

Improving consensus and commitment to strategy implementation: evaluating systems thinking workshops

Rodney J. Scott

PhD student, University of Queensland, Australia

rodney.scott@mpi.govt.nz

Robert Y. Cavana

Reader in Business Analytics, Victoria Business School

Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

bob.cavana@vuw.ac.nz

Donald Cameron

Senior Lecturer, School of Agriculture and Food Sciences

University of Queensland, Australia

donald.cameron@uq.edu.au

Improving consensus and commitment to strategy implementation: evaluating systems thinking workshops

ABSTRACT

Strategy literature reports communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions as important in effective strategy implementation. These have also been reported as outcomes of “systems thinking” group model building workshops, suggesting possible applicability.

This paper presents results of a systems thinking intervention to support the implementation of an organisation strategy in a New Zealand government department. Four separate three-hour systems thinking workshops were conducted with department employees.

A range of survey and work-sample methods were used to evaluate changes in communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions. Post-workshop survey results and work-samples showed significant increases in the outcomes measured.

This paper represents work in progress, as part of a longitudinal study evaluating outcomes over time.

Keywords: strategy, implementation, strategy and culture, strategy execution, systems thinking

INTRODUCTION

Strategy implementation has the same success factors as the reported outcomes of “systems thinking” group model building. Interpersonal success factors (Skivington and Daft 1991) for strategy implementation are communication quality (Hambrick and Cannella 1989), insight (Wind and Floyd 1990), consensus (Floyd and Woolridge 1982), and commitment to conclusions (Kim and Mauborgne 2005). A review of 107 papers revealed that these are the main outcomes reported in group model building interventions (Rouwette, Vennix and Van Mullekom 2002).

Processes for effectively implementing strategy are yet to be fully explained and explored. This case study uses survey tools to evaluate whether there have been increases in strategy implementation success factors when using group model building in a government strategy implementation context.

The evaluation may inform management decisions on one possible approach to strategy implementation. This paper only evaluates immediately workshop outputs – further study is required to explore the long-term impacts of group model building.

Implementation Success Factors

Literature on the nature of strategy implementation and the reasons for its success and failure is not well organised (Noble 1999, Yang 2008). Skivington and Daft (1991) proposed that strategy implementation literature could be divided into two broad categories; structural views, and interpersonal process views. Structural and control elements, as emphasised in early strategy implementation literature (Miles and Snow 1978, Hrebiniak and Joyce 1984, Drazin and Howard 1984, Gupta 1987), are direct tools available to executives in shaping their organisation. However, as strategies are executed by people, a range of interpersonal and cognitive factors may also be critical (Noble 1999).

Noble (1999) proposed that these two categories could be further divided into a number of sub-categories, which closely align to a model developed by Rouwette et al (2002); communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions (“CICC”).

Communication Quality

Many authors (Argyris 1989, Sandy 1991, Workman 1993, Kim and Mauborgne 2005) identify communication between managers and staff as the cognitive hurdle that any strategy must overcome. Different authors have focussed on vertical communication between leaders and staff (Fidler and Johnson 1984, Robertson and Gatignon 1986, Johnson and Frohman 1989) and horizontal communication between peer groups (Hambrick and Cannella 1989). This study includes both managers and subject experts.

Insight

Several authors (Floyd and Woolridge 1982, Floyd and Woolridge 1982, Hrebiniak and Snow 1982, Hrebiniak and Joyce 1984, Robertson and Gatignon 1986, Redding and Catalanello 1994, Bonoma and Crittenden 1998, Baum and Greve 2001, Tang 2011) explore the role of autonomous behaviours in generating novel insight, and conclude that the success of strategy implementation is positively linked to staff innovation.

Consensus

The degree of unanimity and agreement of a group is positively associated with implementation success (Floyd and Woolridge 1982, Schweiger, Sandberg and Rechner 1989, Wind and Floyd 1990, Noble 1999). Low agreement is associated with implementation failure (Guth and MacMillan 1986 and Huy 2011).

Commitment to Conclusions

The level of dedication to implementation can be measured in both intensity (Nutt 1983, Woolridge and Floyd 1989, Kim and Mauborgne 2005) and durability (Nutt 1983, 1986 and 1990, Bourgeois 1980, Bourgeois and Brodwin 1984). This paper considers only the intensity of dedication, but proposes further investigation into durability. Whitney and Smith (1983) find that the hand-over of strategy from senior to middle management can be problematic – middle management may be apathetic to strategies they have not been involved in developing. This study includes only employees that were not involved in the creation of the strategy.

Systems Thinking

Systems thinking is a scientific field of knowledge that explores systems as a set of interacting or interdependent components forming an integrated whole (Senge 1990). Proposed interventions developed through system thinking are not automatically adopted by an organisation (Rouwette and Vennix 2006). This may be due to a lack of understanding of prevailing politics (Greenberger, Crenson and Crissey 1976), or a lack of ownership by the client (Stenberg 1980). As a result, some practitioners experimented with involving client groups in the modelling process (Richardson, Andersen, Maxwell and Stewart 1994). These approaches are now commonly referred to a “group model building” (Rouwette et al 2002) or “participatory modelling” (Rouwette and Vennix 2006).

Systems Thinking and Strategy

Systems thinking has been applied to many disciplines and subject areas (Mingers and White 2000, Andersen, Vennix, Richardson and Rouwette 2007). One area in which systems thinking has been

particularly prevalent is in strategy development (Pidd 2004). Some have argued that the reason for this applicability is the complex and interrelated choices that strategy presents (Broman, Holmberg and Robert 2000, Aligica 2005, Houchin and MacLean 2005).

Although there is a significant volume of literature describing the applicability of systems thinking in strategy development, far fewer authors have examined the use of systems thinking in strategy implementation, though Sterman (2000) describes this as an area for future research. Snabe and Größler (2006) describe the contribution that a quantitative model (created by the modeller) can make to understanding and refining a strategic decision (structural view of strategy implementation). This paper instead focuses on the contribution that staff participation in the development of a qualitative model can have on communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment (interpersonal process view of strategy implementation).

Reported Group Model Building Outcomes

Based on Andersen, Richardson and Vennix's (1997) review of the existing model building literature, Rouwette et al (2002) identified four outcomes that were generally described as beneficial. These were (increases in): communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions ("CICC").

The interpersonal/process view (Skivington and Daft 1991, Carroll 1993) of strategy implementation focuses on group dynamics, for which there are many notable evaluation methods. Frameworks such as "SYMLOG" (System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups – Keyton 1999) and "BECM" (Being, Engaging, Contextualizing and Managing Matrix – Bell 2011) provide alternate methods for understanding group dynamics. However, the close relationship between success factors described in strategy implementation literature and the CICC framework make it particularly suitable for use in this study.

CASE STUDY

A group model building intervention was applied to a case study organisation. The organisation is a large government department in New Zealand. The organisation completed the formation of a corporate strategy, and then began planning for how this would be implemented. Particular concerns from senior staff included:

- The strategy may be poorly understood, or there may be differences in interpretations.
- No plan exists for the actions that the organisation should take to realise the intent set out in the strategy.
- Those responsible for implementing the strategy did not participate in its development, and therefore may not feel a sense of ownership.

Middle managers and subject matter experts were split into four groups (based on subject area), and each completed a group model building activity to determine what actions should be taken to realise part of the strategy. The activity consisted of a three hour workshop to complete a qualitative model with a novice group. The model was a causal loop diagram, applying the methodology described by Maani and Cavana (2007). The causal loop diagram was chosen over other systems tools as it is easier for a novice group to use.

METHODOLOGY

Most studies used anecdotal or descriptive evidence in evaluating group model building – only a small number attempted quantitative assessment (Rouwette et al 2002). This study used content analysis (Holsti 1969, Cavana Delahaye and Sekaran 2001) of work samples (before and after the workshop) and a range of (quantitative and qualitative) survey tools to evaluate whether the four outcomes (communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions) had been produced. A total of 52 people attended the four workshops, with a total of 40 completed surveys.

Work samples

Schön (1979), Lakoff (1980), McCardel (2009) and Franco and Rouwette (2011) all stress the comparison between pre-intervention and post-intervention thinking. Participants were twice asked to

list the four actions they thought were most important for the organisation to take to achieve the strategy outcome in their workshops – once immediately before and again immediately after the workshop.

Questionnaire

This study uses a questionnaire that contains three types of information: quantitative data (Likert scale questions, and ratings of different components), qualitative data, and demographic data.

Likert questions

The thirty Likert-scale questions have been developed by other authors (Pers. comm. Etienne Rouwette 2011). Rouwette (2011) combined questions from existing modelling literature including Vennix (1993) and Dooley, Fryxell and Judge (2000).

Questions concerning communication were assessed for scale reliability using Cronbach's alpha (a measure, between 0 and 1, of internal consistency between multiple questions evaluating the same factor, which treats any covariance among items as true-score variance – Allen and Yen 2002), with results of 0.82 (Vennix and Rouwette 2000) and 0.69 (Rouwette 2011). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha was 0.77. Cronbach's alpha for questions concerning insight was 0.76 for the current study. Questions concerning consensus have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84 (Vennix and Rouwette 2000) and 0.60 (Rouwette 2011) in previous studies. For the current study, one question had a correlation of less than 0.20 to the rest of the scale, and was removed (Allen and Yen 2002). The remaining questions have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.77 for the current study. Questions concerning commitment have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.88 (Dooley et al 2000) and 0.56 (Rouwette 2011). For the current study, Cronbach's alpha was 0.74.

Questions concerning usefulness of individual components

Participants were then asked to evaluate the usefulness of individual components of the model building process, and assess them on an 11-point scale (“was of no use whatsoever” – “contributed

very much”, Rouwette, Vennix and Felling 2009). Seven questions were chosen based on the steps identified by Maani and Cavana (2007).

1. The opportunity for open and extensive discussion
2. The presence of a designated facilitator
3. The use of behaviour-over-time graphs (line graphs)
4. The identification of variables (sticky-labels)
5. The use of causal diagrams
6. The identification of leverage points
7. The use of structured agenda

Qualitative Feedback on Workshop Participation

The questionnaire included the opportunity for participants to contribute handwritten suggestions to improve the process (Rouwette 2011).

Demographic Data of Workshop Participants

The questionnaire also included demographic data (age, gender, education, length of employment, level within the organisation). Participants mean age was 45 years, with a range of 31 to 64 years. They had been employed at the organisation for a mean of 10 years (range 1-40 years). 27 of 40 respondents were male, 21 were in management positions, and 29 had post-graduate tertiary qualifications.

RESULTS

Survey results from Likert questions

Results from the Likert questions were analysed using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Stephens 1974), which showed that the results are normally distributed. A mean score of higher than neutral was recorded for all four outcome areas (communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions), with a Student’s t-test (Stephens 1974) 2-tailed significance of less than 0.001 (compared to “a/d = neither agree nor disagree” – see Table 1). This finding indicates that the participants feel the process contributed to an increase in these areas.

Survey results comparing group model building to a “normal meeting”

Questions that asked participants to compare the workshop with normal meetings also followed a normal distribution. Again, a mean score of higher than neutral was recorded for all four outcome areas (communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions), with a Student's t-test 2-tailed significance of less than 0.001 (compared to “a/d = neither agree nor disagree” – see Table 2). This indicates that the participants felt the process was more effective than a hypothetical “normal” meeting.

Survey results relating to different workshop elements

Questions that asked participants about different elements of the workshops also followed a normal distribution. For six of seven questions, a mean score of higher than neutral was recorded with a Student's t-test 2-tailed significance of less than 0.001 (compared with “0 = did not obstruct, but was of no use either” – see Table 3), indicating that the participants felt that opportunity for open discussion, presence of a facilitator, identification of variables, use of causal diagrams, identification of leverage points and use of structured agenda all contributed the overall effect of the meeting. For the seventh question (the use of behaviour-over-time graphs), there was no significant result (significance of 0.03), meaning that it is unclear if participants felt that the use of behaviour-over-time graphs contributed to or obstructed the sessions.

Relationship between demographic data and survey results

Demographic data was compared with the results from the questionnaire (results for communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions, and results for each of the workshop elements). There were no significant findings for gender or length of employment with the organisation.

Non-managers were more likely to rate the presence of a facilitator and the use of a structured agenda as contributing to the outcomes of the workshop, but these were seen as positive elements by both

managers and non-managers (see Table 4). This may be related to the use of facilitation to mitigate the effect of power-imbalances (see conclusion).

Participants 45 years and older were more likely (p-value less than .01) to rate causal loop diagrams and the identification of leverage points as contributing to the outcomes of the workshop, but these were seen as positive elements by both age groups (see Table 5). Participants with post-graduate qualifications were significantly more likely to report that the workshops contributed to consensus and commitment to conclusions, though both participants with and without post-graduate qualifications believed the process led to an increase in these areas (see Table 6). The significance of these results are unclear.

Pre- and post-workshop work-samples

Participants were twice asked to list the four actions they thought were most important for the organisation to take to achieve the strategy outcome in their workshops – once immediately before and again immediately after the workshop. These were coded using a longitudinal quantitative text analysis (Holshi 1969 – see Table 7). There were far fewer distinct coded data points in the post-workshop actions (distinct coded data points per workshop), and most of the post-workshop actions were not found in the data from before the workshop (codes only found in post-workshop text).

Less answers were volunteered post-workshop – the significance of this result is unclear (see conclusion).

Participants were asked to describe the three best features, three most disappointing features, and make three suggestions for how to make the workshops better. These were coded and analysed. The most popular features were the participants ownership of the causal loop diagrams (identified by 18 of 33 participants), the communication between participants (15 of 33), diverse participants (12 of 33) and the presence of a facilitator (10 of 33).

The duration of the workshop (3 hours) was identified by participants as too short (6 out of 24 participants), too long (3 of 24) and about right (1 of 24). The only repeated suggestion for improvement was that pre-reading should have been provided to participants so they knew what to expect from the workshop process (7 out of 22 participants). Other suggestions included “more guidance on identifying variables”, “reduced scope”, “ensure...all the right people (are present)”, and “bigger room”.

CONCLUSIONS

The literature describing strategy implementation is fragmented and poorly supported by quantitative evidence (Noble 1999). Strategy implementation literature identifies communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions as success factors associated with effective strategy implementation. Group model building is associated with these outcomes (Rouwette et al 2002).

A large number of studies on systems thinking interventions use qualitative and anecdotal data (Mingers and White 2010). Only a relatively small number attempt quantitative assessment (Rouwette et al 2002). The CICC questionnaire framework is a promising tool that has now been used in part or full across several studies (Rouwette 2011).

This study, with 40 respondents across four workshops, strongly suggests that group model building can produce reported success factors for strategy implementation. Participants reported an increase in all four outcomes (communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions) through a survey questionnaire. Participants reported that these outcomes were achieved better and more quickly than in a “normal” workshop. Written responses indicate that diverse participation, open communication and model ownership were important components of the workshop.

Content analysis before and after the workshop showed new ideas (insight) and increased consensus between participants. Most concepts (“suggested actions”) described by participants after the workshop could not be found in the pre-workshop content. Unexpectedly, in the post-workshop

content, participants volunteered fewer “suggested actions” (by 35%). One explanation may be that identifying leverage points in the system (places where minimum effort produces maximum outcome) encouraged participants to focus on the “critical few” rather than listing many possible solutions.

Non-managers were more likely to rate the presence of a facilitator and the use of a structured agenda as contributing to the outcomes of the workshop. This result had not been anticipated, but may be explained as a way for less powerful participants to ensure their views are considered. Many authors (Schwartz 1994, Heron 1999, Tropman 2003, Rees 2005) have explored the ability of an independent facilitator to reduce the effect of power-imbalances between participants. Comparing group model building with other facilitation techniques (and the effect of power-imbalances in each setting) may be an area for further exploration.

The survey is based on participants’ self-assessment of the outcomes that have occurred. Content analysis provided a separate measure of insight and commitment that was consistent. In an earlier study, Rouwette (2011) found consistent results between semi-structured surveys of participants and the questionnaire used here.

While this study is limited by the sample size (40 participants), the use of common assessment tools allows easy comparison with other studies. Rouwette 2011 also reported that participants believed that participation in the workshop process improved communication quality, insight, consensus and commitment to conclusions.

The 23 Likert questions have been used in other studies and have been assessed for scale reliability. Other assessment tools have not been validated. There was agreement between results obtained through the Likert survey questions and the work samples.

This research provides a single case study that suggests group model building can contribute to effective strategy implementation. Further evaluation is required to determine whether the changes

observed are persistent, or whether the changes in attitudes filter through the organisation (beyond the workshop participants).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the NZ Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for financial assistance and support for this research. However, the opinions and interpretations contained in this paper are the authors' own.

REFERENCES

- Aligica PD (2005) Scenarios and the growth of knowledge: Notes on the epistemic element in scenario building, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 72 (7), 815-824.
- Allen MJ and Yen WM (2002) *Introduction to Measurement Theory*, Waveland Press, Long Grove
- Andersen DF, Richardson GP and Vennix, JAM (1997) Group model building: adding more science to the craft, *System Dynamics Review* 13(2), 187–203.
- Andersen DF, Vennix JAM, Richardson GP and Rouwette EAJA (2007) Group model building: Problem structuring, policy simulation and decision support, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 58 (5), 691–694.
- Argyris C (1989) Strategy Implementation: An Experience in Learning, *Organizational Dynamics* 18, 4–15.
- Baum JAC and Greve HR (2001) *Multiunit Organizations and Multiunit Strategy: Advances in Strategic Management*. Elsevier, Oxford.
- Bell S and Morse S (2011) Being, Engaging, Contextualizing and Managing Matrix - a Means for Nonspecialists to Assess Group Dynamics? *Systems Research & Behavioral Science* 28, 319–339.
- Boecker W (1989) Strategic Change: The Effects of Founding and History, *Academy of Management Journal* 32 489–515.
- Bonoma TV and Crittenden VL (1998) Managing Market-Implementation, *Sloan Management Review* 29, 7–14.
- Bourgeois LJ (1980) Performance and Consensus, *Strategic Management Journal* 1, 227–248.
- Bourgeois LJ and Brodwin DR (1984) Strategic Implementation: Five Approaches to an Elusive Phenomenon *Strategic Management Journal* 5, 241–264.
- Broman G, Holmberg J and Robert, KH (2000) Simplicity without reduction: Thinking upstream towards the sustainable society, *Interfaces* 30 (3), 13-25.
- Carroll GR (1993) A sociological perspective on why firms differ, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14:237-250.
- Cavana RY, Delahaye BL and Sekaran U (2001) *Applied Business Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Wiley, Brisbane.
- Dooley R, Fryxell G and Judge W (2000) Belaboring the not-so-obvious: Consensus, commitment, and strategy implementation speed and success, *Journal of Management* 26, 1237–1257.
- Drazin R and Howard P (1984) Strategy Implementation: A Technique for Organizational Design, *Columbia Journal of World Business* 19, 40–46.
- Fidler LA and Johnson JD (1984) Communication and Innovation Implementation, *Academy of Management Review* 9, 704–711.
- Floyd SW and Woolridge W (1982) Managing Strategic Consensus: The Foundation of Effective Implementation, *Academy of Management Executive* 6, 27-39.
- Franco LA and Rouwette EAJA (2011) Decision development in facilitated modelling workshops, *European Journal of Operational Research* 212 164–178.
- Greenberger M, Crenson MA and Crissey BL (1976) *Models in the Policy Process: Public Decision Making in the Computer Era*, Russell Sage Foundation: New York.
- Gupta AK (1987) SBU Strategies, Corporate-SBU Relations, and SBU Effectiveness in Strategy Implementation, *Academy of Management Journal* 30, 477–500.
- Guth WD and MacMillan IC (1986) Strategy Implementation versus Middle Management Self-Interest, *Strategic Management Journal* 7, 313–337.
- Hambrick DC and Cannella AA (1989) Strategy Implementation as Substance and Selling *Academy of Management Executive* 3, 278–285.
- Heron J (1999) *The Complete Facilitator's Handbook*, Kogan-Page, London.
- Holsti OR (1969) *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Houchin K and MacLean D (2005) Complexity theory and strategic change: an empirically informed critique, *British Journal of Management* 16 (2), 149–166.
- Hrebiniak L and Snow CC (1982) Top Management Agreement and Organizational Performance, *Human Relations* 35 1139–1158.
- Hrebiniak L and Joyce WF (1984) *Implementing Strategy*, MacMillan, New York.

- Huz S, Andersen DF, Richardson GP and Boothroyd R (1995) Measuring mental model alignment from a Group Model-Building intervention, *Paper presented at the International System Dynamics Conference*.
- Huz S, Andersen DF, Richardson GP and Boothroyd R (1997) A framework for evaluating systems thinking interventions; an experimental approach to mental health system change, *System Dynamics Review*, 13(2), 149-169.
- Johnson LL and Frohman AL (1989) Identifying and Closing the Gap in the Middle of Organizations, *Academy of Management Executive* 3, 107–114.
- Keyton J (1999) Analyzing interaction patterns in dysfunctional teams, *Small Group Research* 30(4): 491-518.
- Kim WC and Mauborgne R (2005) *Blue Ocean Strategy*, Harvard Business Press. 2005.
- Lakoff G and Johnson M (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
- Lyneis JM, Cooper KG and Els SA (2001) Strategic management of complex projects: a case study using system dynamics, *System Dynamics Review* 17 (3), 237-260.
- Maani KE and Cavana RY (2007) *Systems Thinking, System Dynamics – Managing Change and Complexity*, 2nd Edition. Pearson Education, New Zealand.
- McCardle-Keurentjes M, Rouwette EAJA, Vennix JAM and Jacobs E (2009) Is Group Model Building worthwhile? Considering the effectiveness of GMB, *Paper presented at the International System Dynamics Conference*.
- Miles RE and Snow CC (1978) *Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Mingers J and White L (2010) A review of the recent contribution of systems thinking to operational research and management science. *European Journal of Operational Research* 207, 1147–1161.
- Noble CH (1999) The Eclectic Roots of Strategy Implementation Research. *Journal of Business Research* 45, 119–134.
- Nutt PC (1983) Implementation Approaches for Project Planning, *Academy of Management Review* 8, 600–611.
- Nutt PC (1986) Tactics of Implementation, *Academy of Management Journal* 29, 230–261.
- Nutt PC (1990) Strategic Decisions Made by Top Executives and Middle Managers with Data and Process Dominant Styles, *Journal of Management Studies* 27, 173–194.
- Pidd M (2004) Contemporary OR/MS in strategy development and policy-making: Some reflections, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 55 (8), 791–800.
- Porter ME and Kramer MR (2006) Strategy and society, *Harvard Business Review* 84 (12), 24–78.
- Redding JC and Catalanello RC (1994) *Strategic Readiness*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Rees F (2005) *The Facilitator Excellence Handbook*, Second Edition, Pfeiffer, San Francisco.
- Richardson GP, Andersen DF, Maxwell TA and Stewart TR (1994) Foundations of mental model research, *Proceedings of the 1994 International system dynamics conference: problem solving methodologies*, 181–192.
- Robertson TS and Gatignon H (1986) Competitive Effects on Technology Diffusion, *Journal of Marketing* 50, 1–12.
- Rouwette EAJA and Vennix JAM (2006) System dynamics and organizational interventions, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 23(4), 451-466.
- Rouwette EAJA, Korzilius H, Vennix JAM and Jacobs E (2011) Modeling as persuasion: The impact of group model building on attitudes and behaviour, *System Dynamics Review*, 27(1): 1-21.
- Rouwette EAJA (2011) Facilitated modelling in strategy development: measuring the impact on communication, consensus and commitment, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*. 62, 879–887.
- Rouwette EAJA, Vennix JAM and Van Mullekom T (2002) Group model building effectiveness. A review of assessment studies, *System Dynamics Review*, 18(1), 5-45.
- Sandy W (1991) Avoid the Breakdowns between Planning and Implementation, *Journal of Business Strategy*, 12, 30-33.
- Schwartz RM (1994) *The Skilled Facilitator: Practical Wisdom for Developing Effective Groups*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

- Schweiger DM, Sandberg WR and Rechner PL (1989) Experiential Effects of Dialectical Inquiry, Devil's Advocacy, and Consensus Approaches to Strategic Decision Making, *Academy of Management Journal* 32 745–772.
- Senge PM (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*, Doubleday Currency, New York.
- Skivington JE and Daft RL (1991) A Study of Organizational “Framework” and “Process” Modalities for the Implementation of Business-Level Strategic Decisions, *Journal of Management Studies* 28, 45–68.
- Snabe B and Größler A (2006) System Dynamics Modelling for Strategy Implementation - Case Studies and Issues, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 23, 467-481.
- Stenberg L (1980) A modelling procedure for public policy, in Randers, J. (ed.), *Elements of the System Dynamics Method*, Cambridge, 292–312.
- Stephens MA (1974) EDF Statistics for Goodness of Fit and Some Comparisons, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 69(347), 730–737.
- Tang F (2011) Knowledge Transfer in Intraorganization Networks, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 28, 270-282.
- Tropman JE (2003) *Making Meetings Work: Achieving High Quality Group Decisions, Second Edition*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Vennix JAM (1995) Building consensus in strategic decision-making – System dynamics as a group support system, *Group Decision and Negotiation* 4 (4), 335-355.
- Vennix JAM (1996) *Group Model Building: Facilitating Team Learning Using System Dynamics*, Wiley.
- Vennix JAM (1999) Group model-building: tackling messy problems, *System Dynamics Review* 15 (4), 379-401.
- Vennix JAM and Rouwette EAJA (2000) Group model building. What does the client think of it now? *Paper presented at the International System Dynamics Conference*.
- Vennix JAM, Scheper W and Willems R (1993) Group model building. What does the client think of it? *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 1993 International System Dynamics Conference*.
- Wind Y and Floyd SW (1990) The Strategy Process, Middle Management Involvement, and Organizational Performance, *Strategic Management Journal* 11, 231–241.
- Workman JP (1993) Marketing's Limited Role in New Product Development in One Computer Systems Firm, *Journal of Marketing Research* 30, 405–421.
- Yang L, Sun G and Eppler MJ (2008) Making Strategy Work: A Literature Review on the Factors influencing Strategy Implementation, in: *ICA Working Paper 2*, University of Lugano (USI), Lugano, Switzerland

Table 1: Likert questionnaire results by outcome-area (5-point scale: 1-5, neutral response = 3)

	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Communication	40	4.04	0.77
Insight	40	3.81	0.75
Consensus	40	3.68	0.70
Commitment	40	3.66	0.72

** $p < .01$

Table 2: Likert questionnaire results compared to a normal meeting (5-point scale: 1-5, neutral response = 3)

	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Communication	39	3.96	0.82
Insight	39	4.07	0.73
Consensus	39	3.82	0.83
Commitment	39	3.50	0.78

** $p < .01$

Table 3: Questionnaire results for different workshop elements (11-point scale: -5 to +5, neutral response = 0)

	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Opportunity for open discussion	37	+3.26	1.69
Presence of a facilitator	37	+3.10	1.41
Identification of variables	40	+3.43	0.93
Use of causal diagrams	39	+3.43	1.15
Identification of leverage points	38	+3.45	1.14
Use of structured agenda	35	+3.03	1.58

** $p < .01$

Table 4: Relationship between manager/non-manager role and questionnaire results for different workshop elements (11-point scale, -5 to +5)

	Manager			Non-Manager		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Presence of a facilitator	20	2.85	1.60	19	3.33	1.24
	Manager			Non-Manager		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Use of structured agenda	20	2.85	1.72	19	3.18	1.51

** $p < .01$

Table 5: Relationship between age and questionnaire results for different workshop elements (11-point scale, -5 to +5)

	Over 45			Under 45		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Use of causal diagrams	18	3.61	1.04	17	3.00	1.22
	Over 45			Under 45		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Identification of leverage points	18	3.89	0.83	17	3.00	1.32

** $p < .01$

Table 6: Relationship between education-level and questionnaire results for consensus and commitment to conclusions

	Post-graduate			Under-graduate		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Increased consensus	29	4.20	0.44	11	3.83	0.49
	Post-graduate			Under-graduate		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Increased commitment to conclusions	29	4.48	0.59	11	4.09	0.41

** $p < .01$

Table 7: Comparison of suggested actions before and after workshops – coded text analysis

	Mean pre-workshop	Mean post-workshop
Coded data points per workshop	39	25
Distinct coded data points per workshop	30	10
Codes only found in post-workshop text		16