

A LITERATURE REVIEW ON CHANGE MANAGEMENT IN SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS

Erdem ERCİYES*

Abstract



This study aims to investigate change management implementations in security organizations through a literature review and to develop a holistic perspective on change management for security organizations. In order to reach this aim, the researcher discusses reflections of change perception, efforts to understand change management process and leadership impact on change management. One of the findings of the research demonstrates that while military organizations mostly focused on transformation and innovation in the change management process, police organizations' focal point was mainly about reform process. Change management models are not packet programs that can be implemented to all kinds of organizations and situations as every institution has a different character, dynamics, sources of manpower, and aims. Therefore, each attempt at change must be considered according to the special attributes of each organization, such as culture, dynamics, structure, characteristics and vision. Herein, organizational culture plays one of the most important roles in the success of change management in security organizations. In addition, officials and managers of security organizations should increase their awareness towards change management. Future studies may establish a change management model for security organizations via primary data sources or develop practical recommendations how to provide awareness of the followers towards change management in the security organizations.

Keywords: Change Management, Change, Security Organizations, Organizational Culture, Organizational Development

GÜVENLİK KURULUŞLARINDAKİ DEĞİŞİM YÖNETİMİ UYGULAMALARINA YÖNELİK YAZIN TARAMASI

Öz

Bu çalışma, güvenlik kuruluşlarındaki değişim yönetimi uygulamalarını yazın taraması yaparak incelemeyi ve güvenlik organizasyonları için değişim yönetimi üzerine bütüncül bir bakış açısı geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaca ulaşmak için araştırmacı, değişim algısının yansımalarını, değişim yönetimi sürecini anlama çabalarını ve değişim yönetimi üzerindeki liderlik etkisini tartışmaktadır. Araştırmacının bulgularından biri, değişim yönetimi sürecinde askeri kuruluşlar çoğunlukla dönüşüm ve yeniliğe odaklanırken, polis kuruluşları reform sürecine odaklanmaktadır. Değişim yönetimi modelleri, her kurumun farklı karakterleri, dinamikleri, insan gücü kaynakları ve amaçları olduğu için her türlü organizasyon ve duruma uygulanabilecek paket programlardan değildir. Bu nedenle, değişimdeki her girişim kurumunun kültür, dinamik, yapı, özellikler ve vizyon gibi her özel niteliklerine göre şekillendirilmelidir. Tamda bu noktada, kurum kültürü, güvenlik kuruluşlarındaki değişim yönetimi başarısında en önemli rollerden birini oynamaktadır. Buna ilave olarak, güvenlik kuruluşları yetkilileri ve yöneticileri değişim yönetimi konusundaki farkındalıklarını arttırmalıdır. Gelecekteki çalışmalar, güvenlik kuruluşları için birincil veri kaynakları yoluyla bir değişim yönetimi modeli oluşturabilir veya değişim yönetimine karşı güvenlik kuruluşlarında çalışanların nasıl farkındalıklarının sağlanacağına dair pratik öneriler geliştirebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Değişim Yönetimi, Değişim, Güvenlik Kuruluşları, Organizasyon Kültürü, Organizasyonel Gelişim.

* Dr., Jandarma Genel Komutanlığı, Strateji Başkanlığı, Ankara, erdemerciyes@yahoo.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7842-0967>

INTRODUCTION

Transformation of macroeconomic policies from liberalism to neoliberalism in the 1980s and early 1990's has been influenced by societies, business and public management approaches. Since then, the concept of "change" has been a hot topic in the existing literature. Changes have become inseparable part of daily lives. These rapid changes have highlighted the significance of change management for the the survival of organizations both in private and public sectors.

Likewise, the progress of new public management understanding accelerated adaptation of change management implementations in the public sector. However, security organizations such as gendarmeries, polices and armies followed this process slower that other public organizations due to their confidentiality concerns and dull bureaucracy mechanisms.

This research aims to scrutinize current change management implementations of security organizations in the existing literature and to develop a holistic perspective on change management in security organizations. In order to reach this aim, the researcher discusses reflections of change perception, efforts to understand change management process and leadership impact on change management through reviewing the literature. Furthermore, this research's scope is not only limited with these topics but also focuses closely on how organizational culture establishes a bridge between security organizations and change through providing conceptual insights.

1. CHANGE PERCEPTION IN THE SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS

The perception of security leaders and followers towards change process is one the most important factor for a successful change management implementation in security organizations. In order to ensure employees' positive attitudes toward a change process in the security forces, Yilmaz et al. (2013) developed an understanding of managerial methods and provided considerable implications for *homeland security* managers. They utilized a quantitative process through obtaining data via a questionnaire survey method from 204 key Turkish security managers. According to their findings, observing the attitudes of employees toward change and choosing the most suitable change management method would bring success in a change process. Moreover, employees must be informed, consulted, and supported to participate in a change management process by their superiors. Hence, they would prefer to be part of a change rather than resisting it. Furthermore, Yilmaz et al. (2013) emphasized the importance of careful selection of change management methods but did not define how this would be accomplished. They neither offered any change management models nor made an original contribution to the literature. They more or less reinforced the previous researchers' findings.

There is a huge gap in the literature about how change perception affects change management process in the security organizations. This gap also hinders development of theoretical and practical frameworks for the change management process. Because, analyzing followers' attitudes toward change and determining significant elements that affect those attitudes are seen as important factors in a change process. Understanding the behavioral fundamentals of followers' attitudes towards change and may also be utilized as a part of the whole change management process while dealing with overcoming resistance to change.

2. EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS IN SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS

To understand the factors which bring success in change management, Jacobs et al. (2006) investigated German police officers' attitudes in change projects. They conducted 92 semi-structured interviews with high potential future managers of the *German Police Organization* in 2006. They found five factors providing success in change projects: a. Support (the most important), b. Goals, c. Communication d. Work condition and e. Competence. Moreover, they focused on social-behavioral aspects of change processes and emphasized their importance in the change management process. Jacobs et al. (2013) utilized these five success factors and developed a framework that could integrate individual behavior and organizational identity into a single organizational change theory. This framework had cultural and institutional dimensions. In the beginning of the study, Jacobs et al. had three main assumptions: *Firstly*, organizational change could violate organizational identity; *Secondly*, specific external and internal conditions could bring both success and failure in a change process; and *finally*, general patterns and mechanisms could be implemented into all change processes. They shaped their model according to these three assumptions and tested their theoretical framework at ten European police institutions. At the end of the study, they made recommendations for establishments to be cautious in a change process, because, the external environment and internal dynamics of organizations must be in harmony during the change process. If not, it may cause failure in a change management. This study contributed to the literature through integrating internal and external factors in a change process. As well, they reached the conclusion that taking into consideration cultural dimensions and organizational identity would increase the success rate of a change implementation (Ibid).

In order to understand and explain change process in police organizations, Hart (1996) offered an integrative and holistic approach through combining human and organizational dimensions. He developed a change management model which was composed of communication, management support, leadership, change targets, coercive and participative change, and change teams. Moreover, this study focused on the importance of organizational culture, especially while overcoming resistance

to change in police organizations. The major issue to take with this model though is that it was mostly based only on Hart's own observations, and more generally, contemporary change management theories. Instead, the study's theoretical framework should have been tested by an overt observation in a police organization. Subsequently, this research is only theoretical and observational, and unfortunately not practical as of yet.

Beeson and Davis (2000) denoted that traditional change models could not be useful whilst changing whole systems at public organizations. In order to overcome this problem, like Hart, they developed a holistic approach via the *Complexity Theory*¹. They explained complex systems and made a case study on how to install a new fingerprint identification scheme into the police force structures of England and Wales. This study attempted to understand the configuration of change in complex public organizations, but it did not present a change management model which was supported by empirical assessments.

Managing reform process became main focus of change management process in police organizations. Likewise, Degnegaard (2010) focused on change management aspects of the Danish police reform scheme. He utilized ethnography, action-oriented research, and document studies through combining multi-sited methodology with an analytical triangulation. There was a strong link between theory, methodology and practice in this research. Methodology helped differentiate between external, managerial, and operational matters in change management. He posited that lack-of ability in the change management and not having strategic change leadership were two main reasons for the Danish police reform's failure. In addition, Kotter's change model was utilized in the practice portion of the research, but due to grasping only the internal perspective of the change model, the research could not gain success in its change attempt. Thus, the importance of capturing the external aspects of the organization in the change management matter emerged. Degnegaard emphasized the importance of organizational culture and having a clearly defined strategy in change management that was composed of external, managerial, and operational levels (Ibid). The study profoundly analyzed the reasons for failure in Danish police force's reforms and effectively combined theory, methodology and practice. However, at the end of the study, in lieu of presenting a concrete change model, only some recommendations for change management process were presented.

The concern of reform was also seen following technological developments. Collette et al. (2006) investigated how to pursue a technological change in a police organization. They mostly focused on the transition period and efficient and positive management contributions to the success of a technological change

¹ Complexity theory is the study of complex, nonlinear, dynamic systems with feed-back effects (Levy, 1994: 167).

project. According to their findings, using methodical and rigorous transition management adaptable to organizational change dynamics could bring success in a technological change process and transition process should focus on time and bound to work units of a manageable size. On the other hand, change has more complex dynamics than only transition. Many academics agree that transition is just a phase of the change process. Therefore, this study may provide an insight on how to manage a technological transition process in the police services.

On the other hand, Clausewitz (1984) described change in the military from a rather simple perspective, asserting that if something was useful, it could trigger change and be copied by others. However nowadays, it is not as simple as Clausewitz's characterization, especially because, parallel to the rapid changes in the security conjuncture, many militaries face different kinds of change. Therefore today, change management in the army gains more importance than in the past (Thiele, 2007). In addition, nature of an army is highly resistant to change (Davidson, 2013; March and Olsen, 1984). This is because army organizations are not structured to change themselves rapidly and their work leans heavily on hierarchical relations, operating routines, bureaucratic interests, and cultural preferences (Farrel, 2013).

Scurlock (2004) defines change in the Army as a strategically complex transformation process which is based on organizational culture, educated and experienced leaders, voluntary participation of individuals, technological adaptation processes, and a flexible changing environment. Creating an organizational culture that encourages human dimensions to take prudent risks and embrace change were the key elements of a successful change process in the Army.

Davidson (2013) posited three main sources for a military change: a. External pressure (civilian leadership); b. The need to grow or survive (acquiring more resources or influence); and c. Failure (facing new technologies or tactics used by an enemy). In order to implement successful military change, he offered to utilize *Organizational Learning Theory* which would begin from an individual level and then expand to the whole organization. This process would change the institutional memory of the organization. According to organizational theory, some organizations may show more resistance to accept new situations than others. Hereby, understanding organizational culture gains more importance. Organizational learning must be embedded in organizational culture through experiential learning, generational learning, informal networks, communities of practice, and the role of leadership. Experiential learning could be realized through activities and intellectual reflections such as reading, listening, and thinking. Generational learning is applied with sharing of knowledge amongst members of one's generation and has a delayed impact on organizational behavior. Informal

networks learn their experiences while complaining or chatting with each other, but communities of practice try to learn something about their profession. Military leaders could easily prevent or permit or promote learning processes in their institutions².

Nielson (2010) categorized military types of change as *reform* and *innovation* and then established four important sources of a change for military organizations: a. Political; b. Social; c. Economic; and d. Technological development. She noted that military organizations faced many difficulties while adapting to change to their structures. In order to overcome these difficulties, she scrutinized military organization size, working mechanisms, and nature, and offered two main recommendations to managers. *Firstly*, military leaders must make reforms which are necessary to secure the organization's supply of critical resources, and also, must strengthen the social legitimacy of their organizations. *Secondly*, leaders must reduce uncertainty in their organizations. This research provides an understanding of change structures of military organizations and presents some useful recommendations, to their leaders, for change.

Farrell and Terriff (2002a) utilized the term *military innovation* as synonymous with *major change*. They posited that the main sources of a military change are: a. Cultural norms; b. Politics and strategy; and c. New technology. Cultural norms consist of inter-subjective beliefs regarding social and natural worlds while defining the nature of military change. Politics and strategy shape militaries according to changing threats to national security. In order to reach better operational capabilities, armies follow technological developments very closely and desire to adapt new technologies into their systems. The authors offer a three-step model to manage a military change: *Firstly*, reasons for military change must be clarified by states; *secondly*, state and armies are to accept that there are various obstacles which could impede change, such as the strategic environment, technology, or military culture; and the final step is to determine facilitators of a military change. The type of facilitator must be selected according to the constraints at hand. Here, civilian and military leadership play the most important roles. They must be very active in the change process and explicitly show their support to change through creating new promotional pathways related to the new tasks vis-à-vis change (Farrel and Terriff (2002b). They ought to draw general lines concerning major changes, but during the implementation, general rules must be more specific. For example, after overcoming resistance, it has not been mentioned how change consistency should be provided. Yet overall, their research presents a general guidance while dealing with a military change.

² Even though, Davidson does not make a differentiation between change types in a military setting, utilizing organizational learning theory may be an effective way for dealing with transformational changes.

Furthermore, Farrell (2013: 2) emphasized the importance of “adaptation”. According to him; military adaptation was “...change to strategy, force generation, and/or military plans and operations, undertaken in response to operational challenges and campaign pressures”. He divided military adaptation into two levels: *First*, the strategic level was seen mostly in state decisions such as changing military strategy or acquiring new equipment for a military campaign. *Second*, was the operational level where military organizations adapted when preparing a plan or conduct of operations (Ibid). While dealing with adaptation, he emphasized the importance of core values and identity of community which formed strategic culture. He made a distinction between adaptation and innovation in his analytical framework through developing a sliding scale.

Particularly, since after the noughties, the concept of military transformation has gained more importance at international organizations. Osinga (2010: 15) defined military transformation as:

“In terms of comprehensive, discontinuous and possibly disruptive changes in military technologies, concepts of operations and organization, in contrast to incremental or evolutionary change that marks normal defense modernization.”

A comparison study was made in the book, “A Transformation Gap” (Terriff et al. 2010), about how six NATO member states³ conducted a military transformation process in their countries. According to their findings, external process of military emulation and internal process of military innovation establish a military transformation process. Military innovation is shaped by threat, civil-military relations, and military culture. On the other hand, military emulation occurs through success motive and legitimacy (Farrell and Terriff, 2010). This research provides an explanatory contribution to the literature about military transformation process, but it does not produce a solution-based change model on how transformation could be handled in a better way.

Rosen (1988) explains how armies can succeed in generating innovation. He infers that the perceptions of key military leaders about how structural changes take place in the strategic environment would play the most important role in the change process. Nonetheless, this research gives too much importance to the role of leaders and ignores the role of subordinates in the change process. Even in armies, without contribution of subordinates, it is almost impossible to perform a successful and long-term change process.

³ Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and Poland.

Gray (2006) made critical review of revolutionary military change concepts in warfare. He analyzed political, strategic, socio-cultural, economic, technological, and geographical impacts on a military change process. At the end of his study, he emphasized seven prominent findings: a. While an army develops its capacity for understanding war and its circumstances, simultaneously, it must follow military-technical modernization; b. Revolutionary change in social attitudes, like fighting and cultural skills, may be more important than revolutionary change in warfare; c. Historical research may contribute to the recognition and understanding of revolutionary changes in warfare; d. Public, strategic and military cultures may affect strategic and military decisions; e. Revolutionary change must be implemented in an adaptable, flexible and dynamic manner; f. Revolutionary change must aim at tactical, operational, strategic, or political triumphs; and g. The “audit of war” may reveal revolutionary change in warfare (Ibid). The main concentration of the study was how revolutionary research is conducted in warfare, but its scope was too limited, and the findings could not be generalized to holistic change processes in armies.

Reform and innovation are two main triggers of change management in the security organizations. The officials of security organizations intend to reach success in both reform and innovation process. However, this success motive may bring patience, and this feeling may cause harm for institutionalization of change. Hence, leadership gains importance for perpetually change implementations.

3. LEADERSHIP IN CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Kim and Mauborgne (2003) investigated how from 1994 to 1996, William Bratton, former police commissioner of New York City, managed to transform the metropolis into the safest municipality in the United States without increasing the police department’s budget. They explained the success of Bratton’s change management scheme with the *Tipping Point Leadership Theory*. According to this theory, once the beliefs and energies of people connect to each other in any kind of an organization, a new idea will spread like an epidemic and this will provide for fundamental and rapid change. There are four steps in this theory: a. Break through the cognitive hurdle: Key managers in an organization should experience the organization’s problems; b. Sidestep the resource hurdle: Current resources should be used mostly in the areas which need change the most; c. Jump the motivational hurdle: Key influencers in the organization should be motivated; and d. Knock over the political hurdle: In order to overcome resistance to change, it is important to convince a respected senior insider to be on your team (Ibid). Even though this study is an example of leadership literature, it gives an idea on how to overcome resistance to change in security forces.

Army organizational structures are more hierarchical than police organizations. Therefore, strategic leadership in a change management gains more importance in armies than in police administrations (Wright, 2013). Pascale et al. evaluated army culture in the light of four distinct indicators: a. Power; b. Identity; c. Conflict; and d. Learning. According to their findings, in order to manage change process, transformational leadership was the most convenient type of leadership in the army (Pascale et al., 2007).

Gerras and Wong (2013) investigated the difficulty to change army strategic leaders' minds. They found that the most important reason for this difficulty is organizational culture. Strategic leaders are not able to see reality due to organizational culture which discourages subordinate dissent or disagreement. In order to solve this problem, a comfortable communication channel which is based on mutual respect must be established between strategic leaders and subordinates since interacting with different people and seeing various perspectives are the most effective way to change someone's mind. This study holds an important place in the existing literature through emphasizing the role of leadership and organizational culture in the army's change process.

Sullivan⁴ (1995) cites the importance of creating a climate for leaders in the army that would embrace a change attempt. In order to create a change climate and to make clear the common understanding of a change's direction, *firstly* a vision must be developed. The *second* step is transforming the vision into action which develops a broad consensus for change and shares the vision through doctrine. *Thirdly*, fostering innovation indicates that change was real, useful, and purposeful. *Fourthly*, emphasizing values provides trust and communication in the army, and the *last* step is breaking the organizational, relational, technological, and procedural molds while rewriting doctrine. Change does not contain stability in nature as it always evolves. It is a journey but not the destination. Sullivan did not present a scientific methodology which supports his assumptions. His assumptions should have been tested with a combination of theoretical and practical research, but instead he just provided some recommendations about a change process.

Security organizations have highly structured hierarchical organizational relations. Due to this hierarchical management approach, followers' roles in such organizations are mostly ignored. While overcoming resistance to change, some managers choose negative methods, such as punishment and forcing regulations, against staff. Unfortunately, this kind of management approach hinders the development of change management in the security organizations.

⁴ The 32nd Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

CONCLUSION

This research identified a gap in the existing literature through secondary data sources. Even though there are some researches about security organizations on change management in the existing literature, there is a noteworthy gap in the law enforcement domain. Military organizations mostly focused on transformation and innovation in the change management process. On the other hand, police organizations' focal point was mainly about reform process.

The findings of the research emphasize the role of organizational culture while developing a change management approach. Change management models in the literature of business administration do not fit the organizational culture of the specific security organizations. This is because most of them are based in, and designed for, the Western Culture, and what others there are, do not provide a suitable model for highly hierarchical organizations. For these reasons, a need has emerged to develop a specific change management approach that is based on needs and organizational characteristics of the security organizations and its units. In order to provide it, organizational culture, dynamics, structure, characteristics and vision should be clarified by officials of security organizations. Furthermore, this awareness should be supported by institutional trainings on change management both for officials and staff.

This research will be a reference about change management implementations in the security organizations for future studies. Hence, researchers may establish a change management model for security organizations via primary data sources to fill the gap. Furthermore, one of the major findings of the research is "*officials and managers of security organizations should increase followers' awareness towards change management*". Future studies may also develop practical recommendations how to provide awareness of the followers in the security organizations.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 50, pp.179-211.
- Beeson, I., & Davis, C. (2000). Emergence and accomplishment in organizational change, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(2), pp.178-189.
- Clausewitz, C.V. (1984). *On War*, M. Howard and P. Paret (eds), Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Collerette, P., Legris, P., & Manghi, M. (2006). A successful IT change in a police service, *Journal of Change Management*, 6(2), pp.159-179.
- Davidson, J. (2013). *Lifting the Fog of Peace*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Degnegaard, R. (2010). *Strategic Change Management: Change Management Challenges in the Danish Police Reform*, Doctoral School of Organization and Management Studies, Copenhagen Business School.
- Farrell, T. (2013). Military Adaptation, in T. Farrell, F. Osinga and J.A. Russell (eds), *Military Adaptation in Afghanistan*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Farrell, T. and Terriff T. (2002a). *The Sources of Military Change*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Farrell, T. and Terriff T. (2002b). Military Change in the New Millennium, in T. Farrell and T. Terriff (eds.), *the Sources of Military Change*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Farrell T. and Terriff T. (2010). Military Transformation in NATO: A Framework for Analysis, in T. Terriff, F. Osinga and T. Farrell (eds), *A Transformation Gap? American Innovations and European Military Change*, California: Stanford Security Studies.
- Gerras, S.J. and Wong, L. (2013). *Changing Minds in the Army: Why It Is So Difficult and What to Do about It*, Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press, October. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1179>
- Gray, Colin S. (2006). *Recognizing and Understanding Revolutionary Change in Warfare: The Sovereignty of Context*, Pennsylvania: US Army War College

- Press. retrieved from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=640>
- Hart, J.M. (1996). *The Management of Change in Police Organizations*, College of Police and Security Studies, Slovenia.
- Jacobs, G., Keegan, A., Christe-Zeyse, J., Seeberg, I., & Runde, B. (2006). The fatal smirk: Insider accounts of organizational change processes in a police organization, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(2), pp.173-191.
- Jacobs, Gabriele, Arjen van Witteloostuijn and Jochen Christe-Zeyse (2013). A theoretical framework of organizational change, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26(5), pp.772-792.
- Kim, W.Chan & Mauborgne, R. (2003). *Tipping Point Leadership*, Harvard Business Review, April.
- Levy, D. (1994). Chaos theory and strategy: theory, application, and managerial implications, *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, pp.167-178.
- March J. & Olsen J. (1984). The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life, *American Journal of Political Science*, 78(3), pp.734-749.
- Nielson, S.C. (2010). *An Army transformed: The U.S. Army's Post-Vietnam Recovery and the Dynamics of change in Military Organizations*, Pennsylvania: US Army War College Press, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1020>
- Osinga F. (2010). The Rise of Military Transformation, in T. Terriff, F. Osinga and T. Farrell (eds), *A Transformation Gap? American Innovations and European Military Change*, California: Stanford Security Studies.
- Pascale, R., Millemann, M., & Gioja, L. (1997). *Changing The Way We Change*, Harvard Business Review, 75(6), 126-139.
- Rosen S.P. (1988). New Ways of War: Understanding Military Innovation, *International Security*, 13(1), pp.134-168.
- Scurlock, Robert E. Jr., (2004). *The Human Dimension of Transformation*, in *A Nation at War in An Era of Strategic Change*, ed. Williamson Murray, Pennsylvania: US Army War College Press. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/files/pub580.pdf>.

- Sullivan, G. R. (1995). Leading Strategic Change in America's Army: The Way Forward, *Planning Review*, 23(5), 16.
- Terriff, T., F. Osinga and T. Farrell (eds), (2010). *A Transformation Gap? American Innovations and European Military Change*, California: Stanford Security Studies.
- Thiele, R. (2007). *Keeping Pace with Innovation -The Challenge of Change Management in Armed Forces*, International Relations and Security Network (ISN), Center for Security Studies (CSS).
- Wright, L. (2013). Quality Improvement and Organizational Change Initiatives: An Analysis of the U.S. Army's Warrior Transition Unit (WTU), *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 12(2), pp.195-112.
- Yılmaz, S., Özgen, H., & Akyel, R. (2013). The Impact of Change Management on The Attitudes of Turkish Security Managers Towards Change, A Case Study, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26(1), pp.117-138.