

Applied Leadership and Management in the Workplace

Module Assignment Submission

Student Name:	Nicky-J Paton-Lewis
Student Number:	2315603
Module No:	BMSK6011
Module Title:	Leading and Implementing Workplace Change

Statement of Confirmation of Authenticity

By the act of making this submission, the student declares that this is the work of the student named above. The work has not, in whole or in part, been knowingly presented elsewhere for assessment, or where assessment has been built on a previous assessment, this has been identified. Where materials have been used from other sources it has been properly acknowledged. If this statement is untrue, the student acknowledges that an assessment offence has been committed.

Attention is drawn to the plagiarism and unfair practice policies of both the University and of ILM.

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Critically analyse the current forces for change in the organisations micro and macro environment that can impact workplace culture capability</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Evaluate how organisational stakeholders can be efficiently led through complex workplace change</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>conclusion</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>references</u>	<u>5</u>

Introduction

This assignment explores how change can affect a small property business and the people involved in running it. It first considers internal and external forces for change, using PESTLE and SWOT to identify key influences on the organisation. It also examines how different views between the business partners can affect workplace culture, decision-making and organisational capability. The assignment then considers the main stakeholders affected by change and how they can be effectively led and involved. ADKAR and the McKinsey 7-S Framework are critically evaluated as approaches to managing change, with Lewin's work providing an additional perspective. Finally, the assignment considers how effective leadership can support adaptation while maintaining positive stakeholder relationships and future business capability.

Critically analyse the current forces for change in the organisation's micro and macro environment that can impact workplace culture and capability

The property business operates within an environment where decisions can be affected quickly by economic conditions, regulation, customer expectations and changes in the housing market. However, external pressures alone do not determine how successfully a business responds. Internal factors such as leadership, communication, resources and the relationship between the business partners can be equally important. This is particularly relevant within a small organisation where both partners are directly involved in significant decisions. Their different approaches can provide a wider range of knowledge and ideas but can also make it difficult to agree when change is necessary and how it should be implemented.

Organisational culture is important in understanding this relationship. Schein (2010) argues that culture develops through shared assumptions and established ways of responding to problems. In a small business, the behaviour of the owners can have considerable influence because there are fewer management levels separating strategic decisions from everyday operations. Within this organisation, one partner generally places greater value on established methods and previous experience, while the other is more willing to consider new systems, investment opportunities and alternative ways of operating. It would, however, be too simplistic to regard one approach as resistant and the other as automatically beneficial. Experience can prevent unnecessary risk, while openness to change can prevent the organisation becoming dependent on methods developed under different market conditions.

The wider pressures affecting the organisation can initially be considered through PESTLE analysis.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Force for change</u>	<u>Possible effect on the business</u>
---------------	-------------------------	--

Political	Government housing policy and changes affecting property owners and investors	May influence investment decisions and require business practices to be reviewed
Economic	Interest rates, borrowing costs, inflation, property values and renovation costs	Can affect profitability, available finance and attitudes towards investment risk
Social	Housing affordability, changing customer expectations and demand for good-quality accommodation	May influence which properties are purchased, improved or retained
Technological	Property platforms, digital marketing, financial software and property management systems	Can improve efficiency but may create disagreement over costs and necessity
Legal	Property legislation, contracts, safety responsibilities and licensing requirements (Rent Smart Wales, n.d.)	Requires compliant working practices and responses to regulatory change
Environmental	Energy efficiency and increasing expectations surrounding sustainable property	May increase short-term costs while improving longer-term property quality and value

Although PESTLE identifies several pressures, their significance cannot be understood separately. Pettigrew et al. (2001) argue that organisational change should be considered in relation to its context and the interaction of different influences over time. In property, an apparently attractive investment could become less viable when borrowing costs, renovation expenditure and regulatory requirements are considered together. PESTLE is therefore useful for identifying pressures but less effective at determining how an organisation should respond to them.

Economic conditions demonstrate this limitation. Changes in house prices and rents can influence the financial attractiveness of property investment (Office for National Statistics, 2026), while borrowing and renovation costs can create additional pressure. Caution may therefore appear sensible during uncertain conditions. However, uncertainty does not necessarily mean investment should stop. A weaker market could create opportunities to negotiate lower purchase prices or acquire properties with longer-term potential. The same external force may therefore represent either a threat or an opportunity depending on the circumstances.

Different attitudes towards risk can lead the partners to interpret the same conditions differently. One may rely more heavily on previous experience, while the other may be more willing to pursue an opportunity where future returns are uncertain. Kahneman and Klein (2009) argue that experience and intuitive judgement can be valuable, but their reliability depends partly on the environment in which that experience developed. Previous success in property therefore provides useful knowledge but does not guarantee that the same decisions will remain appropriate as market conditions change.

Equally, willingness to take risks should not automatically be associated with innovation. A new investment could expose the business to unnecessary financial pressure. A stronger approach would combine experience with current evidence, including renovation costs, financing requirements, local property values and expected returns. This could also reduce conflict by making decisions less dependent on which partner argues their position most strongly.

Regulation creates a different pressure because there is less freedom to decide whether change is necessary. Where the organisation undertakes relevant letting or property management activities in Wales, licensing and regulatory requirements must be considered, including those administered through Rent Smart Wales (Rent Smart Wales, n.d.). Compliance can increase administration and costs, particularly for a small business. However, viewing regulation only as a burden ignores its role in encouraging professional standards and reducing risks to tenants and property owners. The organisation therefore needs to distinguish between changes that can reasonably be debated and external requirements where adaptation is unavoidable.

Technology provides greater scope for disagreement. Digital accounting, online advertising, shared documents and property management systems could improve access to information and reduce problems surrounding expenditure or progress. Davis (1989), however, suggests that technology acceptance is influenced by perceived usefulness and ease of use. Introducing a system simply because it is newer would therefore not necessarily improve capability.

One partner might support a shared system because information could be accessed more quickly, while the other may regard existing methods as sufficient. Both positions can have some justification. Familiar processes may avoid unnecessary expenditure, but refusing to reconsider them could create inefficiency as the business develops. Conversely, technology that does not solve an identifiable problem could simply increase costs. The relevant question is therefore not whether a system is modern, but whether it provides sufficient organisational value.

Environmental pressures create a similar tension between immediate expenditure and longer-term benefit. Improving insulation, heating or energy efficiency can increase renovation costs but may improve property quality and future value. This requires the partners to balance current financial capability against longer term returns and demonstrates how macro environmental pressures interact with internal decision making.

The micro environment also creates forces for change. A particularly important factor is the relationship between the partners. Barney (1991) argues that valuable organisational resources can contribute to competitive advantage when effectively used. Property knowledge, established contacts and practical experience can therefore strengthen the business, but their value is reduced if disagreement prevents the partners from combining their knowledge.

Conflict itself is not necessarily harmful. Jehn (1995) distinguishes between task conflict and relationship conflict. Disagreement about a property investment could encourage alternatives to be considered and prevent an expensive mistake. However, when disagreements become personal, constructive challenges may become a barrier to change.

Communication is therefore important. Covey (1989) argues that effective relationships involve seeking to understand another person's position before expecting one's own to be understood. Applying this

principle could encourage the partners to examine the reasoning behind opposing views. However, understanding another perspective does not mean that both positions are equally appropriate. Financial evidence, market information and risk still need to inform decisions. Covey's approach may therefore improve communication but should support rather than replace evidence based judgement.

The partner's equal influence can further complicate decision making because responsibilities may overlap. Scandura (2018) highlights the importance of leadership and communication in organisational behaviour. Where authority is unclear, disagreements concerning expenditure, investments or business development may remain unresolved. Clearer responsibilities could improve capability, although completely separating responsibilities could remove valuable challenges. A more balanced approach would allow routine decisions to be made independently while significant financial or strategic decisions require joint agreement.

SWOT analysis

Strengths

Different knowledge and perspectives between the partners

Practical property experience and established contacts

Direct involvement of both owners

Ability to make decisions without a large management structure

Weaknesses

Frequent disagreement can delay decisions

Different attitudes towards risk and modernisation

Responsibilities and authority may overlap

Dependence on an effective partnership

Opportunities

New property investment opportunities

Digital systems and online marketing

Improving the value of existing properties

Threats

Higher borrowing and renovation costs

Regulatory and compliance changes

Uncertainty in property values and customer demand

SWOT demonstrates that organisational characteristics cannot always be classified as entirely positive or negative. Different perspectives are potentially both a strength and a weakness. They may improve decisions by encouraging challenge but can reduce the organisation's ability to act when disagreement

becomes excessive. Helms and Nixon (2010) argue that the usefulness of SWOT depends on moving beyond lists towards meaningful analysis. Simply identifying disagreement as a weakness therefore provides little value unless the organisation considers when disagreement improves judgement and when it damages performance.

The same applies to external factors. Technology may appear to be an opportunity without a particular system providing any real benefit, while an uncertain property market may be labelled a threat despite potentially creating investment opportunities. SWOT therefore depends heavily on interpretation and can oversimplify complex conditions.

Teece et al. (1997) provide another perspective through dynamic capabilities, arguing that organisations need the ability to adapt and reorganise resources as circumstances change. For this business, capability does not require constant change. Instead, it involves recognising when existing practices remain valuable and when changing conditions require a different response.

This also affects workplace culture. If disagreement becomes a competition that one partner must win, adaptability may decline. In contrast, a culture where assumptions can be challenged and decisions supported by evidence may turn different perspectives into a useful capability. Schein (2010) suggests that repeated responses to organisational problems can become embedded within culture. How the partners manage disagreement may therefore influence both immediate decisions and the longer-term direction of the business.

Overall, external and internal forces for change are closely connected. Economic conditions, regulation, technology and property expectations originate outside the organisation, but their effect depends on how the partners interpret and respond to them. Similarly, internal disagreement becomes particularly significant when external conditions require important or timely decisions. PESTLE and SWOT are useful for identifying these pressures but cannot determine the correct response. Organisational capability ultimately depends on combining different perspectives, challenging assumptions and responding to evidence without allowing constructive disagreement to become damaging conflict.

Evaluate how organisational stakeholders can be efficiently led through complex workplace change.

Leading change within a small property business presents different challenges from change in a larger organisation. Although there are fewer management levels, both partners have considerable influence and may hold different views about risk, investment and future development. Change can also affect tenants, contractors, customers, lenders and professional advisers. Effective leadership therefore requires an understanding of which stakeholders are affected, the influence they hold and the level of involvement they require.

Freeman (1984) defines stakeholders as individuals or groups that can affect or are affected by organisational objectives. This is relevant because property decisions rarely affect the partners alone. Purchasing and renovating a property, for example, may involve lenders and contractors and ultimately affect tenants or customers.

However, involving every stakeholder equally would be inefficient. Mitchell et al. (1997) suggest that stakeholder importance can be assessed through power, legitimacy and urgency. This allows involvement to be proportionate, although stakeholder influence can change during a project. A contractor may have limited influence over overall business strategy but substantial practical importance during renovation.

Stakeholder analysis

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Main interest in change</u>	<u>Influence</u>	<u>Appropriate leadership approach</u>
Business partners	Profitability, risk and future direction	Very high	Joint decisions, clear responsibilities and objectives
Tenants/customers	Quality, communication, affordability and reliability	Medium	Clear communication and opportunities to raise concerns
Contractors/tradespeople	Payment, work availability, instructions and timescales	Medium	Early communication and realistic expectations
Lenders/financial providers	Financial stability and repayment	High	Accurate financial information and responsible decisions
Professional advisers	Legal, financial and regulatory compliance	Medium to high	Involvement where specialist knowledge is required
Regulators/local authorities	Compliance with property standards	High in relevant areas	Maintain compliance and respond to requirements

The partners are the most influential internal stakeholders because they determine strategic direction. However, equal influence creates difficulty when they disagree. In a conventional hierarchy, a senior leader may make the final decision, whereas repeatedly allowing one partner to dominate could damage this relationship. Leadership therefore needs to be collaborative. This does not mean every decision

requires lengthy negotiation. Routine operational matters can be delegated, while property purchases and significant financial commitments should require joint approval.

Stakeholder analysis also has limitations. Mitchell et al. (1997) provide a useful basis for prioritisation, but power and urgency can change. Tenants may have limited influence over an initial investment decision but become more significant if renovation disrupts their living conditions. Stakeholder analysis should therefore be reviewed during change rather than treated as a one off exercise.

One approach that could support change is the ADKAR model. Hiatt (2006) identifies awareness, desire, knowledge, ability and reinforcement as important elements of individual change. Its focus on individuals is particularly relevant because the partners may respond differently to the same proposal.

Awareness requires understanding why change is necessary. If the business is considering a shared digital system for renovation expenditure, describing it as more modern would provide a weak justification. Evidence that costs are difficult to monitor or information is being missed would provide a stronger case. Armenakis et al, (1993) similarly argue that readiness is influenced by whether change is considered necessary and appropriate. If one partner does not accept that a problem exists, implementation is unlikely to resolve the disagreement.

Desire is different from awareness because recognising a problem does not mean supporting a particular solution. A partner could accept that financial monitoring needs improvement while questioning whether new software is worthwhile. Oreg et al, (2011) found that reactions to organisational change are influenced by both individual characteristics and how change is managed. Reluctance should therefore not automatically be labelled resistance, as questions about cost or practicality may expose genuine weaknesses in a proposal.

Knowledge and ability concern whether change can actually be implemented. If a new system is introduced, both partners must understand and consistently use it. Holt et al. (2007) argue that readiness includes beliefs about whether individuals and organisations are capable of implementing change. Agreement is therefore insufficient where time, skills or financial resources are lacking.

Reinforcement aims to prevent a return to previous practices (Hiatt, 2006). However, reinforcement should include evaluation. Continuing to use a new process that has not improved performance would turn the model into an obstacle rather than a guide.

This shows a wider limitation of ADKAR. Its structure can make change appear more predictable than it is. Support may change when costs or practical consequences become clearer, while property decisions may be disrupted by financing problems, renovation costs or changing markets. ADKAR is therefore useful for understanding individual adoption but provides less insight into whether the wider organisation is aligned.

The McKinsey 7-S Framework offers a contrasting perspective. Waterman et al. (1980) argue that organisational effectiveness depends on the relationship between strategy, structure, systems, shared values, style, staff and skills. Instead of concentrating primarily on individual acceptance, the framework considers whether organisational elements support one another.

7-S Framework to the property business

Element	Application
Strategy	Investment priorities, acceptable risk and future growth
Structure	Responsibilities and authority between the partners
Systems	Processes for finances, property information and decisions
Shared values	Agreement about the purpose and direction of the business
Style	Communication and management of disagreement
Staff	Partners, employees and regular contractors
Skills	Property knowledge, financial judgement, negotiation and digital capability

The framework is particularly useful because disagreement between the partners may reflect wider misalignment rather than individual resistance. For example, one may prioritise stable returns while the other prioritises expansion. Both objectives can be reasonable, but without an agreed strategy they may produce inconsistent decisions. Establishing investment criteria and acceptable levels of risk could provide a clearer basis for assessing opportunities.

Structure and systems are also relevant. If both partners are responsible for everything, accountability can become unclear. Allocating responsibility for routine areas may improve efficiency while retaining joint involvement in significant decisions. Similarly, formal systems could provide more objective information, but technology cannot compensate for poor communication. If financial data are used only to defend existing positions, the underlying problem remains. This is a strength of 7-S because it discourages the assumption that changing one organisational element will automatically solve wider problems.

Shared values may be particularly significant. Schein (2010) suggests that underlying assumptions influence organisational behaviour. If the partners define success differently, disagreements about individual properties may reflect a deeper strategic issue. Establishing what the business is collectively trying to achieve could therefore be more effective than resolving each disagreement separately.

Nevertheless, 7-S has limitations. It identifies areas requiring alignment but gives limited guidance about the sequence of change or how disagreement should be managed during implementation. Assessing all seven elements may also be unnecessarily complicated for a small business. It is therefore more useful as a diagnostic framework than as a detailed implementation process.

ADKAR and 7-S consequently provide different perspectives. ADKAR is particularly useful for understanding how individuals recognise, accept and implement change, whereas 7-S can identify wider problems involving strategy, structure, systems and shared values. Neither should be treated as a formula that guarantees successful change.

Lewin's (1947) work adds another perspective by considering how established behaviour can be challenged before new practices become embedded. In the property business, recognising problems with an existing process could help challenge established routines before a different approach is introduced. However, the commonly used interpretation of unfreezing, changing and refreezing can appear too stable for a property environment where markets, regulation and financial pressures continue to develop. Burnes (2004) argues that Lewin's work has often been oversimplified and was more complex than this basic three-stage interpretation suggests. Lewin is therefore useful for understanding why established practices can be difficult to change, but it should be applied flexibly rather than assuming that change reaches a permanent end point.

This reflects Stouten et al. (2018), who argue that popular approaches to organisational change do not always represent the complexity found within research. Models can organise thinking, but context, relationships and unexpected developments continue to influence change. An agreed plan may therefore need revision if market conditions or the financial position of a project change.

Leadership consequently involves more than following a model. Edmondson (1999) argues that psychological safety enables individuals to raise concerns and discuss mistakes. Although this organisation is much smaller than many teams considered in organisational research, the principle remains relevant because both partners need to challenge decisions without disagreement becoming personal.

Efficient leadership should also not be confused with making decisions as quickly as possible. Rapid agreement can result in poor decisions if risks are not challenged, while continuous debate can result in missed opportunities. Constructive challenge should therefore be followed by a clear decision. Agreeing investment criteria beforehand and reviewing the outcomes of major decisions could help the business learn from both successful and unsuccessful choices.

External stakeholders require proportionate involvement. Contractors need clear instructions and realistic timescales, tenants or customers require communication when directly affected, and professional advisers should be used where specialist legal or financial knowledge is required. Freeman's (1984) stakeholder approach is useful because it encourages consideration of consequences beyond the interests of the owners. However, involving every stakeholder in every decision would slow the organisation and blur responsibility. The level of involvement should therefore reflect the stakeholder's influence, expertise and exposure to the consequences of change.

Overall, complex change is unlikely to be managed successfully through authority or a single model. ADKAR helps explain individual understanding and adoption, while 7-S identifies wider alignment issues. Lewin also highlights the challenge of moving away from established practices, although its application needs to remain flexible. Effective leadership therefore requires these approaches to be adapted to the circumstances of the business. Clear responsibilities, evidence-based decisions, constructive challenge and proportionate stakeholder involvement can enable the organisation to respond to change without losing the benefits provided by different perspectives.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the property business is affected by external pressures and internal challenges that influence its culture and capability. Economic conditions, regulation and technology can create pressure for change, while differences between the partners influence how these pressures are interpreted. PESTLE and SWOT are useful for identifying such forces but cannot determine the appropriate response. ADKAR and the 7-S Framework provide complementary approaches to managing change, while Lewin highlights the difficulty of moving away from established practices. However, no model should be followed rigidly within a changing property environment. Effective leadership requires clear communication, shared objectives, evidence-based decisions and proportionate stakeholder involvement. This can allow the business to benefit from different perspectives while remaining capable of responding to future challenges and opportunities.

References

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organisational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681–703.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977–1002.
- Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change*. Simon & Schuster.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Helms, M. M., & Nixon, J. (2010). Exploring SWOT analysis: Where are we now? A review of academic research from the last decade. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 3(3), 215–251.
- Hiatt, J. M. (2006). *ADKAR: A model for change in business, government and our community*. Prosci Learning Center Publications.
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organisational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255.
- Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(2), 256–282.

- Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree. *American Psychologist*, 64(6), 515–526.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41.
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853–886.
- Office for National Statistics. (2026). Private rent and house prices, UK: July 2026. Office for National Statistics.
- Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organisational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(4), 461–524.
- Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W., & Cameron, K. S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 697–713.
- Rent Smart Wales. (n.d.). Landlord and agent licensing. Welsh Government.
- Scandura, T. A. (2018). *Essentials of organisational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful organisational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 752–788.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Waterman, R. H., Jr., Peters, T. J., & Phillips, J. R. (1980). Structure is not organization. *Business Horizons*, 23(3), 14–26.