; Strategy
Above site requirements are not aligned and sometimes contradict with our site requirements. (2)	Work requirements	Mission	Strategy; Leadership; Systems; Structure
My boss is the master manipulator. It's all about her. If it helps her, she'll throw you to the wolves.	Leader-Member Interaction; relationships	Behavior	Leadership; Culture; Systems

Instructions for interpreting Table 3. It is critical that this table is well understood. The table codes the responses to questions with respect to their relevant organizational design elements. There are four columns in the table. Column A provides the statement or comment as a response to the question. Column B provides the main general topic of the response. Column C identifies the main SOD element that is affected or directly related to the response. Column D addresses the other SOD elements related to or affected by the response. The questions are also color coded, based on the purpose of the question. The responses are color-coded according to which question they answered. Therefore, if a response is green, that means that this is a response related to the ideal condition the employees wish to have in the workplace, not what they report as currently having. The responses in blue text are comments regarding those items that the respondents stated were positive attributes in this organization at the time of the study. The brown text responses are comments regarding those resources or topics in the organization that need improvement.

Recommended Interventions

It is evident that the organization assessed is not in an ideal state of effectiveness and efficiency and requires drastic change in several, if not all, areas represented by the SOD framework. It was recommended that the organizational leadership take a serious look at the findings in the assessment and consider necessary changes through a series of intervention and external consultation and organizational development of industrial/organizational psychology guidance. This can be accomplished through numerous approaches. One potential approach is Beckhard's Confrontation Meeting.

Beckhard's Confrontation Meeting. Once the organization has been assessed, it is critical for the leadership in the organization to understand their roles and the direction to go in order to improve the organization. The SHE organizations is apparently in a state of dysfunctional effectiveness in which, although the job is getting done and the metric

performance is nothing to scoff at, the organizational culture is poor, and the structure and systems problems are easily recognized by organizational members. Therefore, after the organization's action research is reviewed, implementation of a management awareness session is necessary. Beckhard's Confrontation Meeting is an intervention in which the entire management team of an organization take a reading of their own organizational health through a series of activities. Discussions of the problems, underlying causes, and potential outcomes are addressed, and the management works to develop action plans to correct the problems, and creates a plan with a schedule of completion (French & Bell, 1999). In this case, the Beckhard's intervention should be used specifically to address the collective of management issues identified during the organizational assessment.

From there, it is necessary for the organization to apply other follow-on interventions for positive change, necessary because continuing to perform in the manner in which the organization currently performed was unsustainable and is almost certain to prove ineffective in the long term. Application of interventions can automatically disrupt the "perfection" of the unacceptable status quo, because organizations are perfectly designed for the results they get (Maurer, 2010).

Organizational Structure. One of the major areas that showed problems within the organization during the assessment was the organizational structure. There were numerous aspects of the structure that affect the organization, including the organizational work distribution that can be viewed as problems in the organizational roles and responsibilities and with assignment of managerial duties to organizational leaders.

Organizational chart. The organizational structure that existed in the organizational at the time of the action research indicated that organizational dysfunction had to do with the fact that more than half of the SHE professional staff worked for one manager, and that manager was responsible for not only all of the administrative, development, and leadership duties for the staff, but also for maintaining the day-to-day relationships with all of the leaders and managers in the support areas that the 10 SHE staff supported. The recommendation made after assessing the organizational structure urged realignment of the organization, with a more equal distribution among the managers, including spreading out the number of staff members to each manager, and aligning managers with major divisions on the site. The proposed reorganization was recommended to the senior Director with serious discussion from and particular emphasis on more equitable work distribution between organizational leaders.

Review and Employ Changes to Value Stream Analysis Results. It is imperative that the leaders and department staff thoroughly review the value stream analysis exercise that showed that more than 50% of the work focus was spent on middle value or middle priority items, which at times results in lack of timely completion of high priority items. Furthermore, some of the high priority items were assigned priority as a result of corporate initiatives and requirements. It is recommended that the site leadership use influence without authority and the data to exhibit the effects of such assignments on site SHE productivity and customer dissatisfaction. Furthermore, the organization should use the stream analysis data to understand time distribution to assignments as well as to re-distribute efforts and re-prioritize projects, tasks, and assignments to make sure that the high priority items are focused on with appropriate prioritization and effort. Using the

stream map can be applied to track performance and calculate time expended on priority tasks versus lower priority ones, and can also inform reassessment of the RACI.

Develop New Accurate RACI. During the diagnostic portion of this action research, the findings of the responsibility mapping exercise exposed that the RACI made the different groups aware of their responsibilities and the sizes of each group's work, but the work performed currently in the department does not match what the RACI defines. Further, there was disagreement regarding the work responsibilities, and these need to be negotiated and resolved. Thus, it is recommended that the department undertake a responsibility mapping initiative to create a new, accurate RACI, and ensure that the RACI table is used as a guide to all for the employees as the roles and responsibilities document, and that all competing, obsolete documents are archived and removed from functional use.

Systems. There were numerous problems identified with the systems that are in place. This was particularly so with the (a) rewards systems, (b) hiring, (c) communications, and (d) employee development within the organization. The evidence for the trouble with this system was exhibited in the action research findings (Table 3). Numerous intervention should be set in place to address these problems including common solutions as well as known OD interventions.

Rewards. The department should establish additional awards. Some can be monetary and have to be budgeted appropriately. However, moreover, it is important that the organizational leaders recognize the employees for a job well done. This is part of that emotional intelligence that is necessary in the workplace. It is visible that the employees are overworked, particularly because they are doing some redundant work, and are often

criticized but rarely valued for their work. Awards should be established, public praise for accomplishments should be more common among managers for their employees, and additional incentives, including items like a monthly parking space, can go a long way in terms of recognition.

Hiring. Managers should continue to try to hire the most qualified individuals for the roles that become available. Nevertheless, the only way individuals receive promotions within the company are through application to other jobs. Managers should be certain to evaluate current employees for openings in the future. Furthermore, leaders should ensure that they are selecting individuals that bring a diversity of ideas, experiences, thoughts, and cultural backgrounds, and that all groups are included and able to participate fully in their work. Human resources policies should be adhered to regarding equal opportunity in hiring and promotion, as well as duty distribution.

Employee development. Employee development is critical. A great deal of it can be performed in-house, without the necessity to break the budget in order to provide training. Certified individuals, including managers, can hold classes on professional topics instead of sending employees to external classes. Nevertheless, professional certifications require annual continuing education. Managers should be sure to budget for or plea for more funding for professional development. Furthermore, leaders must ensure they provide professional development through appropriate assignment of staff to areas where they can learn and develop their skills and knowledge as professionals.

Appreciative Inquiry. Although appreciative inquiry (AI) is a dialogic method for OD, it was used diagnostically in the assessment portion of this study. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the organization use AI as an intervention. This intervention is based

on the assertion that the organization is a positive one to be embraced, and that the focus of the intervention is on the positive practices in the organization rather than the problems (French & Bell, 1999). Although the problems and challenges should not be discounted, AI focus on the things the organization does well could help enhance or improve those systems that are functioning, and ensure that the functioning systems that the employees appreciate are fostered, enhanced, and continued.

Leadership. As exhibited in observation and through the action research, leadership is the SOD element that is a major contributor to this organization's problems. Numerous leadership interventions should be implemented in order to improve leadership performance and thus organizational effectiveness going forward.

Action Research Review and Understanding. To begin with, one of the best ways for the organizational leadership to truly begin to understand the flaws in the organization's leadership and how they impact the organization is by taking a deep and thorough read and give consideration to the answers that are provided in the action research (Table 3) performed as part of the organizational assessment. Changes cannot be made or managed effectively until the organization understands what the problems are and what changes actually need to be made. Thorough evaluation by individual organizational leaders, followed by a thorough review as a leadership team would be an effective way to begin to make improvements. This should perhaps be followed by mediated group discussion between the department leaders and the department staff to discuss the findings of the action research, and to chart a path forward to repair relationships, correct problems, ensure awareness and openness moving forward, and begin to repair part of the

organizational culture. Phased interviews could also potentially be used periodically over the next year to monitor changes.

BOATS Leadership Development. It is apparent that one of the main problems that exists in this organization is the disparity of thought and observation surrounding the leader-member exchange (LMX). The observation and the survey questionnaire exhibited a lack of alignment on this topic, and expresses that there is a lack of personal awareness, understanding, and accountability for the leaders' roles in the conflicts that ensue and the dysfunctions in the organization. This can be attributed to behaviors presented in numerous sociological and psychological theories, including narcissistic behavior, hubris, conflict avoidance and deflection, conceit, fundamental attribution error, and lack of personal and situational awareness. This phenomenon has previously been described as Withdrawn Self Dishonesty (WSD) and is often identified when a leader exhibits a combination of these behaviors (Shufutinsky, Cox, & Vizcarrondo, 2017).

Thus, it is necessary to address this concern, among others, with the leaders of the organization. A recommended intervention for application that would potentially benefit the leadership in identifying their own flaws in this organization is the use of Shufutinsky's *Based on a True Story* (BOATS) storytelling method for leadership development. With the application of this method, consultants can utilize scenarios that are based on real events in order to determine whether the leaders are situationally unaware, self unaware, or a combination, and provide the feedback through a transparent framework in which the leaders would be confronted with the truth based on direct observation rather than consultant interpretation. This approach can drive increased

Gestalt in leaders and foster self-development in leader behavior and their leadership practices.

Gestalt Approach. All of the leaders in this organization have their own leadership styles, although some are more similar than others. All styles were assessed as part of the organizational assessment. Gestalt Therapy is often used with the goals of (a) awareness, (b) integration, (c) maturation, (d) authenticity, (e) self-regulation, and (f) behavior change (French & Bell, 1999). The action research performed during this assessment identified leadership weaknesses. One of the main points of the assessment was to evaluate these aspects, and to recommend change to improve the current condition. Just like the necessity for organizational leaders to be prepared for and recognize that change is desirable and necessary (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996), the leaders in this group must also be prepared and recognize their own role and contribution to the problems and the need for change. They must understand the leader-subordinate relationship in the organization, and to examine their abilities to own up to their characteristics and possible weaknesses, rather than deflecting and avoidance behaviors (French & Bell, 1999). Thus, the use of the Gestalt Approach, and even Gestalt Therapy where necessary, could be a very useful means of ensuring that the leaders have a self-awareness and an understanding of their part in the necessity for the organization to improve.

Use of Self. The review of the action research results, and the Gestalt intervention may be very useful for improving on the leadership element of the SOD model. Nevertheless, it is pertinent that the leaders do not view or accidentally assume that flaws identified in the leadership are not simply complaints from employees or that they are not simply resolved through a quick fix-it approach. It is critical that organizational leaders take

what they have learned from Gestalt and BOATS and that they are and remain aware and conscious of their misgivings, their scenarios, and the roles that they play in the work environment. This requires continual reflexivity. In order to do this, they must first recognize their position in the space of their interactions with each other and with their subordinates on a regular basis. A means of doing this is to be aware and purposely implement use-of-self or self-as-instrument as part of their leadership and management toolkit going forward.

Use-of-self is often defined as consciously using one's whole being for effectiveness in whatever the current situation is presenting itself. The whole purpose of utilizing this method is to be able to execute a role within the system or the interaction effectively, without personal interferences such as preconceptions, biases, blindness, and agendas (Jamieson, Auron, & Shechtman, 2010).

Effective use of self-as-instrument not only addresses self awareness, but also the ability of the leader to interpret what is going on in a given scenario or environment as clearly as possible, providing the ability to take action appropriate to the situation (Jamieson, Auron, & Shechtman, 2010). If the leadership problems are to be corrected, and the correction is to be sustained for a larger sustained effective organization, the leaders should be able to implement and integrate Self-as-Instrument as part of their regular routine at work. This can be accomplished in a number of ways, and may not be the same result for each individual leader.

Presencing. Although often recognized and used from the spiritual perspective (Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2004), a broader and more shallow form of presencing can be used in the organizational development sense, as a means of use-of-self

because it influences one to be fully present and situationally aware of the present moment, including the use of deep listening, observation, and open-mindedness beyond preconceptions and traditional sensemaking pathways (Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2004).

Emotional intelligence. The action research exhibited that there are problems with the manner in which some organizational leaders interact with staff. In particular, there were comments regarding toxic leaders as well as complaints about the manner in which leaders talk to staff or belittle them. Thus, self-reflection during use of self can probably highlight the problems that some leaders have, particularly related to emotional intelligence. All the leaders in the organization can use some experience with emotional intelligence. Coursework or training on this topic to aid managers, in addition to the self reflection and acceptance, can help improve leader-subordinate relationships.

Vision and Mission. The mission and vision of the organization were not spelled out independently. Therefore, it is more difficult to identify the mission or the vision if they are not independent. The failure to spell out mission individually doesn't help when the organizational strategy needs to be assessed or designed. It is recommended that the mission and vision statement be re-written and separated as two individual statements, particularly that they be written specifically for the site organization rather than using the corporate vision statement.

Strategy. Porter's 5 Tests of Good Strategy exhibit that the organization does not have a clear and effective way of figuring out its appropriate responses to the demands of a changing environment, and no effective condition under which it can sustain that which it does possess.

The organization must have an established and clear mission and vision statement and strategy must be designed in order to align with the mission and drive activities to meet the mission.

Distinctive tailored value proposition. The organization has a distinctive tailored value proposition. However, there are some elements that contribute to the organizations ineffectiveness when it comes to this element of strategy. Mainly, as determined through observation, analysis of projects, and responses from the action research questionnaire, approximately one quarter of the department's time is spent on above-site actions and responsibilities. Although these matters are often very important and can contribute to good SHE conditions on the site, they are rarely of immediate urgency, and they are sometimes administrative in nature, providing limited if any benefit to the site that the organization supports. Nevertheless, these headquarter-assigned responsibilities are assigned with high urgency, and often end up taking priority over site responsibilities that may be urgent for safety purposes, and for continued operations. These lower value tasks often receive undue higher priority and pull attention from the highest value tasks. In order to improve this, it will take a strong site leadership response to above-site leaders. Site Directors can potentially use tools such as a SWOT Analysis, among others, to exhibit necessary priorities to the site. Additionally, site Directors need to be prepared to request extensions for deadlines which conflict with higher value proposition items.

Trade-offs. The problem identified regarding trade-offs has to do with trading site demands in order to complete corporate demands, even during the site demands highest urgency. In order to address this problem, the organizational leadership should exhibit courage and candor, which are key elements in the practice of the corporate leadership

behaviors, in addressing the above-site leaders with regards to corporate assignments and tasks. These managers verbally espouse the practice of influencing without authority, but this is a scenario in which they need to “talk the talk” by addressing above-site leaders regarding rolling, lesser value, delegated obligations. These assignments and deadlines need to be addressed, particularly when they interfere with site requirements and deadlines, and can result in injuries and incidents when other priorities are not addressed in a timely manner as a result.

Strategic fit. As seen in the responses from the action research, the ability to innovate is either resisted as a result of time, or fear. As an outcome, the organization continues to do things the old way, repeatedly. With a minimal staff for a site of over 5000 employees, efficiency is pivotal, but the lack of the organization to innovate causes redundancy of work, among other items holding the organization back. It is recommended that the leaders ensure that innovation is encouraged, and that they participate, with inclusion and consult from the rest of the staff members, in innovative programs and systems. Removing unnecessary activities, and combining and creating comprehensive programs to reduce redundancy are critical to strategic fit. Furthermore, they should ensure that there are no negative consequences for failure of innovative ideas. Punishing innovations that do not have ideal outcomes results in decreased innovation.

Continuity over time. This test of effective strategy identifies whether an organization is able to maintain advantage through operational effectiveness and adaptability. Although individuals in the organization have become accustomed to adjusting to changing priorities and adapting, the employees feel overworked, overwhelmed, and tired, and have made numerous statements in the action research regarding the above-site tasks

interfering with valuable assignments. Under the current conditions, it is clear that continuity over time cannot be sustained, and talent will, as exhibited over the past several months, self-attract from the company. This is not because the organization is not able to adapt or is not open to change, or because employees are not resilient or effective, but rather as a result of poor change management by onsite and above-site leaders.

Sustained effectiveness in organizations requires continuous change and the ability and willingness to adapt to it (Lawler & Worley, 2006). Organizational complexities also shift over time as a result of the environment, among other things. Thus, it is necessary for organizations to assess not only where they are now, but where the organization will be in a future state. One way of doing this is through the use of the Built-to-Change Model (Lawler & Worley, 2006).

Built-to-Change Model. Most organizational strategy models do not address this, and focus on current state alone. That is not enough and it leads to building of static organizations (Lawler & Worley, 2006). In order to be able to anticipate change, the assessed organization can potentially improve on continuity over time by implementing the Built-to-Change, or B2Change Model for a dynamic view of organizational effectiveness (Lawler & Worley, 2006). This model expresses the value of ongoing environmental changes and contends that they should be the key determinants of strategy and organizational design (Lawler & Worley, 2006) necessary to prevent organizational stagnation or failure.

The B2Change model focuses on strategizing, creating value, and designing as the primary contributors to organizational effectiveness, paying attention to an organization's product lines and the way that an organization differentiates itself from competitors. In

the center of the model is identity, representing an organization's stable set of core values, behaviors, and beliefs (Lawler & Worley, 2006). This model allows an organization to look at both current and potential future environments. Additionally, this model urges an organization to realize that future performance depends on response to these environments. It is expected in today's hyper-dynamic industrial environment that organizations should be built to change and that organizational success will continue to be evermore dependent on the ability to respond quickly to unexpected change (Lawler & Worley, 2006). Making this organization more efficient and at least evaluating the possibility of organizing it to be a B2Change organization should be a priority in strategy development when addressing continuity over time.

Culture. Culture is often believed to be a separate part of an organization that is a side-effect of all of the other parts rather than one that can be directly addressed (Kates & Galbraith, 2007). However, that thought has often been from the assessment of culture in organizational design rather than organizational development and change. Jamieson's SOD model (Jamieson, 2017) interprets culture as not only a part of the design and development of organizations, but as central to organizational effectiveness. Every major part of an organization, whether effective or problematic, can affect the entire organization. This is because they are not single elements, but rather a part of a larger system. Organizations should be viewed and interpreted as a complete system in which all parts of the system affect all other parts, either directly or indirectly (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994).

As exhibited in Table 3, the results of the action research survey displayed numerous problems with culture. Whether it was dealing with relationships with leaders,

with one another, or whether it was a lack of room for ideas and innovation, many, if not all of the problems identified, affect the culture within an organization. Likewise, in order to improve the organization, culture needs to be directly affected. However, the only way to directly affect culture is by affecting the other elements of the model. Therefore, many of the changes already being addressed through recommended interventions in organizational structure, systems, strategy, and leadership will have a direct effect on organizational culture. Nevertheless, there are some interventions that can be performed to improve culture further.

First, there is opportunity for organizational activities and events, including teambuilding activities. Group teambuilding activities could be anything from internal games to external organized events such as ropes courses. These kinds of activities can help build friendships, trust, and support for one another. Second, the organization needs to address diversity. There are often open positions within the department, considering it's current state of organizational culture. It is of the highest recommendation that the organization evaluate hiring a diverse population to increase diversity in the organization's workforce. Improving the statistics from where they are currently is critical to success. All of the research data shows successes behind diversity. It is time for this organization to get on board.

Implementation and use of Hofstede's model. Furthermore, the organization need not only hire or expand on the diversity front, but the leaders need to understand how to be appropriate in interactions with the diverse population. There are implicit biases that exist in most organizations, and the observations during this study, as well as the survey, made it clear that this organization is no exception. In fact, implicitly prejudice

statements were observed during the course of the study from the site SHE leadership. To ensure that these hidden biases do not become increasingly severe problems, and to address diversity adequately, the organization should implement the use of Hofstede's model as a leadership training tool, and make sure that this is discussed or provided as training to the rest of the organization, considering they all interaction with thousands of people on the site. This tool, along with other renowned methods such as Hall's, Schein's, or Denison's culture assessment methods, could be very fruitful to the organization.

Culture change through the physical workplace setting. A couple of things became apparently clear as a result of the action research questionnaire. The responses addressed a few physical items, particularly regarding office spaces. The employees that took the survey made notice that managers often close their doors to accomplish work. The employees find this as a barrier to effective relationships and communication, and specifically asked for an open-door policy, in which they can come see their managers. Leaders closing their doors regularly in order to do work and meet deadlines does not allow for an open door policy. Therefore, managers should strive to leave their doors open at all times when a private meeting or conference is not taking place.

Furthermore, with regard to artifacts, at least one employee complained that the cubicles provided for the SHE staff are barriers to good relationships and conversations regarding professional and personal matters. The leadership should consider evaluating shorter cubicle walls to provide for better interaction throughout the day.

Culture Change Through Teamwork Improvement. Improved culture often comes with improved teamwork. There are multiple attributes of a good team, and people have

historically argued what a good team is. Some of the attributes of a strong team can directly transfer to improved culture. These attributes are described by Katz & Miller (2013), as the four key critical components that change the way an organization collaborates and behaves as a team.

The 4 Keys that Change Everything include four main elements that make teamwork more effective (Katz & Miller, 2013). First, there are many problems, difficult situations, and conflicts that arise in the workplace. People often tend to avoid conflict. The problem is that avoiding the discomfort does not solve the problem. Thus, the first key is focused around leaning into discomfort and facing the problem (Katz & Miller, 2013). Facing the problem can help find a resolution, so leaning into the uncomfortable situation is critical (Katz & Miller, 2013). The second key element has to do with listening better. This element is called *listening as an Ally* (Katz & Miller, 2013). What that means is that group members, including leaders, should be prepared to listen thoroughly to their direct reports and others that come to them with problems (Katz & Miller, 2013). Furthermore, staff members should be prepared to listen to one another and to their managers. But this element does not only mean listening to problems, it also addresses providing critical honest feedback, whether good or bad. The third key is to state intent and intensity when speaking regarding a priority or obligation (Katz & Miller, 2013). This is critical for communication. If a direct report does not understand the assignment and the urgency of the assignment, there is a chance that it will not be accomplished to an acceptable level or within an acceptable timeframe. Finally, the last key is focused around sharing street corners (Katz & Miller, 2013), referring to ideas, opinions, and perspectives from where individuals stand. This is closely aligned to

diversity, and particularly diversity of thought. Individuals see things differently depending on where they stand from a knowledge perspective, as well as experiential, ethnic, national, religious, and other aspects (Katz & Miller, 2013). Being able to see every aspect can make a team more effective, and can definitely increase understanding and thus improve relationships and culture.

Conclusion Statement

The role of an SHE department is to engage teams and departments in organizations and help ensure a safe and healthy workplace free of exposures to hazardous physical, chemical, and biological agents in the workplace. In order for this to occur, it is critical that SHE departments are able to engage organizations, maintain relationships, enforce compliance with regulations, perform training, interact with internal and external authorities, and promote and maintain a positive workplace culture and organizational safety culture. However, organizations often have problems with effectiveness, and SHE departments are no exception. This case study identifies a fairly large SHE department in a large manufacturing and research organization, and the organizational assessment exhibits organizational problems with effectiveness and the likely unsustainability of reported high levels of SHE performance.

It is evident that an organizational assessment is critical for program and organizational improvement. Organizational assessments are complex, lengthy, and can be quite in depth, and that timing is not always ideal for completion. It is apparent just

from the assessment that has been completed, that this organization has challenges with (a) leadership, (b) vision and mission statements, (c) strategy, (d) systems, (e) structure, and (f) culture, and that the organization has a long way to go to become the effective organization they want to be. Numerous problems were identified through an action research strategic methodology that included observation, review of documents, and questionnaires. From the observation of interactions and review of previous work, the result was not shocking, but very telling of the organization and the problems that interfere with any effective sustainability of performance and talent retention.

Thus, numerous interventions were recommended as a course of correction for the identified problems, with the intent that the organization that was assessed follow through and correct organizational deficiency and dysfunction. It is expected, based on the signs of failed retention and worker attitudes, that the failure to implement an effective strategic plan of interventions to correct the problems identified create an unsustainable environment and result in decreased talent retention, morale, performance, and declining culture in this organization.

Although this case study does not follow the organization through an extended period to observe successful or failed implementation of intervention, the case study can be an example to other SHE organizations as a necessity for similar evaluations and actions. Furthermore, the organizational assessment methods and tools, and suggested interventions, can be applied by other organizations that struggle from similar organizational plagues, preferably with the guidance of a trained organizational science professional.

In essence, this action research assessment supports the idea that in order to have a strong organizational safety culture, there must first be a strong organizational culture in Safety (departments).

References

- Baker, D. P., Day, R., & Salas, E. (2006). Teamwork as an essential component of high- reliability organizations. *Health services research, 41*(4p2), 1576-1598.
- Barak, M. (2000). Beyond Affirmative Action: Toward a Model of Diversity and Organizational Inclusion. *Administration in Social Work, 23*(3/4), 47-68.
- Brief, A. P., Buttram, R. T., Reizenstein, R. M., Pugh, S. D., Callahan, J. D., McCline, R. L., & Vaslow, J. B. (1997). Beyond good intentions: The next steps toward racial equality in the American workplace. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, 59-72.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. (5th Ed). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Courtney, K. O., Joe, G. W., Rowan-Szal, G. A., & Simpson, D. D. (2007). Using Organizational Assessment as a Tool for Program Change. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 33*(2), 131-7.
- Duncan, W. J., Ginter, P. M., & Swayne, L. E. (1998). Competitive Advantage and Internal Organizational Assessment. *Academy of Management Executive, 12*(3), 6-16.
- Eoyang, G. H. & Holladay, R. J. (2013). *Adaptive Action: Leveraging Uncertainty in Your Organization*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, CA.
- French, W. L. & Bell, C. H. (1999). *Organizational Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organizational Improvement*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Greene, R. D., & Berthoud, H. (2015). OD is Diversity. *OD PRACTITIONER, 47*(4).
- Hoffman, D. A. & Stallworth, L. E. (2008). Leveling the Playing Field for Workplace Neutrals: A Proposal for Achieving Racial and Ethnic Diversity. *Dispute Resolution Journal, 63*(1), 36-46.

- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Jamali, D., Khoury, G., & Sahyoun, H. (2006). From Bureaucratic Organizations to Learning Organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 13(4), 337-52.
- Jamieson, D. W. (2017). *Strategic Organization Design – Overview*. Lecture Presentation, Cabrini University Organizational Development Program. Radnor, PA.
- Jamieson, D. W., Auron, M., & Shechtman, D. (2010). Managing Use of Self in Masterful Professional Practice. *OD Practitioner*, 42(3), 4 -11.
- Jayne, M. E., & Dipboye, R. L. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human resource management*, 43(4), 409-424.
- Joplin, J. R., & Daus, C. S. (1997). Challenges of leading a diverse workforce. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(3), 32-47.
- Katz, J. H. & Miller, F. A. (2014). Learning from the Journey. *OD Practitioner*, 46(4), 39-43.
- Katz, J. H. & Miller, F. A. (2013). *Opening Doors to Teamwork & Collaboration: 4 Keys That Change Everything*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Katz, J. H. & Miller, F. A. (2013b). Judging Others Has Not Worked... So Let's Join Them. *Executive Forum*, Fall(2013), 51-56.
- Lawler, E. E. & Worley, C. G. (2006). *Built to Change: How to Achieve Sustained Organizational Effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco, CA.
- Lowman, R. L. (2005). Importance of Diagnosis in Organizational Assessment: Harry Levinson's Contributions. *The Psychologist Manager Journal*, 8(1), 17-28.
- Magretta, J. (2012). *Understanding Michael Porter: The Essential Guide to Competition and Strategy*. Harvard Business Review. Boston, MA.
- Maurer, R. (2010). *Beyond the Wall of Resistance*. (Revised Ed.). Bard Press. Austin, TX.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.

Pfeffer, J. & Sutton, R. I. (2006). *Hard Facts, Dangerous Half-Truths, & Total*

Nonsense: Profitting from Evidence-Based Management. Harvard Business Review. Boston, MA.

Plummer, D., & Jordan, C. G. (2007). Going Plaid. *OD PRACTITIONER*, 39(2), 3.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*.

Sage: Los Angeles, CA.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: Human*

Purpose and the Field of the Future. Crown Business. New York, NY.

Shufutinsky, A., Cox, R., & Vizcarrondo, M. E. (2017). The Collapse of Sensemaking in

Injury Root Cause Investigations Resulting in Ineffective Injury Prevention Decision-Making: A

Retrospective Case Study. *Juniper Online Journal of Public Health*, 2(2), 1 – 11.

Walton, D. (2012). *Emotional Intelligence: A Practical Guide*. MJF Books. New York,

NY.

Worley, C. G., Hitchin, D. E., & Ross, W. L. (1996). *Integrated Strategic Change: How*

OD Builds Competitive Advantage. Addison-Wesley. Reading, MA.