

# CHAPTER

## METHODS OF MANAGING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE AT INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-670-6-17>

**Oleksiy Zubko**

*PhD Student*

*National University Zaporizhzhia Polytechnic*

**Petro Gudz**

*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor,*

*Professor of the Department of Management and Administration*

*National University Zaporizhzhia Polytechnic*

### **Summary**

*The aim of the article is to provide a theoretical and methodological substantiation of the autonomy of the change implementation phase within the structure of managing organizational transformations and to develop a systematic classification of change implementation management methods for industrial enterprises. The study seeks to clarify the content of the concept of “change implementation management methods,” to determine their functional role in the transformation process, and to align them with the levels of organizational management. The methodological framework of the research is based on theoretical analysis, comparison, systematization, and conceptual generalization of scholarly approaches to change management. The study includes a critical review of classical and contemporary models, in particular the approaches of Kurt Lewin, John P. Kotter, and Edgar Schein, as well as processual, behavioral, and institutional concepts. The findings substantiate that change implementation constitutes an inter-level socio-organizational process that cannot be reduced to the technical execution of decisions but requires a comprehensive combination of managerial interventions. The content of the concept of “change implementation management methods” is refined as a functionally defined subset of management methods aimed at ensuring the transition from formalized decisions to sustainable behavioral and institutional practices. An original classification of methods is proposed according to their functional role in the transformation process (project-organizational, communicative-meaning, behavioral-emotional, motivational-reinforcing, capacity-building, and institutional-legitimizing methods). Their correspondence to cognitive, organizational-managerial, and systemic-cultural levels of management is established. Key barriers inherent in the implementation phase are identified, and the necessity of combining methods from different groups to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of change*

*is substantiated. The practical outcome of the study is the development of an analytical model suitable for further empirical research on managing change implementation at industrial enterprises in Ukraine.*

## **Introduction**

In the contemporary conditions of a transformational economy, the digitalization of production, intensifying global competition, and the need for structural shifts in Ukraine's industry during the post-war recovery period, the issue of managing organizational change acquires strategic significance. For domestic industrial enterprises, change is no longer episodic in nature but increasingly assumes the character of a continuous process of adaptation to an unstable external environment, wartime and post-war challenges, the restructuring of logistics chains, modernization of the technological base, and the transformation of managerial models. Under these conditions, the effectiveness of organizational development is determined not only by the ability to generate innovative solutions or formally initiate transformations, but above all by the capacity to ensure their effective implementation and sustainable institutionalization in the everyday practices of the enterprise.

In the scholarly literature, change management is traditionally described as a sequence of interrelated phases – from recognizing the need for transformation and forming a vision to implementing and consolidating new practices J. Hubbart [1]; G. Bhavani & M. Mahalakshmi [2]; O. Tarasiuk [3] et al. At the same time, the implementation phase has long remained methodologically “dissolved” within the broader management process, being considered primarily as a technical continuation of the initiation stage. In classical models, particularly in the works of Kurt Lewin and John P. Kotter, the realization of change is conceptualized either as a managed transition of the organization to a new state of equilibrium or as a sequence of managerial steps intended to secure the achievement of planned outcomes.

Although such logic laid the foundation for contemporary change theory, it simultaneously contributed to the formation of a linear-normative perception of implementation as a relatively controllable and rationally ordered process. However, empirical studies of recent decades demonstrate that a significant proportion of initiated organizational changes fail to achieve their intended objectives or are accompanied by adverse effects such as increased resistance, decreased employee motivation, loss of organizational coherence, and intensification of internal conflicts. This indicates that the issue of change implementation extends beyond formalized procedures and requires consideration of security-related, social, behavioral, digital, cultural, and institutional factors.

Contemporary scholarly discourse increasingly emphasizes processual and contextual approaches that conceptualize change as a prolonged, nonlinear, and

multilevel process unfolding within a specific organizational environment and involving the active interaction of managerial decisions with existing norms, values, and routine practices, as well as the equally active administration of change implementation in enterprises of the real sector of the economy. In this context, change implementation should be interpreted as an independent and problematic phase of management within which the transition occurs from formalized managerial decisions to new patterns of behavior, procedures, and institutional routines.

It is precisely at this stage that the strategic intentions of leadership are transformed into actual organizational shifts, and the success of change is determined by management's ability to integrate diverse groups of managerial methods – from project-organizational and communicative to behavioral-emotional and institutional-legitimizing instruments. Thus, the implementation phase represents a specific “point of critical tension” at which cognitive, managerial, and systemic-cultural dimensions of transformation intersect.

This issue is particularly relevant for industrial enterprises in Ukraine operating under conditions of heightened security, market, and energy uncertainty, limited resources, and the simultaneous need to address tasks of recovery, modernization, and integration into global production chains. Under such circumstances, it is insufficient merely to adopt instrumental models of change management; rather, a conceptual rethinking of methods for managing change implementation is required, taking into account the multilevel nature of the organization and the barriers arising at cognitive, organizational-managerial, and systemic-cultural levels.

Despite the substantial body of research in the field of change management, the scientific literature reveals ambiguity in the interpretation of the concept of “methods of managing change implementation.” It is often used in a generalized manner without a clear distinction between methods of initiating, implementing, and consolidating transformations. At the same time, the absence of a systematized classification of methods specifically oriented toward the implementation phase complicates both theoretical analysis and the practical application of managerial approaches in enterprise activities. Accordingly, there is a need for a conceptual clarification of the content of methods for managing change implementation, for defining their functional role in the transformational process, and for constructing a coherent model that integrates functional and level-based approaches to analysis.

Such a formulation of the problem enables a transition from a fragmented description of instruments to a systemic understanding of the mechanisms ensuring the effectiveness and sustainability of organizational change. Therefore, the study is aimed at deepening the theoretical and methodological foundations of managing change implementation and at developing an analytical framework suitable for examining transformation practices in

Ukrainian industrial enterprises. The proposed approach seeks to integrate the achievements of classical and contemporary change theories with the needs of the national production sector, ensuring a holistic vision of the process of implementing organizational transformations within a complex and dynamic environment.

### **1. Theoretical and methodological foundations of organizational change implementation**

A methodologically significant phase in the management of organizational change, alongside the processes of its generation and initiation, is the direct implementation (realization) of change. It is at this stage that managerial intentions, formulated in the form of strategic decisions, programs, or projects, are transformed into actual behavioral, structural, and institutional shifts in the enterprise's activities. The effectiveness of implementation determines the viability of changes, the level of their acceptance by personnel, and the organization's capacity to consolidate and reproduce them in everyday practice.

The implementation of change should not be viewed as an isolated operational stage, but rather as an integrative, multi-level process unfolding at the intersection of cognitive–creative, organizational–managerial, and systemic–cultural levels of management. While the generation of change ensures the formation of a space of possible managerial alternatives, and the initiation of change provides their formalization and managerial launch, implementation is aimed at integrating innovations into the real activities of the enterprise and aligning managerial decisions with existing structures, values, norms, and established practices.

At the same time, for a long period within academic discourse, the realization of change was predominantly considered a “technical continuation” of the initiation process, reduced to the execution of approved plans, programs, or projects. This approach was characteristic of classical management models, within which organizational change was interpreted as a rational, linear, and controllable process subject to planning and directive managerial influence from top management. Within this logic, the implementation of change was not distinguished as an independent problem phase with its own mechanisms, barriers, and internal dynamics.

Illustrative in this context is the approach of K. Lewin, who conceptualizes change as a systemic, sequential, and manageable process of transition between states of quasi-stationary equilibrium [4–5]. He interprets change as a process of disrupting and restoring equilibrium, emphasizes the role of group norms, resistance, and social context, and substantiates the necessity of a systemic and multi-level approach to change management. These ideas are directly linked to his well-known concept of *unfreezing – moving – freezing* [4, pp. 228–236]:

1. Unfreezing – preparation for change. K. Lewin emphasizes that for a group to change its behavior or level of productivity, it is necessary to “soften” the existing situation, that is, to disrupt the current state of equilibrium. This stage involves reducing psychological and social resistance supported by forces that maintain the status quo. Without such intervention, new levels or standards of activity are not perceived as possible or necessary.

2. Moving (change) – the direct implementation of a new level of behavior or standard. At this stage, the actual transition to a new state occurs: new behaviors, organizational practices, or technological solutions that ensure a different level of system functioning are planned, tested, and implemented. In this logic, change implementation is viewed as a managed process of introducing planned decisions rather than as an independent problem phase with its own internal dynamics.

3. Freezing – consolidation of new standards in order to stabilize the achieved changes. K. Lewin stresses that without the “freezing” phase, changes remain temporary and are prone to reversal under the influence of resistance forces that become reactivated within the organizational system.

An important element of Lewin’s approach is the analysis of resistance forces to change, within which he demonstrates that the stability of group norms and the nature of interaction between the individual and the group can significantly block transformations. At the same time, in his view, changing group standards and procedures is a more effective means of achieving sustainable change than individual managerial interventions. Thus, in Lewin’s classical concept, the implementation of change is interpreted as a managed transition of a social system to a new state of equilibrium, considered within the general logic of change rather than as an independent problem phase with its own methods and barriers.

J. P. Kotter formulates eight sequential stages of change management that constitute a holistic model for implementing transformations in organizations as a linear sequence of critical steps, namely: creating a sense of urgency, forming a guiding coalition, developing a vision, communicating the vision, empowering action, generating short-term wins, consolidating gains, and anchoring changes in the culture. This structured logic of change development emphasizes the normative and process-oriented nature of Kotter’s model, in which the implementation of change is interpreted as the consistent execution of clearly defined managerial actions [6, p. 21].

E. Schein describes the implementation of change as the introduction of planned interventions, which include establishing contact relationships, selecting methods of work, collecting data, carrying out interventions, and evaluating results – thus, managerial actions become the actual mechanism for embedding change into the organization’s everyday functioning [7, pp. 102–103].

At the same time, the results of numerous empirical studies indicate that in the process of managing the implementation of change, a significant proportion of initiated transformations fail to achieve the planned outcomes or are accompanied by side effects in the form of increased resistance, emotional exhaustion of personnel, and disruption of organizational cohesion. This necessitates a reconsideration of change implementation as an independent management phase that requires a purposeful combination of different methods, tools, and managerial mechanisms at various organizational levels. Contemporary research increasingly emphasizes that change implementation has a processual and dynamic nature and requires consideration of social and behavioral factors, which goes beyond the purely technical execution of managerial decisions.

In this context, the implementation of change emerges not merely as a process of executing managerial decisions, but as a complex socio-organizational process within which a transition occurs from formal managerial decisions to new patterns of behavior, from innovative initiatives to sustainable organizational practices, and from declared objectives to institutionally embedded results. It is from these positions that we examine the methods of managing change implementation, as well as the tools and barriers associated with their application.

In the academic literature, the concepts of “change management methods” and “methods of change implementation” are predominantly used in a generalized manner and encompass a wide range of managerial influences at different stages of the transformation process. In this study, we use the term “methods of managing change implementation” to emphasize those managerial actions, tools, practices, and mechanisms that ensure the direct realization of change and its subsequent consolidation in organizational activities.

Accordingly, methods of managing change implementation are considered as a functionally defined subset of change management methods, focused on the transition from formalized managerial decisions to new models of behavior, procedures, and institutional routines.

A critical rethinking of the classical normative–process logic of change implementation was proposed by M. Beer and N. Nohria, who, based on the analysis of a large number of empirical cases, demonstrated that most organizational change programs fail not because of design flaws, but due to the one-sided application of managerial methods at the implementation stage. The authors distinguish two basic theories of change: *Theory E*, oriented toward economic efficiency and rigid structural and financial interventions, and *Theory O*, focused on the development of organizational capabilities, culture, and employee engagement. It is shown that the dominance of only one of these approaches reduces the viability of change: implementation based on the logic of *Theory E* undermines trust and organizational capacity, whereas exclusive

reliance on *Theory O* may slow down transformations and reduce economic performance. Consequently, the authors interpret change implementation not as a purely technical execution of managerial decisions, but as a complex socio-organizational process that requires an integrated combination of “hard” and “soft” management methods [8, pp. 133–216].

Thus, the analysis of classical and contemporary approaches to change management indicates that the key problem lies not so much in the absence of managerial tools as in the ambiguity surrounding the interpretation of management methods themselves, their roles, boundaries of application, and their relationship to managerial functions. This determines the need for conceptual clarification of the notion of “method” within a broader theoretical context.

## **2. Conceptualization of methods for managing change implementation**

Given the polysemy and interdisciplinary nature of the concept of “method,” as well as the different ways it is used in change management research, it is appropriate to turn to its philosophical origins, since it is within the classical European tradition that the foundations for subsequent applied interpretations of this term were laid. In this regard, the approach of R. Descartes is particularly illustrative, as he was among the first to systematically conceptualize method as a universal tool for structuring cognitive and practical activity. Descartes was one of the first to provide a normative definition of the concept of method, interpreting it as a system of reliable and easy-to-apply rules, adherence to which prevents the acceptance of falsehood as truth and ensures the gradual and consistent growth of knowledge up to the limits of human capability [9, pp. 371–372]. Thus, in philosophical terms, method appears not as a single action or procedure, but as a normative–rational system of rules of thinking that organizes the process of achieving a result.

In modern explanatory dictionaries, the concept of “method” is interpreted as a way of ordered activity aimed at achieving a defined goal, realizing an objective, program, or plan through the combination of appropriate actions and operations [10, p. 184].

Within the basic provisions of management theory, management methods are traditionally interpreted as ways and instruments for implementing managerial functions and decisions, through which the subject of management exerts purposeful influence on the object of management in order to achieve organizational goals.

The functional approach of A. Fayol (planning, organizing, coordinating, commanding, controlling) [11, p. 13] created the theoretical foundation for the further interpretation of management methods as ways and means of implementing managerial functions in the process of achieving organizational objectives.

In the concept of P. Drucker, management methods are not distinguished as a formalized category; however, they are interpreted through a system of managerial practices, tools, and techniques by means of which management exerts purposeful influence on people's activities and ensures the achievement of results [12, p. 8].

M. Mescon, M. Albert, and F. Khedouri do not single out management methods as a separate category with a formal definition; nevertheless, management methods are presented through decision-making models and methods and practical ways of implementing management functions, which are effectively described as a set of practical means of managerial influence on the organization [13].

Within the systems and contingency approach to management developed by H. Koontz and C. O'Donnell [14, pp. 22–23], management is considered not as a set of universal prescriptions, but as a process of situational application of managerial knowledge, principles, and techniques to achieve set objectives. The authors emphasize that management theory is not intended to prescribe specific actions for managers, but rather to form a conceptual and instrumental foundation that is applied depending on the context of the managerial situation. In this sense, management methods may be interpreted as ways of practically applying managerial knowledge and techniques in the process of performing managerial functions and making decisions, which corresponds to the situational nature of effective management.

In the management literature, a widespread classification divides management methods into economic, administrative (organizational and directive), and socio-psychological methods, which differ in the nature of managerial influence, implementation instruments, and orientation toward economic interests, behavioral regulation, or motivational and psychological factors of personnel activity. This classification is presented in educational literature as a basic and generally accepted typology of managerial influence methods, used to explain the mechanisms for achieving organizational goals and aligning individual, collective, and social interests [15, pp. 126–131].

Taking into account philosophical and managerial interpretations of the concept of “method,” methods of managing change implementation should be regarded as a specialized group of management methods oriented toward the realization of managerial decisions related to organizational transformations.

In contemporary applied research, methods of managing change implementation are considered not as formalized procedures, but as a set of managerial tools, practices, and algorithms aimed at implementing innovations, ensuring sustainable development, and engaging personnel in transformational processes.

For example, in the work of a group of authors, the following groups of methods are identified:

1) Communication methods – these can be interpreted as methods of behavioral and socio-psychological influence and include:

- open and transparent communication;
- employee participation in decision-making;
- feedback mechanisms;
- communication of change results;
- creation of an “atmosphere of success”.

2) Organizational and procedural methods – substantively, these represent classical managerial methods for decision implementation and include:

- definition of roles and responsibilities;
- development of change implementation algorithms;
- monitoring and reporting.

3) Human resource development methods – conceptually, these may be generalized as methods for ensuring the organization’s capacity for change and include:

- training;
- professional development;
- competency development;
- support of learning programs.

4) Motivational methods – methods aimed at consolidating change at the behavioral level, including:

- incentive systems;
- recognition of achievements;
- non-material motivation;
- fostering employee engagement.

5) Analytical and control methods – methods of monitoring and stabilizing change, including:

- change indicators;
- monitoring and reporting [16, pp. 2259–2260].

Contemporary academic discourse on change management demonstrates an increasing focus on emotional and behavioral mechanisms for supporting personnel during transformation processes, which is reflected in the development of socio-psychological and behavioral methods aimed at addressing resistance to change.

Within socio-psychological and value-oriented methods of managing change implementation, modern research places particular emphasis on emotional and meaning-making mechanisms for supporting personnel under conditions of transformation. These methods are directed not so much at external control of employee behavior as at fostering internal readiness for change and reducing perceptions of change as a threat.

Empirical studies indicate that during organizational transformations, specific emotional reactions are activated that are associated with the loss of

familiar ways of working, identity, or a sense of stability. In this context, organizational nostalgia may function as an adaptive psychological resource in the process of organizational change. Appeals to positively colored experiences of the past contribute to the preservation of organizational identification, support intrinsic motivation, and maintain a sense of meaningful work during periods of transformation. This allows organizational nostalgia to be considered a potential socio-psychological tool for managing change implementation. At the same time, excessive or uncritical orientation toward a “golden period” in an organization’s development may intensify divisions between different groups of employees and foster latent resistance to change, which necessitates cautious managerial use of this instrument [17, pp. 89–106].

Within value-oriented methods of managing change implementation, the emphasis shifts toward aligning transformations with core organizational and individual values. Research devoted to the value dimension of organizational change demonstrates that the level of support for or rejection of change is largely determined by the extent to which proposed innovations correspond to employees’ perceptions of what is “important and right” within the organization. The implementation of changes that contradict established values or personnel identity is accompanied by increased latent resistance and reduced effectiveness of managerial influence.

In this regard, managing change implementation is increasingly viewed as a process of purposeful work with values, including their reinterpretation, actualization, and contextualization within new organizational conditions. This approach enables the integration of change into a broader meaning framework of enterprise activity and ensures its internal acceptance. Value-oriented methods become particularly relevant in cases of deep transformations associated with business model revision, digitalization, or changes in the social mission of industrial enterprises.

M. van Dijke and J. M. Leunissen demonstrate that organizational nostalgia can serve as a change management instrument because, under conditions of threat or organizational transformation, it mitigates the negative effects of stress and supports organizational identification, intrinsic motivation, and a sense of meaningful work. At the same time, the authors emphasize that uncontrolled appeals to a “golden past” may intensify divisions between “old” and “new” employees, which should be considered a potential barrier to change implementation [17].

Within the context of value-oriented methods of change management, a significant place is occupied by the approach proposed by J. Klein, who examines organizational change through the prism of rethinking and actualizing core organizational values [18]. The author demonstrates that the alignment between individual and organizational values and the values embedded in change initiatives directly determines the level of employee

support or resistance, the pace of transformation, and its outcomes. Thus, value management and “working with values” are viewed as effective tools for change implementation, especially under conditions of deep and value-laden transformations.

It can be stated that in academic literature, methods of managing change implementation are described through instruments, practices, mechanisms, leadership roles, or their eclectic combinations.

In contemporary Ukrainian academic discourse, for example in the study by M. M. Yakymets, V. Karkovska methods of managing change implementation are predominantly interpreted in an instrumental manner – as a set of practical managerial tools, procedures, and techniques [19, pp. 105–106]. At the same time, the processual and behavioral dimensions of change implementation are presented fragmentarily and do not form a coherent methodological framework, which underscores the need for systematization and conceptual generalization of methods for managing change implementation.

Within the instrumental approach, methods of managing change implementation are regarded as a set of specific managerial tools, techniques, and practices used by management to practically implement planned transformations. This approach is based on the assumption that change effectiveness is determined by the correct selection and consistent application of formalized managerial means capable of ensuring coordination of actions, reducing uncertainty, and controlling the achievement of results.

Indicative in this regard are the already mentioned models of J. Kotter, which effectively offer an instrumental set of managerial actions for change implementation, as well as applied approaches such as Prosci (the ADKAR model) and PMI standards, in which managing change implementation is interpreted as a system of tools for supporting project execution. While the instrumental approach allows for clear structuring of managerial actions, it has been criticized in academic research for its limited attention to the social and cultural aspects of change implementation. In particular, B. Burnes emphasizes that linear change models oriented toward sets of managerial tools and steps ignore contextual, political, and cultural factors of organizational transformation [20, p. 990].

Within the contextualist and processual approach, A. Pettigrew criticizes episodic and instrumentally oriented models dominant in organizational change research, in which change is treated as a set of discrete managerial actions or projects detached from the organization’s historical, social, and political context. Pettigrew emphasizes that such approaches fail to explain change formation mechanisms because they ignore the long-term interaction of actions, structures, and context over time [21, pp. 655–656].

Representatives of behavioral and processual perspectives (S. Piderit; K. Weick and R. Quinn; A. Pettigrew) emphasize that instrumental approaches

insufficiently account for emotional dynamics, sensemaking processes, and the ambivalence of employee attitudes, which reduces their effectiveness in real organizational settings. Sandy Piderit, for example, criticizes approaches to change management in which employee resistance is viewed as a one-dimensional negative reaction that must be eliminated. She demonstrates that such approaches ignore ambivalence and the cognitive and emotional components of employee attitudes toward change, reducing a complex psychological process to a set of behavioral interventions [22, pp. 783–788].

Thus, the behavioral approach focuses on the human dimension of change implementation and conceptualizes management methods primarily as means of influencing employees' perceptions, emotions, and behavioral responses during transformation processes. Within this approach, change is interpreted not only as structural or procedural shifts, but as a process of reinterpreting individual and collective meanings accompanied by emotional tension, uncertainty, and resistance.

Key concepts of the behavioral approach include sensemaking, emotional dynamics, and resistance to change. K. Nguyen Huy conceptualizes change management not through formal instruments, but through managerial behavior practices related to working with employee emotions. The managerial actions described by the author, aimed at sustaining engagement in change and reducing emotional tension, effectively function as methods of change implementation during periods of radical transformation. In this context, Huy identifies several interrelated patterns of managerial behavior that perform the function of methods for managing change implementation during radical transformations.

First, he refers to managers' emotional commitment to change projects. This is interpreted not as general motivation, but as purposeful self-regulation of emotions by change agents, including the formation and maintenance of enthusiasm and persistence, personal identification with the project, the ability to endure frustration, resistance, and uncertainty, as well as selective attention to information that supports change implementation. Functionally, this type of behavior operates as a method of mobilizing change energy.

Second, the author emphasizes attending to recipients' emotions, which encompasses managers' deliberate actions aimed at reducing fear, anger, and anxiety, supporting a sense of safety and predictability, and addressing experiences of loss of status, identity, or stability. In applied terms, these actions function as methods of stabilization and ensuring operational continuity during change processes.

Third, Huy introduces the concept of emotional balancing, which does not reduce to a single instrument but describes a processual mechanism formed at the group level as a result of combining the two previous patterns. Excessive focus on "pushing change" leads to chaos and emotional exhaustion, whereas

excessive emphasis on maintaining stability leads to organizational inertia. Their balance creates conditions for adaptation, organizational learning, and effective change implementation [23, pp. 31–69].

K. Weick and R. Quinn argue that organizational change is not a discrete event or a sequence of managed steps, but a continuous process of “changing” that constantly unfolds within organizations. From this perspective, instrumental models oriented toward a fixed set of methods and stages are limited because they ignore the nonlinear nature of change, the multiplicity of local initiatives, and the role of organizational inertia. Thus, summarizing the approach of Weick and Quinn, which can be associated with the processual perspective, the effectiveness of change implementation is linked not to the correct application of individual managerial tools, but to management’s ability to work with change dynamics, organizational context, and continuous feedback [24, pp. 362–364; 375–379; 381–382].

The processual approach proceeds from an understanding of change as a prolonged, nonlinear, and dynamic process unfolding over time and requiring constant adjustment of managerial influence. Within this logic, methods of managing change implementation are not reduced to one-time tools or decisions, but are interpreted as an ordered sequence of managerial actions, stages, and feedback loops aimed at supporting and guiding the transformation process.

Representatives of this approach (in particular B. Burnes, as well as K. Weick and R. Quinn) emphasize that change may be episodic or continuous in nature; therefore, methods for managing its implementation must be flexible, adaptive, and sensitive to context. Within the processual approach, feedback mechanisms, learning-in-action, and adjustment of managerial decisions in response to organizational reactions acquire central importance. Thus, methods of managing change implementation are viewed as processual mechanisms for supporting the organization’s movement from one state to another.

The institutional approach examines change implementation through the prism of established organizational institutions—routines, norms, rules, and legitimacy perceptions. Within this logic, methods of managing change implementation are directed not only at altering formal structures or individual behavior, but at transforming the institutional foundations of organizational activity that ensure stability and the reproduction of social order.

Representatives of institutional theory (in particular P. Tolbert and L. Zucker) demonstrate that innovations do not become sustainable immediately, but rather through a process of institutionalization that includes routinization, formalization, and social legitimation; formal changes without institutional anchoring remain superficial [25]. Another key idea proposed by the authors is the conceptualization of institutionalization as a process (rather than an event) comprising three stages:

1. the pre-institutionalization stage (experimentation, emergence, and testing of innovations);
2. the semi-institutionalization stage (diffusion of innovations, their formalization, and standardization);
3. the full institutionalization stage (routinization of practices, normative consolidation, and acquisition of the status of “taken-for-granted” organizational norms) [26, p. 179].

Accordingly, methods of managing change implementation within the institutional approach encompass mechanisms for legitimizing new practices, integrating change into everyday procedures, and gradually transforming innovations into “taken-for-granted” elements of organizational life. This approach explains why formally implemented changes often fail to take root without institutional consolidation.

### **3. Functional and multi-level classification of change implementation methods**

As a result of examining the evolution of methods for managing change implementation – from linear instrumental models to processual, behavioral, and institutional explanations –we propose an original classification of methods for managing change implementation based on their functional role within the transformation process (Table 1).

Table 1

**Summary Table of Methods for Managing Change Implementation**

No.	Category of methods	Object of influence	Expected outcome in implementation
1	Project-organizational methods	structure, processes, project	controllability of implementation
2	Communication and sensemaking methods	understanding, alignment of meanings	reduction of uncertainty, acceptance of change
3	Behavioral and emotional methods	emotions, resistance, ambivalence	sustainable engagement, reduced sabotage
4	Motivational and reinforcement methods	incentives, recognition	consolidation of new behavior
5	Capability development methods	competencies, skills	ability to perform new practices
6	Institutional and legitimization methods	norms, rules, routines, legitimacy	institutionalization of change, sustainability and embedding of new practices

*Source: developed by the author*

Within this study, methods of managing change implementation are understood as an ordered complex of managerial actions, instruments,

practices, and mechanisms that ensure the controllability of the change trajectory, employee acceptance of change, organizational realization of decisions, and sustainable consolidation of new practices. These methods are considered a functionally defined subset of the broader concept of change management methods, focused specifically on the implementation phase and the outcomes of its realization.

In our view, this approach makes it possible to avoid reducing methods of managing change implementation to a mere list of tools while simultaneously ensuring clear conceptual boundaries of the notion of “method,” thereby preventing its unjustified expansion to encompass any type of managerial influence.

Within the proposed classification, the following groups of methods are distinguished.

1) Project-organizational methods (instrumental –procedural). The function of this group of methods is to translate managerial decisions into controlled execution (coordination, resources, control, roles). Typical manifestations include a plan (roadmap), allocation of responsibilities, regulations and procedures, implementation schedules, risk management, monitoring, and reporting. These methods are derived from classical models proposed by K. Lewin and J. P. Kotter.

The function of these methods is to form a shared understanding of why, what, and how change is being implemented, reduce uncertainty, and ensure feedback. Typical manifestations of this group include open communication, employee participation, explanation of causes and consequences, regular feedback, communication of results, and the creation of an “atmosphere of success.” The methodological basis for distinguishing these methods lies in the approaches developed by V. Chychun, O. Hrechanyk, T. Khlebnikova, O. Temchenko, H. Kravchenko, and A. Pettigrew.

3) Behavioral and emotional methods (emotional regulation and work with resistance). These methods perform the function of reducing emotional barriers, supporting engagement and adaptation, and transforming resistance into a manageable process. They manifest through recognition of ambivalence, work with fear and anger, support for psychological safety, behavioral support interventions, and emotional balancing. Methodologically, these methods are grounded in the works of S. Piderit (addressing the ambivalence of employees’ attitudes toward organizational change), K. Huy (attention to employee emotions and emotional balancing), and K. Weick and R. Quinn (change as a process of ongoing “changing” rather than a one-time event).

4) Motivational and reinforcement methods (consolidation through incentives and recognition). These methods are intended to stabilize new patterns of behavior, reinforce desired actions and outcomes, and make change beneficial and meaningful for employees. They include rewards, recognition of

achievements, non-material motivation, and the fostering of engagement. Methodologically, these methods are supported by the works of V. Chychun, O. Hrechanyk, T. Khlebnikova, O. Temchenko, and H. Kravchenko.

5) Capability development methods. These methods are designed to ensure the ability to perform new practices (competencies, skills, learning), that is, to make change feasible. Typical practices include training, professional development, competency development, support for learning programs, and the development of change-related skills among managers.

6) Institutional and legitimization methods (institutionalization and routinization). These methods perform the function of providing sustainability to change by translating innovations into rules, routines, norms, and “taken-for-granted” practices. They include the formalization of standards, integration into procedures, legitimation of new practices, normative consolidation, and the transition from experimentation to standardization. Their theoretical foundation is provided by the works of P. Tolbert and L. Zucker (stages of institutionalization) and by the thesis that formally implemented changes fail to take root without institutional anchoring.

The author’s classification of methods for managing change implementation, presented in Table 1, is constructed according to their functional role in the transformation process. At the same time, it is compatible with the multi-level logic of change management, namely the cognitive → organizational-managerial → systemic-cultural levels. This is explained by the fact that each identified category of methods has a predominant level of managerial influence, although in practice it may also affect adjacent levels (Figure 1).

Thus, communication and sensemaking methods as well as behavioral and emotional methods are predominantly implemented at the cognitive level, as they are aimed at shaping the meaning of change, reducing uncertainty, regulating emotional dynamics, and addressing the ambivalence of employees’ attitudes toward change.

Project-organizational methods and capability development methods primarily correspond to the organizational – managerial level, as they ensure the transition from managerial decisions to controlled execution through structures, procedures, coordination of resources, and coordinated actions.

Motivational and reinforcement methods as well as institutional and legitimization methods mainly belong to the systemic – cultural level, since they ensure the consolidation of new patterns of behavior, legitimation of rules, and routinization of practices, thereby reducing the risk of organizational regression to the previous state. Accordingly, the model presented in Figure 1 illustrates the alignment of groups of change implementation methods with the respective levels of management and the expected outcomes of their application, conceptualizing change implementation as a multi-level process whose

effectiveness is determined by the integrity and complementarity of managerial influences.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>COGNITIVE</b>	<b>ORGANIZATIONAL -MANAGERIAL</b>	<b>SYSTEMIC-CULTURAL</b>
<b>Methods' Focus</b>	Ensuring employees' understanding of changes; providing meaning to the changes; reducing uncertainty; addressing ambivalence	Transforming change decisions into managed implementation; coordinating resources and actions	Ensuring the embedding of changes, their consolidation and subsequent reproduction as normatively accepted practices integrated into organizational culture and the institutional order
<b>Groups of Methods</b>	Communicative- Semantic	Project-Organizational	Institutional - Legitimizing
	Behavioral-Emotional	Analytical- Control	Motivational - Reinforcing
	Methods of Engagement and Participation	Capacity Building Methods	
<b>Expected Results</b>	acceptance of change, reduction of resistance, and "shared understanding" of ongoing processes	manageability of implementation, coordination of departmental actions, and the ability to execute new procedures technologies	stabilization of the new order, regulatory formalization, reproducibility of practices, and reduction of the "rollback" risk
<b>Barriers</b>	uncertainty, ambivalence, personnel attitude, resistance to change.	Gap between formalized plans and actual practice, weak coordination, and a deficit of required competencies	inertia of norms and routines, lack of legitimacy of new practices, and the risk of returning to the previous state

**Figure 1. Structural model of management methods**

*Source: developed by the author*

The synthesis of scholarly approaches to managing change implementation also makes it possible to identify the barrier-prone nature of the implementation phase, which is conditioned by a set of interrelated constraints at different levels of management. At the cognitive level, such barriers include uncertainty, ambivalence in employees' attitudes, and resistance to change; at the organizational – managerial level, they manifest as gaps between formalized plans and actual implementation practices, weak coordination, and a lack of

necessary competencies; at the systemic – cultural level, they involve inertia of norms and routines, lack of legitimacy of new practices, and the risk of reversion to the previous state. The presence of these barriers objectively necessitates the combination of methods from different groups in the process of managing change implementation.

Within this study, the proposed model is used not as a normative management scheme but as an analytical framework for examining the specific features of managing change implementation at industrial enterprises in Ukraine. It enables the structuring of empirical material according to management levels and the identification of factors that determine differences in the effectiveness and sustainability of organizational change.

### **Conclusions**

1. The methodological autonomy of the change implementation phase within the structure of managing organizational transformations at industrial enterprises is substantiated. It is demonstrated that implementation cannot be reduced to the “technical” execution of decisions; rather, it constitutes a multi-level socio-organizational process in which formalized managerial decisions are translated into new patterns of behavior, procedures, and institutional routines.

2. The evolution of approaches to change implementation is systematized, ranging from classical normative and linear models (K. Lewin, J. P. Kotter, E. Schein) to contemporary process-based, behavioral, and institutional explanations, including criticism of instrumentalism and an increased focus on emotional dynamics, sensemaking, and institutionalization.

3. The content of the concept of “methods for managing change implementation” is уточнено as a functionally defined subset of change management methods aimed at ensuring the transition from managerial decisions to actual implementation and subsequent consolidation of change within organizational activities. The conceptualization of these methods is refined by interpreting them as an ordered system of managerial actions, practices, and mechanisms designed to ensure the transition from formalized decisions to new behavioral, procedural, and institutional routines.

4. An authorial classification of methods for managing change implementation is proposed, along with its structural interpretation in the form of a management-level model that provides both functional and level-based representation of methods and is suitable for further analysis of change management practices at industrial enterprises in Ukraine. Six complementary categories of methods are identified: project-organizational; communication and sensemaking; behavioral and emotional; motivational and reinforcement; capability development; and institutional and legitimization methods. This classification avoids both a narrow instrumental interpretation of methods and

an excessive expansion of the concept of “method” to encompass any managerial influence.

5. The functional purpose of each group of methods is elaborated, and their typical manifestations and expected outcomes in implementation are identified, ranging from reducing uncertainty and resistance (cognitive dimension) and ensuring controllability of execution (organizational–managerial dimension) to stabilization and “embedding” of change through institutional anchoring and reinforcement of new practices (systemic–cultural dimension). This approach establishes a clear link between the object of managerial influence and the outcomes of change implementation.

6. The barrier-prone nature of the implementation phase is outlined, associated with cognitive (uncertainty, ambivalence, resistance), organizational–managerial (gaps between plans and execution, weak coordination, competency deficits), and systemic–cultural (inertia of norms and routines, lack of legitimacy, risk of rollback) constraints, which objectively necessitate the combination of methods from different groups.

7. The methodological status of the proposed model is defined: within this study, it is applied not as a prescriptive management scheme but as an analytical framework for further investigation of the specific features of managing change implementation at industrial enterprises in Ukraine, enabling the identification of imbalances between management levels and the explanation of differences in the effectiveness and sustainability of change.

### References:

1. Hubbart Jason, A. (2023). Organizational Change: Considering Truth and Buy-In. *Administrative Sciences*, vol. 13 (1), p. 3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010003>.
2. Bhavani, G., Mahalakshmi, M. (2023). Change Management: Strategies for Successful Organizational Transitions. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 5, is. 4. Available at: <https://surli.cc/akjszy>
3. Tarasiuk, O. V. (2024). Upravlinnia zminamy v orhanizatsii: osnovni kontseptsii ta modeli [Change management in organizations: basic concepts and models]. *Ekonomika, upravlinnia ta administruvannia*, vol. 1(107), pp. 39–46. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.26642/ema-2024-1\(107\)-39-46](https://doi.org/10.26642/ema-2024-1(107)-39-46) (in Ukrainian)
4. Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, vol. 1 (1), pp. 5–41. Available at: <https://surl.lt/shscok> (Accessed: 5 January 2026).
5. Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Row. Available at: <https://surl.li/aspem> (accessed: 5 January 2026).
6. Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press. Available at: <https://surl.li/suedzw> (accessed: 5 January 2026).

- 7.Schein, E.H. (1969). *Process consultation: its role in organization development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Available at: <https://surl.li/zuigjo> (accessed: 5 January 2026).
- 8.Beer, M., Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 78 (3), pp. 133–216. Available at: <https://surl.li/ckskpp> (accessed: 5 January 2026).
- 9.Descartes, R. (1908). *Œuvres de Descartes. Tome X: Regulae ad directionem ingenii*. Edited by C. Adam and P. Tannery. Paris: Léopold Cerf. Available at: <https://surl.lt/urfenq> (accessed: 13 January 2026).
- 10.Honcharov, S. M., Kushnir, N. B. (2009) Tlumachnyi slovnyk ekonomista [Economist's Explanatory Dictionary]. In prof. S. M. Honcharova. Kyiv : Tsentr uchbovoi literatury, p. 264. Available at: <https://surl.li/mexlxf>. (in Ukrainian)
- 11.Fayol, A. (1984). *General and industrial management*. Revised edn. Translated by C. Storrs. New York: IEEE Press. Available at: <https://surl.lu/jiuioh> (accessed: 6 January 2026).
- 12.Drucker, P. (2007). *The practice of management*. 1st edn. London: Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080942360> (accessed: 6 January 2026).
- 13.Mescon, M.H., Albert, M. and Khedouri, F. (1992). *Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Available at: <https://surl.li/sivyub> (accessed: 13 January 2026).
- 14.Koontz, H. and O'Donnell, C. (1976) *Management: a systems and contingency analysis of managerial functions*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Available at: <https://surl.lu/mccxue> (accessed: 6 January 2026).
- 15.Herasymenko, Y., Pidvalna, O. (2020). *Management (basic course)*. Vinnytsia: Konsol LLC. Available at: <https://surl.li/smxxpl> (accessed: 5 January 2026).
- 16.Chychun, V., Hrechanyk, O., Khliebnikova, T., Temchenko, O., Kravchenko, H. (2023). Change Management Models and Methods: Implementing Innovations, Ensuring Sustainability and Engaging Staf. *Economic Affairs*, vol. 68 (4), pp. 2249–2261. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.4.2023.33> (accessed: 9 January 2025).
- 17.Ivan Dijke, M., Guo, Y., Wildschut, T. and Sedikides, C. (2025). Perceived organizational change strengthens organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior via increased organizational nostalgia. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 110(1), pp. 89–106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001221> (accessed: 2 January 2026).
- 18.Klein, J. (2021). Reflecting backward to project forward: refocusing on values in organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, vol. 57 (4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863211033097> (accessed: 2 January 2026).
- 19.Yakymets, M. M., Karkovska, V. Ya. (2022). Osoblyvosti upravlinnia zminamy u pryvatnomu ta derzhavnomu sektorakh [Features of change management in the private and public sectors]. *Biznes Inform*, no. 3, p.102-108. (in Ukrainian)
- 20.Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 41 (5), pp. 977–1002. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00463.x> (accessed: 14 January 2026).

21. Pettigrew, A.W.M. (1987). Context and action in the transformation of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 24 (6), pp. 649–670. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00467.x>
22. Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: a multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25(4), pp. 783–794. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/259206> (accessed: 12 January 2026).
23. Huy, Q.N. (2002). Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: the contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 47(1), pp. 31–69. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3094890> (accessed: 17 January 2026).
24. Weick, K.E. and Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, no. 50, pp. 361–386. Available at: <https://surl.it/dwjwek> (accessed: 14 January 2026).
25. Tolbert, P.S. and Zucker, L.G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: the diffusion of civil service reform, 1880–1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 28(1), pp. 22–39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392383>.
26. Tolbert, P.S. and Zucker, L.G. (1996). The institutionalization of institutional theory. In Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 175–190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446218556.n6> (accessed: 17 January 2026).