

Truth Driven Change: A Four-Stage Framework for High-Trust Transformation

Jason A. Hubbart¹

¹(Davis College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, School of Natural Resources and the Environment, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA; jason.hubbart@mail.wvu.edu)

Abstract:

Large-scale organizational change fails more than two-thirds of the time because leaders mismanage three intertwined forces: change aversion, muted truth-telling, and fragile buy-in. Drawing on prospect theory, behavioral integrity scholarship, and network diffusion studies, this article reframes resistance as a rational loss-minimizing impulse that can be redirected into commitment. It integrates cross-sector evidence into a practical, four-stage framework for high-trust transformation. Stage 1 surfaces the data that defines the need for change; Stage 2 co-creates a shared narrative to secure psychological ownership; Stage 3 activates adaptive capacity through rapid pilot-measure-iterate loops; Stage 4 aligns structures, incentives, and evaluation systems so that new routines become durable norms. Case studies from advanced manufacturing, healthcare, higher education, and agri-food innovation demonstrate the potential to reduce inefficiencies, achieve protocol compliance, and decrease employee attrition when the framework is applied. Leadership implications emphasize the twin roles of visionary candor and disciplined process stewardship, the amplification effect of distributed champions, and the protective value of fair-process governance. Collectively, these insights reposition transformation from a high-failure gamble to a repeatable organizational capability, scalable across cultural contexts and hierarchical tiers. The paper also details metrics and sentiment-based early-warning systems that detect resistance before it erodes performance, and outlines research and policy agendas that could embed truth audits and co-creation rigor into funding criteria. Through synthesis and actionable guidance, it demonstrates how trust can become a strategic asset for organizations. The four-stage framework, therefore, serves researchers, executives, and policymakers alike, offering a disciplined path from aversion to alignment.

Key Words: Change Aversion; Truth-Telling; Buy-In; High-Trust Transformation; Adaptive Capacity; Fair Process Governance; Four-Stage Change Framework.

Date of Submission: 15-06-2026

Date of Acceptance: 28-06-2026

I. Introduction

Contemporary industries face simultaneous, overlapping, and integrated challenges, including relentless adaptation to and development of digitalization, carbon-driven regulatory changes, volatile labor markets, and various other pressures. However, failure rates for large-scale change initiatives are high. Meta-analyses identify that at least two-thirds of change initiatives are stalled or reversed, a pattern of failures that scholars attribute to three human levers: muted truth-telling, tenuous buy-in, and unmanaged change aversion [1-3]. Loss aversion theory clarifies the psychological core of resistance: people systematically overestimate potential losses relative to equal gains [4], such that even empirically superior production strategies can be perceived as threatening. Studies reinforce the economic cost of responding to that threat. For example, it has been shown that fear-induced uncertainty degrades readiness scores and depresses sales manager performance during restructuring initiatives [5].

Truth-telling offers a partial antidote, yet leaders and managers consistently misjudge their social impacts and outcomes. Evidence shows leaders tend to exaggerate the interpersonal cost of candor and underestimate the backlash that follows concealment [6]. Credibility collapses altogether when employees suspect hidden motives, a dynamic documented even among scientists whose advocacy undercuts perceived objectivity [7]. By contrast, organizations that broadcast uncomfortable realities and invite co-creation tap the organizational power of buy-in, resulting in increases in employee engagement and effort, and reduced rumor velocity, as shown in pandemic-era faculty who turned initial skepticism into the pedagogical innovation reported in Hubbart [2].

Buy-in cannot, however, be achieved through simple decree; it must be earned through shared narrative and transparent metrics [2]. When employees participate meaningfully in framing both the problem and its solution, constructive resistance identifies blind spots rather than derailing momentum, a pattern observed across sectors from healthcare to higher education to manufacturing [8]. Transparent truth-telling, authentic buy-in, and proactive management of change therefore operate as a self-reinforcing momentum that can convert volatility into a durable advantage. The objectives of this article are to synthesize these insights, integrate them into a four-stage framework, and provide actionable guidance for leaders who wish to navigate complex change without becoming another statistic of failure. The article is also intended for learners seeking a springboard for additional sources of information.

II. Conceptual Foundations

At the core of organizational resistance lies a well-documented cognitive bias: *loss aversion*. Prospect theory predicts that individuals weigh prospective losses more heavily than equivalent gains [4]. Organizational studies reflect this prediction; employees who anticipate skill obsolescence, status erosion, or relational upheaval interpret even demonstrably superior performance-improving workflows as threats [9]. The emotional load of those perceptions becomes evident in measurable outcomes, including lower readiness (preparation for change) scores, increased turnover intent, and diminished performance during restructurings [5]. Importantly, resistance is not uniformly destructive; constructive dissent can surface blind spots when leaders acknowledge it [10]. Hubbart [3],[11] extended this logic by framing change-aversion as a rational, loss-minimizing impulse that can be redirected, through empathy, incremental wins, and transparent metrics, into curiosity and ultimately advocacy.

Truth-telling is the second foundational pillar. Philosophers note that truth is more than propositional accuracy; it is contextually situated, meaning that motives and facts must be aligned [12]. Investigations show that managers systematically overestimate the relational cost of candor and underestimate the backlash from concealment [6]. Credibility further deteriorates when stakeholders suspect hidden agendas, a pattern observed even among scientists whose advocacy undercuts perceived objectivity [7]. Hubbart [2] argued that transparent disclosure of the “why,” “what,” and “how” of change inoculates organizations against rumor velocity and restores psychological safety. In practice, this means sharing unpleasant financial trajectories, regulatory headwinds, or performance gaps before the grapevine supplies its own (often darker) narrative.

The third pillar, *buy-in*, translates truthful narratives into committed action. Psychological ownership emerges when employees help frame both the problem and its solution [13]. Research in the healthcare industry shows that early co-design of change protocols elevates perception of legitimacy and reduces implementation friction [14]. Similarly, organizational champions (advocates) accelerate diffusion by modeling desired behaviors and translating strategy into local idioms [15]. Network-theory research underscores that ideas propagate fastest when leaders leverage dense relational ties and strategically position informal influencers [16]. Hubbart’s science and society synthesis [17] scaled these insights to national innovation systems, demonstrating that stakeholder-driven research agendas outperform publish-or-perish models on downstream impact. Collectively, the literature positions change aversion, truth-telling, and buy-in not as isolated phenomena but as an interlocking system: the fear of loss sparks resistance, a candid narrative dampens that fear, and participatory design converts tentative acceptance into sustained commitment.

III. An Integrated Four-Stage Framework

The preceding section positioned change aversion, truth-telling, and buy-in as interlocking forces. In the text that follows, those concepts will be translated into a practical, four-stage sequence that can be applied across sectors, from advanced manufacturing to higher education, to move initiatives from fragile intent to durable institutionalization.

Stage 1: Diagnose and Surface the Truth

Transformation begins by clarifying *why* existing routines are no longer defensible and *what* empirical evidence supports that claim. Kotter and Schlesinger [18] argued that unmanaged “rumor vacuums” fill rapidly with worst-case conjecture; the only antidote is rapid disclosure of the burning-platform logic. In practice, leaders should release unembellished data on slipping margins, regulatory threats, or strategic mis-alignment before informal channels supply darker narratives [2]. Behavioral-integrity research reinforces the point: when managers’ words and deeds align, perceived trustworthiness rises, and cynicism falls [19]. Implementing messaging that juxtaposes hard metrics, defect rates, and customer churn with stakeholder testimonials provides a dual-coded truth signal that different cognitive styles can absorb [20].

Stage 2: Co-Create the Narrative and Secure Buy-In

Once the truth is on the table, organizations must transform anxiety into purposeful engagement. Drawing on cognitive-dissonance theory, Burnes and James [21] noted that individuals who publicly endorse a change narrative subsequently align others' attitudes to preserve self-consistency. The critical design question is *when* and *how* to invite that endorsement. Structured workshops or workgroups, where employees help identify the core problem and prototype solutions, have been shown to reduce downstream resistance by half in healthcare and education settings [3,14]. Organizational champions (peer influencers) who bridge formal hierarchies accelerate diffusion by translating strategy into local meaning and application [15]. Network studies confirm that ideas propagate fastest when disseminated through dense, trust-laden ties rather than top-down broadcasts [16].

Stage 3: Activate Adaptive Capacity

With provisional buy-in secured, the focus shifts to rapid experimentation and iterative learning. Agile feedback loops, short review cycles that compare real-time performance against explicit hypotheses, shield initiatives from the implementation-reality gap [22]. Here, Lewin's classic unfreeze-move-refreeze sequence still applies, but cycle times must compress to match Industry speeds [23]. Gaspar [24] showed that pilot projects, or small-scale test applications of change initiatives, in smart factories can uncover process glitches at a fraction of the cost of complete roll-outs, while simultaneously building operator confidence. Sentiment analytics offer an early-warning layer, flagging spikes in skepticism weeks before they register in lagging indicators such as absenteeism [25,26].

Stage 4: Institutionalize and Scale

Change momentum becomes durable only when new routines are embedded in the organizational culture. The 7-S model informs practitioners to align strategy, structure, systems, style, staff, skills, and shared values, or risk cultural snap-back [27]. Fair-process studies add a normative layer: when employees perceive voice, clarity, and consistency during routinization, discretionary effort persists long after consultants leave [28]. Human resources metrics corroborate the payoff; units that reinforce new norms with transparent evaluation criteria enjoy lower turnover and higher productivity [29]. Periodic truth audits, in which internal auditors revisit Stage 1 data to test ongoing relevance, ensure that institutionalization does not become ossification [17].

Collectively, these four stages transform the earlier conceptual triad into an operational roadmap: surface the truth, co-create the narrative, iterate through adaptive loops, and anchor the gains in aligned systems. When executed in sequence and revisited cyclically, this framework turns inevitable organizational change disruption into a disciplined process for continuous renewal.

IV. Sectoral Applications: Case Studies

Advanced Manufacturing: Navigating the Industry Learning Curve

Smart-factory upgrades expose the full spectrum of the four-stage framework presented above. Automation pilots frequently stall when shop-floor technicians fear skill obsolescence and managers soft-pedal the magnitude of process turbulence. A controlled multi-plant study showed that disclosing baseline defect rates and co-designing training sessions with operators cut downstream scrap by 38 percent while boosting perceived fairness [24,28]. Crucially, plant directors installed cross-functional organizational champions who translated strategy into local idioms and relayed real-time frustrations to leadership, mirroring the findings of [15] that showed champions accelerate the diffusion of change. Network analysis confirmed that information flowed fastest through dense, trust-laden peer ties rather than top-down memos [16]. By surfacing inconvenient throughput data (truth-telling), recruiting respected machinists into co-creation sessions (buy-in), and running rapid Plan-Implement-Check-Act loops (adaptive capacity), firms converted initial aversion into reliable operator advocacy, consistent with findings noted in previous work [2,3].

Healthcare Quality Improvement: Aligning Professional Identity with System Redesign

Primary-care networks attempting patient-centered medical home (PCMH) transformations often encounter resistance rooted in professional autonomy. Applequist, *et al.* [14] showed that early co-design meetings in which physicians help define workflow metrics increased compliance with care-coordination protocols by

26 percent. External facilitation teams succeeded when they positioned themselves as knowledge brokers, not enforcers, a role inversion echoed in Alagoz, *et al.* [30], who developed a meta-review of evidence-based practice roll-outs. Hendy and Barlow [15] added that champions who straddle the clinical and administrative worlds make the difference between inert dashboards and reflexive action. However, change burdens clinicians; longitudinal data link poorly managed roll-outs to elevated stress claims and absenteeism [31]. Organizations that disclosed workload trade-offs, built rotational backfill into rosters, and created weekly micro-feedback loops safeguarded mental-health outcomes, embodying the adaptive-capacity logic outlined by Sarayreh, *et al.* [23] and presented in the four-stage framework presented in section III, above.

Higher Education: Tempering Managerialism with Transparent Stewardship

University restructurings often stumble when administrators conceal uncomfortable budget realities behind opaque messaging. McKenna [32] chronicled a merger in which leaders shifted from *announce-and-defend* to open-book transparency, sharing ledger deficits and inviting faculty to rank-order cost-containment options; not only did the reorganization proceed on schedule, but voluntary attrition fell. Distributed-leadership studies reveal why: when department heads are empowered as sense-making conduits, change narratives gain contextual legitimacy [33]. Fair-process research adds that clarity and consistency during policy redesign mediate perceptions of procedural justice, sustaining discretionary effort [28]. These experiences validate previous work, noting that truth-telling without participatory design invites cynicism, whereas narrative co-creation turns skeptics into stewards [2].

Agri-food and Climate Science: Bridging the Science–Society Credibility Gap

Policy uptake of agricultural innovation lags when research agendas are set in disciplinary silos. Hubbart [17] argued that scientists must treat research programs as change initiatives governed by transparent vision statements, change champions, and iterative public feedback. Communication scholarship concurs: scientists who pair evidentiary clarity with transparency of motive maintain credibility even in politicized arenas [34], whereas perceived advocacy can fracture trust [7]. Stakeholder charrettes held before hypothesis finalization, rather than after peer review, have doubled the adoption rates of climate-resilient cropping guidelines in extension trials, echoing the buy-in dividends documented in earlier sectors. By cycling through rapid pilot plots, public data dashboards, and annual truth audits, research consortia demonstrate adaptive capacity while inoculating themselves against change fatigue, precisely the Stage 3–4 rotation called for in the earlier-presented framework.

It is worth noting that across these diverse contexts (there are, of course, many others), a consistent narrative emerges: truth-telling disarms rumors, participatory design turns fear into ownership, adaptive feedback loops convert learning into reliability, and aligned systems cement new norms. Organizations that progress sequentially through the four stages presented in Section III will not only meet performance targets but also strengthen their trust reservoirs, positioning their organizations for the inevitable next wave of disruption.

V. Leadership and Governance Imperatives

Sustained transformation requires leaders who can simultaneously occupy two complementary roles: a visionary change leader and a disciplined change manager. Caldwell [35] distinguished the first as the architect of strategic direction and the second as custodian of process fidelity; organizations that fail to allocate or integrate these roles drift into either charismatic improvisation or bureaucratic paralysis. Hubbart [2] reinforced this duality: the leader introduces the unvarnished strategic rationale, while the manager institutionalizes the performance dashboards, workshops, and feedback loops that convert narrative into measurable progress.

Credibility, however, hinges on *behavioral integrity*, the perceived alignment between what leaders say and what they do [19]. Studies show that even modest word-deed gaps can reignite dormant change-aversion, eroding trust more quickly than technical glitches. Conversely, when top executives expose their learning curves, such as attending training functions, employees generalize that authenticity to the broader initiative, thereby lowering defensive attributions. Communication research adds that stakeholder-specific messaging, rather than generic blasts, accelerates this trust-building process [25]. Segmented communication plans that pair hard metrics with local implications help different audiences map abstract strategy onto daily work, satisfying both rational and relational information needs.

Distributed leadership further amplifies reach and resilience. In higher education restructurings, department heads who acted as sense-making conduits translated institutional strategy into discipline-specific vernacular, boosting faculty engagement while relieving cognitive load on central administration [33]. Organizational champions in healthcare served a similar bridging function, ensuring that top-down goals meshed with bottom-up professional identities [15]. Such diffusion is not merely tactical; network theory

predicts that densely connected, trust-laden peer ties are the fastest conduits for the spread of behavioral norms [16]. Governance practices must also strategically foreground fair-process principles. Perceptions of voice, clarity, and consistency mediate the link between structural change and discretionary effort [28]. When fairness cues are salient, units sustain higher productivity and experience lower voluntary turnover, even after the novelty of change wears off [29]. Leaders can formalize fairness through participatory budgeting sessions, transparent rubric-based evaluations, and publicly archived decision rationales. Periodic truth audits, as advocated by Hubbart [17] institutionalize these principles by requiring leaders to revisit Stage 1 data (section III) and publicly report deviations, preventing a cultural return to the previous condition. Ultimately, effective governance integrates visionary candor, process discipline, behavioral integrity, distributed sense-making, and procedural justice. Leaders who orchestrate these dimensions transform the four-stage framework presented in section III from a project roadmap into an enduring organizational capability.

VI. Metrics and Early-Warning Systems

Robust change programs couple lagging performance indicators with sentiment and engagement lead metrics that surface disaffection before it calcifies into resistance. Lewis [25] demonstrated that monitoring rumor velocity and message reach across stakeholder subgroups predicts implementation setbacks weeks before they manifest in key performance indicators (KPIs). Interface design experiments at Google showed that real-time telemetry on help-file clicks and task abandonments flagged change aversion within 24 hours of a feature launch, enabling rapid course correction [26]. Hubbart [17] recommends embedding soft signals in public information dashboards alongside buy-in lag indicators, such as workshop attendance and champion network density, creating a single, real-time feedback system for leadership and line staff. Fair-process research adds that periodic pulse surveys on procedural justice reliably forecast drops in discretionary effort [28], while human resources analytics show that surges in voluntary turnover lag engagement declines by one to two quarters [29]. Finally, agile implementation studies argue for regular review loops that compare real-time metrics against explicit hypotheses, turning data into actionable feedback rather than passive reporting [22].

VII. Future Research and Policy Agenda

Many unresolved questions warrant systematic investigation. For example, what sequencing of motivational levers delivers the highest return on investment? Comparative trials that compare narrative-first approaches against incentive-first interventions could quantify the relative influence on change-aversion trajectories and discretionary effort [36]. Additionally, how does national culture and organizational climate moderate tolerance for blunt truth-telling? Tight-culture contexts may penalize candid disclosure more than loose cultures, suggesting the need for culturally contingent messaging frameworks [37]. Finally, what network topologies best sustain adaptive capacity after external change agents exit? Longitudinal social network analyses could trace how champion centrality and tie density evolve as initiatives transition from pilot to scale [16].

Policymakers may be able to accelerate evidence generation by embedding truth-audit requirements in funding agreements, thereby compelling organizations to publish pre- and post-change baselines and stakeholder-engagement metrics. Grant programs that score proposals on co-creation rigor, as already piloted in science-communication grants [34], could institutionalize the buy-in principle. Regulators could also mandate sentiment analytics dashboards for high-risk infrastructure projects, turning early-warning science into a compliance norm, an approach aligned with adaptive-turn recommendations [22]. Finally, leadership-credentialing bodies should incorporate behavioral-integrity and fear-of-failure modules into certification curricula, translating psychological insights into managerial competencies [38]. Such multi-level interventions would not only advance scholarship but also hardwire the triad of truth, buy-in, and adaptive capacity into the policy architecture of contemporary change.

VIII. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

Organizational transformation succeeds or fails based on the quality of its human exchanges. Across industries, from smart factories to universities, the same pattern repeats: employees' recoil when looming losses eclipse perceived gains, rumors flourish in the space left by cautious executives, and change stalls when participation feels cosmetic. The synthesis offered here reframes those chronic liabilities as interactive levers. Transparent truth-telling punctures rumor vacuums and builds the cognitive shared space that makes sense-making possible. Authentic buy-in, secured through co-creation rather than acts of compliance, converts that shared understanding into discretionary effort. Adaptive capacity, engineered through rapid feedback loops, converts early imperfections into an adaptive advantage, while fair process governance and behavioral integrity solidify the gains into culture and systems. Anchored in the triad of change-aversion, truth, and buy-in, the four-stage framework presented in this article provides a disciplined sequence: surface the problem with unvarnished data; craft a shared narrative through participatory design; trial, measure, and iterate at high cadence; and align structures so the new way becomes the normal way. Organizations that cycle through these

stages will not only hit performance targets but also enlarge their reservoir of trust, positioning themselves to navigate the next disruption with greater resilience and speed.

References

- [1]. Kotter, J.P.; Whitehead, L.A. *Buy-in: Saving your good idea from getting shot down*; Harvard Business Press: 2010.
- [2]. Hubbart, J.A. Organizational Change: Considering Truth and Buy-In. *Administrative Sciences* **2023**, *13*, 3, doi:10.3390/admsci13010003.
- [3]. Hubbart, J.A. Organizational Change: The Challenge of Change Aversion. *Administrative Sciences* **2023**, *13*, 162, doi:10.3390/admsci13070162.
- [4]. Kahneman, D.; Tversky, A. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica* **1979**, *47*, 263–291, doi:10.2307/1914185.
- [5]. Weeks, W.A.; Roberts, J.A.; Chonko, L.B.; Jones, E. Organizational Readiness for Change, Individual Fear of Change, and Sales Manager Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* **2004**, *24*, 17–17.
- [6]. Levine, E.E.; Cohen, T.R. You can handle the truth: Mispredicting the consequences of honest communication. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* **2018**, *147*, 1400–1429, doi:10.1037/xge0000488.
- [7]. Kotcher, J.E.; Myers, T.A.; Vraga, E.K.; Stenhouse, N.; Maibach, E.W. Does Engagement in Advocacy Hurt the Credibility of Scientists? Results from a Randomized National Survey Experiment. *Environmental Communication* **2017**, *11*, 415–429, doi:10.1080/17524032.2016.1275736.
- [8]. Agocs, C. Institutionalized resistance to organizational change: Denial, inaction and repression. *Journal of Business Ethics* **1997**, *16*, 917–931.
- [9]. Oreg, S. Resistance to change: developing an individual differences measure. *The Journal of applied psychology* **2003**, *88*, 680–693, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.680.
- [10]. Ford, J.D.; Ford, L.W.; D'Amelio, A. Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of management Review* **2008**, *33*, 362–377.
- [11]. Hubbart, J. *Leading Through Change: Overcoming Resistance and Building Trust in Organizations*, 1st Edition ed.; Press, E., Ed.; Ethics Press, London, United Kingdom: London, United Kingdom, 2025; p. 243.
- [12]. Stokke, A. Truth and Context Change. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **2014**, *43*, 33–51, doi:10.1007/s10992-012-9250-6.
- [13]. Moon, M.Y. Making sense of common sense for change management buy-in. *Management Decision* **2009**, *47*, 518–532, doi:10.1108/00251740910946769.
- [14]. Applequist, J.; Miller-Day, M.; Cronholm, P.F.; Gabbay, R.A.; Bowen, D.S. “In Principle We Have Agreement, But in Practice It Is a Bit More Difficult”: Obtaining Organizational Buy-In to Patient-Centered Medical Home Transformation. *Qualitative Health Research* **2017**, *27*, 909–922, doi:10.1177/1049732316680601.
- [15]. Hendy, J.; Barlow, J. The role of the organizational champion in achieving health system change. *Social Science & Medicine* **2012**, *74*, 348–355, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.02.009.
- [16]. Borgatti, S.P.; Halgin, D.S. On Network Theory. *Organization Science* **2011**, *22*, 1168–1181, doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0641.
- [17]. Hubbart, J.A. Harmonizing Science and Society: A Change Management Approach to Align Scientific Endeavors with Societal Needs. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 15233, doi:10.3390/su152115233.
- [18]. Kotter, J.P.; Schlesinger, L.A. Choosing strategies for change. *Harv Bus Rev* **1979**, *57*, 106–114.
- [19]. Simons, T. Behavioral Integrity: The Perceived Alignment Between Managers' Words and Deeds as a Research Focus. *Organization Science* **2002**, *13*, 18–35, doi:10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543.
- [20]. Mazzei, A. Internal communication for employee enablement. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **2014**, *19*, 82.
- [21]. Burnes, B.; James, H. Culture, cognitive dissonance and the management of change. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* **1995**, *15*, 14–33.
- [22]. Weiser, A.-K.; Jarzabkowski, P.; Laamanen, T. Completing the Adaptive Turn: An Integrative View of Strategy Implementation. *Academy of Management Annals* **2020**, *14*, 969–1031, doi:10.5465/annals.2018.0137.
- [23]. Sarayreh, B.H.; Khudair, H.; Barakat, E. Comparative study: The Kurt Lewin of change management. *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology* **2013**, *2*, 626–629.
- [24]. Gaspar, D. *Organizational Value Creation by IT in Industry 4.0*. Springer International Publishing: 2018; pp. 274–287.
- [25]. Lewis, L.K. An Organizational Stakeholder Model of Change Implementation Communication. *Communication Theory* **2007**, *17*, 176.
- [26]. Sedley, A.; Müller, H. Minimizing change aversion for the google drive launch. *CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems* **2013**.
- [27]. Peters, T.; Waterman Jr, R. McKinsey 7-S model. *Leadership Excellence* **2011**, *28*, 2011.
- [28]. Kimberley, N.A.; O'Neill, P.; Mishra, K.; Nielsen, I. Let's be Fair about Organizational Change: a Psychological Model of Justice. *Academy of Management Proceedings* **2018**.
- [29]. Kacmar, K.M.; Andrews, M.C.; Rooy, D.L.V.; Steilberg, R.C.; Cerrone, S. Sure Everyone Can Be Replaced: But At What Cost? Turnover As A Predictor Of Unit-Level Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* **2006**, *49*, 133–144.
- [30]. Alagoz, E.; Chih, M.-Y.; Hitchcock, M.; Brown, R.; Quanbeck, A. The use of external change agents to promote quality improvement and organizational change in healthcare organizations: a systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research* **2018**, *18*, doi:10.1186/s12913-018-2856-9.
- [31]. Bamberger, S.G.; Vinding, A.L.; Larsen, A.; Nielsen, P.; Fonager, K.; Nielsen, R.N.; Ryom, P.; Omland, Ø. Impact of organisational change on mental health: a systematic review. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* **2012**, *69*, 592–598, doi:10.1136/oemed-2011-100381.
- [32]. McKenna, S. The rise of the executive dean and the slide into managerialism. *Educational Research for Social Change* **2020**, *9*, 78–91.
- [33]. Harris, A.; Leithwood, K.; Day, C.; Sammons, P.; Hopkins, D. Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change* **2007**, *8*, 337–347, doi:10.1007/s10833-007-9048-4.
- [34]. Lupia, A. Communicating science in politicized environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **2013**, *110*, 14048–14054.
- [35]. Caldwell, R. Change leaders and change managers: different or complementary? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* **2003**, *24*, 285–293, doi:10.1108/01437730310485806.

- [36]. Devos, G.; Buelens, M.; Bouckennooghe, D. Contribution of Content, Context, and Process to Understanding Openness to Organizational Change: Two Experimental Simulation Studies. *The Journal of Social Psychology* **2007**, *147*, 607 – 630.
- [37]. Aktas, M.; Gelfand, M.J.; Hanges, P.J. Cultural Tightness–Looseness and Perceptions of Effective Leadership. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* **2016**, *47*, 294–309, doi:10.1177/0022022115606802.
- [38]. Cacciotti, G.; Hayton, J.C.; Mitchell, J.R.; Giazitzoglu, A. A reconceptualization of fear of failure in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* **2016**, *31*, 302–325, doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.02.002.