# INTEGRATION OF PROJECT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT: TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE VALUE CREATION

Vesna_Tornjanski[1], Mladen_Čudanov[2], Gheorghe_Săvoiu[3]
[1] University of Belgrade, Faculty of Organizational Sciences, Serbia, E-mail: vtornjanski@gmail.com
[2] University of Belgrade, Faculty of Organizational Sciences, Serbia, E-mail: mladenc@fon.bg.ac.rs
[3] University of Pitesti, Romania, E-mail: gsavoiu@yahoo.com

**Abstract**: A large and fruitful arena of theories and practices of project and change management disciplines often show these two areas as independent in its basis. However, it has been recently recognized that project and organizational change management disciplines are complementary with a common objective to an organization, i.e. to increase project and change success rates, further implying improvement of overall organizational performances. To understand if project and organizational change management integration represent a path for sustainable value creation for organizations, this paper focuses on empirical research aiming at understanding integration value and dimensions of integration that can build capabilities for a successful project and organizational change outcomes. Overall research results show that multiple values can be obtained by integrating two disciplines.

**Keywords**: *Project management, change management, sustainable value creation, organizational performances, project and organizational change success*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Pressure for constant organizational development and growth, increased by disruptive innovations, foster acceleration of various types of projects and changes that are characterized by uncertainty and complexity. The success rate of projects, especially in organizational change is still low. Such circumstances have led to the introduction and adoption of project-based mode of operation in different industries [1]. Organizational change management (OCM) and project management (PM) are often viewed as puzzled [2]. Similarly, it has been noted that project management and change management are frequently thought to be the same thing [3]. However, current management and organizational literature did not sufficiently cover the topic of project and change management integration, especially not with an empirical approach.

This paper sets out to extend and deepen the understanding of project management and organizational change management integration as a prerequisite for sustainable value creation, based on data collected from banking, IT and other industries. We aim to empirically examine and explain all relationships and perceived importance of various attributes of the domains with regard to this phenomenon by identifying key benefits if organization integrates project and organizational change management disciplines.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Project management

Project is defined as a temporary organization built with the purpose to produce a unique product, service or result. Singular and unrepeatable voyage consisting of specific aim, scope and definite period of time, represent basic characteristics of temporary organization, i.e. project [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Project management represents planned and organized effort to accomplish a particular objective.

Many authors have attempted to define project management. One of the earliest definitions is:
*"Project Management is the application of a collection of tools and techniques (such as the CPM and matrix organisation) to direct the use of diverse resources toward the accomplishment of a unique, complex, one-time task within time, cost and quality constraints. Each task requires a particular mix of these tools and techniques structured to fit the task environment and life cycle (from conception to completion) of the task"* [11].

Another definition see project management as:
*"The planning, monitoring and control of all aspects of a project and the motivation of all those involved in it to achieve the project objectives on time and to the specifed cost, quality and performance"* [12].

Extended definition is given by the UK Associitiation of Project Management (APM), defining project management as:
*"The planning, organization, monitoring and control of all aspects of a project and the motivation of all involved to achieve the project objectives safely and within agreed time, cost and performance criteria. The project manager is the single point of responsibility for achieving this"* [13].

Regardless of the definition, according to Project Management Institute [14], project management consists of five common processes: Initiating, Planning, Executing, Monitoring / Control and Closing. Project management within organization brings strategic value chain that enables organizations an edge over competitors [16]. Despite its significance, most organizations record around 70% of project failure rate [17]. Viewed from another perspective, many authors, e.g. [9, 10] see projects as significant driver for organizational changes. It has been noted that organizational change management has low presence in the literature of project management [15]. However, recently has been formally acknowledged the incorporation of organizational change management to project success [15], representing significant shift in one hand, and the possibility for further research and development of the phenomenon, on the other.

### 2.2. Organizational change management

Currently, organizational aspects such as strategy, business model, structure, processes, culture, employees' activities, mindset and many others are challenged by the change phenomenon [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. Regardless of the level at which change occurs, type, origin, size or duration, it has been argued that organizations need to understand that change is not a straightforward and immediate phenomenon [23]. Kotter

noted that change represent a process consisting of series of phases that often requires a substantial length of time [24]. Lewin's three-step model includes the following stages: unfreezing, shifting to a new level and refreezing the changes. The model emphasizes an understanding of how social groups are composed, motivated and sustained [25]. As an extension to the Lewin's work, several authors have developed Lewin's three-step model with the aim to make it more practical [21, 26].

Bullock and Batten [27] have developed a four-phase model. This model refers to planned change and splits the process into the following stages: exploration, planning, action and integration. The model focuses on the processes of change that describe the methods utilized to shift a situation from one shape to another, yet depicts change phases that organization is required to run, with the aim to enhance the success rate of change process [27]. Bordum [28] in his work described a previously developed generic and circular change model that include five main phases, i.e. preparation phase – referring to analysis of the situation, analysis of business-problem, and the availability of resources; planning phase that implies design plan for long-range, medium-range, short-range: objectives, goals, purposes, strategies, policies and other; implementation phase that includes organization and actions towards finalizing the plan; evaluation of results and final phase that implies plan revision by repeating the planning process [28]. Judson change model was proposed in 1991. Judson's model constitutes of five phases too, starting from analyzing of an organization, planning activities for change, communication with stakeholders and the final phase that refers to reinforcement and institutionalization of change. This model takes into account barriers that might occur in each phase and considers actions towards minimizing these limitations. Yet, resistance to change has been found as the biggest limitation to successful change [29]. Kanter et al. [23] have developed a comprehensive change model that consists of ten phases. The model starts with an analysis of an organizational situation, development of vision and plan, implementation of change with the involved leader, and finally, communication and institutionalization of change. Also, authors recommend the involvement of employees in the change process to reduce resistance and emphasized that only after obtaining the support and involvement of employees, actual implementation can occur [23].

A model that is acknowledged as a holistic one is the Kotter's change model [30]. The model is designed with eight steps, i.e.: establishing a sense of criticality, assembling a trustworthy team to effectively support change, creating a vision and strategy, disclosing a vision to stakeholder group, applying the change and planning short term win-win approach, consolidating benefits and continuously institutionalizing a change. It has been argued that lack of success when implementing a change could be overcome with this model, taking into account that Kotter has found key traps that leaders make when implementing a change [30].

Moorhead and Griffin have proposed their model - Moorhead - Griffin change model that is created for situations when continuous change occurs [31]. The model takes into account fact that change is not an exceptional phenomenon in today's highly dynamic economy, thus the first step in the model refers to analyzing of external and internal forces that influence a change. Understanding and defining problems by using complex diagnostic analysis represent actions in step two, followed by problem solving process. After this phase, implementation, monitoring, control and evaluation steps were proposed by authors to successfully complete change efforts. Besides, this model introduces transition management with the role to emphasize particular management practices that should be taken into account in all change management phases, i.e. from initial situation to the preferred situation [31].

Insurrection model, designed by Hamel is introduced with arguments of necessity to create new wealth opportunities for organizations that operate in a business environment characterized by nonlinear and radical changes. To effectively respond to changes, the model contains eight steps for successful change, starting from the phase of designing a strong plan, writing corresponding policies, building a team, implementing and incorporating a change within an organization [32].

On the other hand, Luecke highlights the significance of recognizing the need and urgency for change and points out that change should be viewed as an opportunity rather than as a threat. The model emphasizes the importance of the role of strong leadership in supporting a change and motivating employees to adopt a change. Luecke's model includes collective identification of problems, finding solutions, development of shared vision, identification of leadership role, implementation of change, monitoring and having prepared strategies for all possible issues that might occur during the process of change [33].

With reference to planned organizational change, three key implications were suggested for practice.
*"First, change agents should focus on systematic change in work settings as the starting point in change efforts and on individual behaviour change as a key mediator associated with organizational outcome change. Because intervention activity affects parts of a work setting other than those changed directly by the intervention, practitioners must insure that the various work setting changes are congruent with each other, sending consistent signals to organization members about the new behaviors desired"* [34, p. 629].

Contrary to planned organizational changes, the emergent approach to change management advocates that numerous external factors restrict ability of management to control, predefine and properly plan activities for change. This phenomenon represents a relatively new phenomenon that lacks theoretical basis for effective managing. According to the available literature on the subject of emergent change management, the most quoted models that deal with emergent change refer to "Big three" model of organizational change and Hinings and Greenwood's model of change dynamics, briefly presented hereafter.

According to the "Big three" model, there are three forms of change, three types of motion and three roles in the change process. Forms of change refer to changes in identity, coordination and in control process. The model proposes three types of motion that relate to: a) organization and extended external business environment, b) interrelated organizational components, and c) employees within an organization. Finally, roles in the change process differentiate change strategists, change implementers and change recipients. Authors emphasized that successful change might be reached by integrating and engaging all components recognized in the model [35].

Hinings and Greenwood model of change dynamics advocates that change comprehends complex and nonlinear interactions and processes that relate within organization and between organization and external business environment, yet put focus on the complexity of external business environment in which organization operates. According to the model, change represents series of dynamic circumstances and actions derived from unpredictable situations. The model postulates that change takes place in five mutual elements: situational limitations, interpretive outlines, benefits, dependence of power, and organizational capacity. To succeed in change management outcomes, the model suggests that leaders should be highly focused on situational limitations in a broader context of organization. In parallel, for successful change management, the model proposes that change should be fitted into internal organizational intangibles, i.e. values, beliefs, interest and interrelations [36, 37].

A holistic view on change management that simultaneously includes various forms and analysis processes is shown in a recently proposed model of Adcroft et al. [38]. This model proposes that to understand transformation process, analytical interventions should take place in transformation event, transformation programme, transformation outcome and transformation myth. Authors argue that this model provides holistic view on change through combining both, rational and irrational components that might create value for organizational change management in different context [38]. Despite growing tendency of organizational changes and its significant role in today's highly volatile and continuously evolving business environment, the evidence shows that excessively planned changes have a low success rate. Existing literature shows a high failure rate of all change initiatives amounting of around 70% [39]. Yet, it has been noted that at least 40% of all organizational change efforts consist of simultaneous different types of changes [40], which implies an application of adequate approaches to managing change aiming at increasing its success rate.

## 2.3. Similarities and differences of project and organizational change management

Recalling to the project management and organizational change management as different disciplines, there are some similarities needed to be pointed out. Project management integrates people, processes, methodologies and tools through all common processes, i.e. initiation, planning, execution, monitoring and control and closure, finally. Project is created with the aim to meet specific organizational goals and overall strategic objectives. Similar to project management discipline, change management includes people, processes and tools to effectively support managing of changes that occur within organization [3].

Project management and organizational change management are founded on different terminologies and different methodologies. Moreover, *"their respective proponents arise out of different part of organizations and have different functional and educational backgrounds. They emphasize different skill sets and competencies"* [15]. However, some authors noted that project managers use change implementation practices *"across a range of projects requiring differing degrees of organizational change, and across both the finance and engineering industries"* [15, 41]. Project management and organizational change management

both aims at increasing the likelihood of initiatives deliver the intended results and expected outcomes. Both are essential during the transitions in the organizational lifecycle, consisting of multiple phases [42, 43] Although each discipline operates independently, Prosci suggests integration of both to take advantages of synthesis and thus to create value to an organization [44].

## 2.4. Hypotheses development

To produce expected organizational results and outcomes through projects and organizational change initiatives, it has been viewed that the most effective approach is to integrate both [44]. Integration value of project management and organizational change management is seen to be most effective in shared objectives - both to be focused on singular objective, risk mitigation in a more proactive manner, sequencing alignment of technical and people activities and improvement of information exchange [45].

When integration dimensions for project management and organizational change management are in question, it has been noted that the most effective integration alignment to carry out expected results and outcomes for an organization is in people, processes, tools, methodologies [44, 45]. Accordingly, hypotheses for further verifications in this study are:

H1. Overall project and organizational change success differ between observed industries.

H2. Integration of project and organizational change management values and dimensions (i.e. shared organizational objectives, ability to anticipate obstacles of change, comprehensive stakeholder analysis, better resource planning, process alignment, tools integration, incorporation of project management methodologies into organizational change management) correlates with the overall greater success outcome.

H3. Multiple values of project management and organizational change management integration are recognized by majority of respondents.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODS

To gather the required data, we have used the survey method. Questionnaire contains 21 questions and sampling frame includes experts from the banking, IT and other industries. A web-based questionnaire was sent to 120 experts and 48 completed the questionnaire, yielding a response rate of 40%. Data were analyzed in three main phases using SPSS software package. First phase of data analysis encompasses scale reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha. Second phase of data analysis implies descriptive statistics of respondents and frequencies according to the industry, country and according to the size of organizations included in the study. The final phase of data analysis implies hypotheses testing using descirptive statistics, correlation and frequencies.

## 4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of internal consistency of the scale validity, analyzed by Cronbach's Alpha test are shown in Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of $\alpha=0.872$ indicate high level of internal consistency.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|---|---|
| .877 | 8 |

Second phase of data analysis implies descriptive statistics of respondents and frequencies according to the industry and country included in the study. Tables 2, 3 and 4 depict descriptive statistics of participants included in the study. According to the results shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4, respondents are in average 39.67 years old, out of which 52.08% are female, while 47.92% are male participants. In addition, majority of participants have been included in the projects and organizational change implementation, i.e. 95.83% of all participants have been included in project implementation, and 77.08% have been involved in organizational change implementation.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics overview according to the age

| | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 48 | 24.00 | 56.00 | 39.67 | 7.45007 |

Table 3. Descriptive statistics overview according to the gender and participation at projects

| | | Have you been part of project(s) at your organization | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No | Yes | |
| Please state your gender | Female | 2 | 23 | 25 |
| | Male | 0 | 23 | 23 |
| Total | | 2 | 46 | 48 |

Table 4. Descriptive statistics overview according to the gender and participation at organizational change implementation

| | | Have you been included in organizational change implementation | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No | Yes | |
| Please state your gender | Female | 8 | 17 | 25 |
| | Male | 3 | 20 | 23 |
| Total | | 11 | 37 | 48 |

Next tables, i.e. Tables 5, 6 and 7 depict frequencies according to the industries and countries contributed to the study and according to the organizational size, respectively. Recalling to the results presented in Tables 5, 6 and 7, participants from four countries contributed to the research results, most of which are from Serbia. Majority of respondents are coming from IT industry (49.9%), followed by banking and insurance (45.8%). When company size is in question, research were carried out in large companies (66.7%), medium size (18.8%) and small size (14.6%), according to the number of employees.

Table 5. Frequencies according to the countries included in the study

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Austria | 2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| | Montenegro | 6 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 16.7 |
| | New Zeland | 1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 18.8 |
| | Serbia | 39 | 81.3 | 81.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 48 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 6. Frequencies according to the industries

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Banking and insurance | 22 | 45.8 | 45.8 | 45.8 |
| | Information technology | 23 | 47.9 | 47.9 | 93.8 |
| | Other | 3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 48 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 7. Frequencies according to the company size

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | 50 to 250 | 9 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| | More than 250 | 32 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 85.4 |
| | Up to 50 | 7 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 48 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Final phase of data analysis implies hypotheses testing. To test hypothesis 1, we have compared overall mean values of overall project and organizational change success per industries under study. The results are provided in Table 8.

Table 8. Overall project and organizational change success comparison between observed industries

| Industry sector | | Overall project success evaluation | Overall organizational change success evaluation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Banking and insurance | Mean | .3136 | .3091 |
| | N | 22 | 22 |
| | Std. Deviation | .20306 | .25803 |
| Information technology | Mean | .7087 | .6130 |
| | N | 23 | 23 |
| | Std. Deviation | .22139 | .28010 |
| Other | Mean | .6333 | .5333 |
| | N | 3 | 3 |
| | Std. Deviation | .47258 | .40415 |
| Total | Mean | .5229 | .4688 |
| | N | 48 | 48 |
| | Std. Deviation | .29839 | .30953 |

According to the obtained results, overall project and organizational change success is the most successful in IT industry and the least successful in banking and insurance sector. Following assumption that overall project and organizational change success differ between observed industries and results presented in Table 8, hypothesis 1 is supported. Moreover, the results show that overall project success differ from overall organizational change success.

Hypothesis 2 is tested by examining the strength of relationship between variables using Pearson's correlation analysis. The results are depicted in Table 9.

Table 9. The results of Pearson's correlation analysis for selected variables

| | Integration of PM/OCM values and dimensions | Success outcome |
|---|---|---|

| Integration of PM/OCM values and dimensions | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .660** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 48 | 48 |
| Success outcome | Pearson Correlation | .660** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 48 | 48 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the output, mean values of all project/organizational change management related variables, i.e.: shared organizational objectives, ability to anticipate obstacles of change, comprehensive stakeholder analysis, better resource planning, process alignment, tools integration, and incorporation of project management methodologies into organizational change management are in uphill relationship with the overall greater success outcome variables (r=0.660; p<0.01). The results are statistically significant. In other words, hypothesis 2 is supported.

Table 10 provides insight into the frequencies when recognized integration values of project management and organizational change management disciplines are in question.

Table 10. Recognized integration values

| Integration value | Recognized value | | Total number of respondents that see value of integration |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | |
| Sequencing and alignment | 24 | 23 | 47 |
| Exchange of information | 39 | 8 | 47 |
| Shared objective | 30 | 17 | 47 |
| Proactive steps | 29 | 18 | 47 |
| **Total** | **122** | **66** | |

Following results shown in Table 10, of total involved respondents amounting of 48, 98% participants (47 respondents) have recognized at least one integration value. Exchange of information is selected as the most beneficial value, followed by shared objectives and proactive steps. However, sequencing and alignment should not be neglected, taking into account number of respondents that recognized this value as benefit from project management and organizational change management integration. Accordingly, hypothesis 3 is supported.

## 5. CONCLUSION

A large and fruitful arena of theories and practices of project and organizational change management often show two disciplines as independent in its foundation. However, it has been recently recognized that project and change management are complementary with a common objective to organizations, i.e. to increase project and change success rates, further implying improvement of overall organizational performances. To understand if project and organizational change management integration represent a path for sustainable value creation for organizations, this paper focuses on empirical research aiming at understanding integration value and dimensions of integration that can build capabilities for a successful project and organizational change outcomes.

Research results indicate that the most effective approach for increasing the likelihood of project and organizational change success is to integrate its management. Integration value of project management and organizational change management is seen to be most effective in shared objectives - both to be focused on the singular objective, risk mitigation in a more proactive manner, sequencing alignment of technical and people activities and improvement of information exchange [45]. When integration dimensions for project management and organizational change management are in question, it has been noted that the most effective integration alignment to carry out expected results and outcomes for an organization is in people, processes, tools, methodologies [44, 45]. Quantification of existing methods removes subjective approach [46], and can be a step toward cross-disciplinary application between project and change management.

Recalling to the given research results, hypothesis 1 is supported, i.e. research results show that overall project and organizational change success differ between observed industries. Further, integration of project and organizational change management values and dimensions (i.e. shared organizational objectives, ability to anticipate obstacles of change, comprehensive stakeholder analysis, better resource planning, process alignment, tools integration, incorporation of project management methodologies into organizational change management) correlates with the overall greater success outcome. Accordingly, hypothesis 2 is supported. Finally, respondents see multiple values of project management and organizational change management integration. Exchange of information is viewed as the most beneficial value, followed by shared objectives and proactive steps. However, sequencing and alignment should not be neglected, taking into account the number of respondents that recognized this value as a benefit from project management and organizational change management integration. Accordingly, hypothesis 3 is supported. The study has some limitations that require further research. First, data were collected with a self-administered questionnaire based on the internet that reflects subjectivity of answers which might cause an underrating or overrating of results. Hence, future research should conduct qualitative studies to create potential to obtain a deeper understanding and feasibility of project and organizational change management integration. Next, this study was based on data collected on a small sample. Thus, future research should incorporate perspectives from a larger sample.

Despite its limitation, the study can contribute both to theorists and practitioners in two important ways. First, the paper contributes to the project management theory and organizational change management theory, by extending the literature with shown results in regard to this phenomenon. Also, if practice integration of the two disciplines, there are increasing potentials to increase overall project and change success. Thus, by focusing on this phenomenon, this paper contributes to change managers, change agents, project managers, strategic managers and policymakers by addressing the key indicators for sustainable value creation, needed to be further developed to be fully operationalised in practice.

## 6. REFERENCES

[1] Bakker, R. M., Cambré, B., Korlaar, L., & Raab, J. (2011). Managing the project learning paradox: A set-theoretic approach toward project knowledge transfer. International journal of project

management, 29(5), 494-503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.06.002.

[2] Lucidchart. (2018). Understanding the Difference Between Project Management and Change Management. Retrieved from: https://www.lucidchart.com/blog/project-change-management.

[3] CIO. (2016). What's difference between project management and change management?. Retrieved from: https://www.cio.com/article/3121685/project-management/what-s-difference-between-project-management-and-change-management.html.

[4] Gann, D. M., & Salter, A. (1998). Learning and innovation management in project-based, service-enhanced firms. International Journal of Innovation Management, 2(04), 431-454. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919698000195.

[5] Turner, J. R., & Müller, R. (2003). On the nature of the project as a temporary organization. International journal of project management, 21(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00020-0.

[6] Cacciatori, E., Tamoschus, D., & Grabher, G. (2012). Knowledge transfer across projects: Codification in creative, high-tech and engineering industries. Management Learning, 43(3), 309-331. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507611426240.

[7] Todorović, M. L., Petrović, D. Č., Mihić, M. M., Obradović, V. L., & Bushuyev, S. D. (2015). Project success analysis framework: A knowledge-based approach in project management. International Journal of Project Management, 33(4), 772-783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.10.009.

[8] PMI. (2000). A guide to the project management body of knowledge. Retrieved from: http://www.cs.bilkent.edu.tr/~cagatay/cs413/ PMBOK.pdf.

[9] Markus, M. L., & Benjamin, R. I. (1996). Change agentry-the next IS frontier. Mis Quarterly, 385-407. doi: 10.2307/249561.

[10] Crawford, L., & Nahmias, A. H. (2010). Competencies for managing change. International journal of project management, 28(4), 405-412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.01.015.

[11] Olsen, R. P. (1971). Can project management be defined? Project Management Quarterly, 2(1), 12–14.

[12] British Standard in Project Management 6079, ISBN 0 580 25594 8.

[13] Association of Project Management (APM), Body of Knowledge (BoK) Revised January 1995 (version 2).

[14] PMI. What is Project Management? Retreived from: https://www.pmi.org/about/learn-about-pmi/what-is-project-management

[15] Hornstein, H.A. (2015). The integration of project management and organizational change management is now a necessity. International Journal of Project Management, 33(2), 291-298.

[16] PMI. (2010). The Value of Project Management. Retrieved from:https://www.pmi.org/-/media/pmi/documents/public/pdf/white-papers/value-of-project-management.pdf.

[17] Billows, D. (2015). Project Failure. Retrieved from: https://4pm.com/2015/09/27/project-failure/

[18] Tracey, J. B. (1994). The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It. Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 47(4), 724.

[19] Luecke, R. (2003). Managing change and transition (Vol. 3). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

[20] Burnes, B. (2004). Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics, 4th edn, Harlow, Prentice Hall.

[21] Todnem By, R. (2005). Organisational change management: A critical review. Journal of change management, 5(4), 369-380.

[22] Al-Haddad, S., & Kotnour, T. (2015). Integrating the organizational change literature: a model for successful change. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 28(2), 234-262.

[23] Kanter, R.M., Stein, B. & Jick, T. (1992). The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience it and Leaders Guide it. Free Press/Maxwell Macmillan Canada/ Maxwell Macmillan International, New York, NY/Toronto/New York, NY.

[24] Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail.

[25] Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. Human Relations, 1(5), 5-41.

[26] Bamford, D. R., & Forrester, P. L. (2003). Managing planned and emergent change within an operations management environment. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 23(5), 546-564.

[27] Bullock, R. J., & Batten, D. (1985). It's just a phase we're going through: a review and synthesis of OD phase analysis. Group & Organization Management, 10(4), 383-412.

[28] Bordum, A. (2010). The strategic balance in a change management perspective. Society and Business Review, 5(3), 245-258.

[29] Judson, A. S. (1991). Changing behavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change. B. Blackwell.

[30] Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading Change. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.

[31] Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1998). Managing people and organizations: Organizational behavior.

[32] Hamel, G. (2002). Leading the revolution: How to thrive in turbulent times by making innovation a way of life. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

[33] Luecke, R. (2003). Managing change and transition (Vol. 3). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

[34] Robertson, P. J., Roberts, D. R., & Porras, J. I. (1993). Dynamics of planned organizational change: Assessing empirical support for a theoretical model. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 619-634.

[35] Kanter, R. M. (2003). Challenge of organizational change: How companies experience it and leaders guide it. Simon and Schuster.

[36] Greenwood, R. (1989). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford, England: B. Blackwell.

[37] Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization studies, 9(3), 293-316.

[38] Adcroft, A., Willis, R., & Hurst, J. (2008). A new model for managing change: the holistic view. Journal of Business Strategy, 29(1), 40-45.

[39] Balogun, J. and Hope Hailey, V. (2004). Exploring Strategic Change, 2nd edn. London, Prentice Hall.

[40] Smith, M. E. (2002). Success rates for different types of organizational change. Performance Improvement, 41(1), 26-33.

[41] Crawford, L., Aitken, A., & Hassner-Nahmias, A. (2014). Project management and organizational change. Project Management Institute, Inc., PA.

[42] Adizes, I., Rodic, D., & Cudanov, M. (2017). Estimating consultant engagement in the corporate lifecycle: study of the bias in South Eastern Europe. *Management:Journal Of Sustainable Business And Management Solutions In Emerging Economies, 22*(2), 1-12. DOI:10.7595/management.fon.2017.0015

[43] Adizes, I., Cudanov, M., & Rodic, D. (2017). Timing of Proactive Organizational Consulting: Difference between Organizational Perception and Behaviour. *Amfiteatru Economic* 19(44), 232.

[44]Prosci. Retrieved from: https://www.prosci.com/resources/articles/integrating-change-management-and-project-management.

[45] Miles (2016). Integrating Project Management and Change Management!. Retreived from: https://leadingorganizationalchangebymiles.com/integrating-project-management-and-change-management

[46] Cudanov, M., Tornjanski, V., & Jasko, O. (2019) Change equation effectiveness: empirical evidence from South-East Europe, *E &M Economics and Management*, 22(1), 99–114, DOI: 10.15240/tul/001/2019-1-00.