



# Organizational Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation

Antonette G. Belago<sup>1\*</sup>, Allan A. Calderon<sup>2</sup>, Leonardo Thenov<sup>3</sup>, Elizabeth Furio Perez<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Administration, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Mani Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Department of Financial Management, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines

<sup>3</sup>Department of International Business Management, i3L University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Department of Bio Management, i3L University, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: antonettebelago@gmail.com

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Submitted 11 October 2025

Revised 15 December 2025

Accepted 16 December 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54250/>

### KEYWORDS:

*Shared Values, Skills, Staff, Strategy, Structure and Systems, Style*

### HIGHLIGHTS

- ❖ Organizational Development and Change Management (ODCM) is vital for companies to succeed and grow
- ❖ Organizational development and change management of EEI Power Corporation
- ❖ The McKinsey 7S framework examined employees' perceptions of the effectiveness of internal organizational elements related to organizational efficiency and change readiness
- ❖ Findings showed that shared values, skills, style, staff, strategy, structure and systems were effective

## ABSTRACT

Organizational Development and Change Management (ODCM) is vital for companies to succeed and grow. The study focused on the Organizational Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation. Descriptive research design were used to examine employees' perceptions of the effectiveness of the McKinsey 7S elements in relation to organizational development and change management. The finding showed that shared values, skills, style, staff, strategy, structure and systems were effective. The study recommends looking into the improvement of the 7S framework specifically to improve shared service, strategy, and skills of EEI Power Corporation. The research contributes empirical evidence on employees' perceptions of the effectiveness of the McKinsey 7S Framework in relation to organizational development and change management at EEI Power Corporation.



Copyright (c) 2025@ author(s).

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Background**

EEI Power Corporation (EEIPC) is a power generation company with investments in renewable energy (RE) power plants and will continue to expand its power generation portfolio, specifically in the RE space. EEIPC is also a credible and reliable supplier of electrical equipment and services, and a licensed electro-mechanical contractor accredited by the Philippine Contractors Accreditation Board.

Organizational development helps the organizations build their capacity to change and achieve greater effectiveness by developing, improving, and reinforcing strategies, structures, and processes. Change management goal is to successfully implement new processes, products and business strategies while minimizing negative outcomes. This study aims to determine the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organizational Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation, as well as the willingness of the employees for change for the betterment of the company and its people.

McKinsey 7S model has been carried out as a guide to the researchers' objectives. It requires a deep understanding, not only limited to understanding a concept but also understanding the problem so that we can provide solutions and draw a conclusion (Ellet 2007).

### **Literature Review**

#### **Change Management**

For organizations, change is a phenomenon that is not possible to eliminate its existence and must be harmonized otherwise, it threatens the organization. Especially in today's world, where rapid changes are taking place in many areas that directly affect organizations such as technology, health, economy, socio-demographic environment, consumer demands, the importance of adapting to change is increasing. These rapid changes and continuous trans-formations in business life affect organizations.

Change in general refers to the transition of something from the current state to another level, but also refers to the differentiation in the skills, abilities, and knowledge levels of the individuals (Taşlıyan & Karayılan, 2011). Change is a process that refers to the transition from one individual and organizational level to another, planned or unplanned, regularly or irregularly, and cannot be prevented from happening (Kerman & Öztıp, 2014). Change is the differentiation that occurs on anything over a certain period of time. It can take the form of improvement or regression.

#### **Organizational Development**

An organization is a system that interacts with its environment, involving many variables. Many organizations today are less competitive than before due to a fast-changing business environment that demands efficiency and innovation. As a result, organizations need to find new ways to operate in order to improve their effectiveness in achieving their goals and objectives.

According to Anderson (2011), organizational development is the overall process used by an organization to increase its effectiveness and support organizational and personal change, using knowledge from behavioral and social sciences.

For an organization to be effective, productive, and satisfying to its members including its customers, it must make changes from time to time. These changes are often driven by customer needs, the desire to remain updated, and the need to adapt to new technologies. Not only must organizations change, but their employees also need to acquire new and advanced skills as their roles within the organization evolve.

## McKinsey 7S Model

This study uses the McKinsey 7S framework as a descriptive case study to assess the organization's capacity for development and change within its specific national context. This model is used as a diagnostic tool to examine internal factors that influence an organization's ability to adapt, develop, and manage change. The McKinsey 7S model helps identify and solve problems within a company by considering more than just reorganizing structure. It focuses on seven key areas: strategy, structure, systems, style, staff, skills, and shared values (Waterman et al., 1980). For an organization to function effectively, these seven elements need to be interconnected.

The 7S model suggests that organizations succeed when all these factors are in harmony (Barney, 1991). The hard elements, such as strategy, structure, and systems, are usually easier to identify and document because they are often written or visible, such as strategy statements, organizational charts, and other reports. The remaining four Ss—style, staff, skills, and shared values—are more abstract (Dunphy and Stace, 1988). Both hard and soft elements are analyzed to understand how organizational members perceive the organization's capacity for development and change.

Strategy refers to the plan of action that outlines objectives and the constraints of the organization's capabilities. Structure involves how tasks and people are divided, how authority is distributed, and how activities and reporting relationships are organized. Systems include the formal and informal procedures used for managing the organization, such as control systems, performance measures, planning and budgeting systems, and information systems. Staff refers to the people within the organization, their competencies, and how they are recruited, trained, managed, and promoted. Skills are the unique competencies that an organization excels in, such as in management, processes, systems, and customer relationships. Style involves the leadership approach of managers, including how they spend their time, what they focus on, how they make decisions, and the organizational culture, which includes values and norms. Finally, shared values represent the core values that are widely accepted in the organization and guide its purpose and direction (Kaplan, 2005).

The application of the McKinsey 7S framework allows measurement of employee perceptions of interactions in internal organizational elements. The result is a clear understanding of the organization's strength and limitations that affect its development capacity within its particular country context.

## METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the research procedures used in this study. It covers the research design, the tools used to collect data, the process of gathering information, and the statistical methods applied to analyze the data.

### Methods

A descriptive research approach was used in this study. The descriptive method focuses on answering the question “what is” related to the topic under investigation. It involves collecting, organizing, presenting, and analyzing data to provide a clear description of the subjects studied. As stated by Best (1983), this method is useful for gaining insights into the characteristics and situations of the research subjects.

In addition, a qualitative research approach was also employed. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), qualitative research takes an interpretive and naturalistic perspective. This means that researchers examine events and phenomena in their real-life contexts, aiming to understand and interpret them based on the meanings people assign to them. This method helped in obtaining relevant data to achieve the goals of the study.

### Description of the Respondents

The participants in this study were employees of EEI Power Corporation. A total of thirty-three (33) individuals completed the questionnaires provided by the researcher, providing the necessary information required for the study.

### Research Instrument

The researcher used a Google Form questionnaire to collect data. The survey was based on the issues identified in the study. The survey questionnaire is composed of two parts. Part I collected information about the respondents' profile, including age, gender, status, highest level of education, years of work experience, time spent with EEI Power Corporation, and the number of trainings attended related to personal and professional growth; while part II included questions assessing the respondents' views on the effectiveness of various indicators connected to Organizational Development and Change Management at EEI Power Corporation, based on the McKinsey 7S model. These indicators included Shared Values, Style, Skills, Staff, Strategy, Structure, and System.

A Likert scale was used to measure the respondents' answers, offering five choices with corresponding scores. The following scale was created to help interpret the responses:

**Table 1.** Likert scale

Scale	Range	Verbal interpretation
5	3.4	81.4
50	2.5	58.4
100	0	32.5

### Data Gathering Procedure

Before starting the data collection, the researcher sent a request letter to EEI Power Corporation to conduct the survey using online questionnaires. Once the letter was approved, the survey questionnaires were sent to the participants.

The researcher collected and processed the data necessary for the study. The data was organized, categorized, and tabulated in Microsoft Excel to support statistical analysis of the survey responses.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

The data were arranged and categorized according to the research design and the questions formulated. The data were entered, counted, and organized to enable the presentation and interpretation of the results.

The following methods were used:

### Percentage (%) and Frequency

These are tools for organizing and displaying grouped data. Frequency shows the actual responses to each question, while percentage indicates the ratio of the frequency of responses (f) to the total number of respondents (n), especially in analyzing the respondents' profile. The percentage is calculated using the following formula:

$$\% = \frac{f}{N}$$

Where:

% = percentage of distribution

f = frequency of responses  
 N = total number of respondents  
 100 = given as constant

### Weighted Mean (WM)

This was used to calculate the total of the product of frequency and unit weight ( $\sum fw$ ) divided by the number of respondents ( $n$ ). The formula for weighted mean is:

$$X_w = \frac{\sum fx}{n}$$

Where:

$X_w$  = weighted mean

$\sum fx$  = sum of all the products of  $f$  and  $x$ ,  $f$  being the frequency of each weight and  $x$  as the weight of each operation

$n$  = total number of respondents

### Ranking

This method was used to interpret the data by replacing numerical or ordinal values with their ranks when data are arranged. It was used to identify the preferred marketing activities of the respondents, arranged from highest to lowest.

### Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

This statistical method was employed to compare the means between groups and to determine if there was a significant difference in the respondents' assessments regarding the effectiveness of the 7S framework at EEI Power Corporation.

## RESULTS

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected through the survey questionnaire.

**Table 2.** Summary of Grand Mean on the Level of Effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Grand Mean	Rank	Verbal Interpretation
Style	3.41	1	Effective
Strategy	3.4	2	Effective
Structure	3.32	3	Effective
Shared Values	3.26	4	Effective
Staff	3.25	5	Effective
Skills	3.2	6	Effective
System	3.18	7	Effective

**Table 2** presents the summary grand mean which were all verbally interpreted as "Effective". Style got the highest grand mean of 3.41 followed by Strategy with 3.4 grand mean. Structure got 3.32 grand mean; Shared values obtained 3.26 grand mean; Staff achieved 3.25 grand mean; Skills received 3.2 grand

mean; and System got 3.18 grand mean.

The item "Value Statements and Codes of Conduct of EEIPC are clear and meaningful" had the highest mean of 3.38. "Values Statement and Code of Conduct of EEIPC are regularly reviewed, evaluated and approved by the Board of Directors" had a weighted mean of 3.25. "Senior Managers communicate the EEIPC's values and code of conduct" had a mean of 3.28. "Employees Acknowledge, Accept and Apply the EEIPC's values and code of conduct" had a mean of 3.22. "Values built into for a change effort, objectives and decision making" had the lowest mean of 3.16.

**Table 3.** Respondents' Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of Style

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>Style</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.2.1</b> Board and Managers show a desire to address change effort in an open and transparent way.	3.38	Effective
<b>2.2.2</b> Board and Managers receive sufficient and timely information about sensitive issues and needs to be improved.	3.31	Effective
<b>2.2.3</b> Board are ready to create change and development committee for EEIPC.	3.44	Effective
<b>2.2.4</b> In pilot areas that need to improve; employees are willing to participate to change effort.	3.44	Effective
<b>2.2.5</b> Issues are taken seriously.	3.50	Effective

As reflected in the table above, "Issues are taken seriously" had the highest mean of 3.50 (Effective). Both "Board are ready to create change and development committee for EEIPC" and "In pilot areas that need to improve; employees are willing to participate to change effort" had a mean of 3.44 (Effective). "Board and Managers show a desire to address change effort in an open and transparent way" had a mean of 3.38 (Effective). "Board and Managers receive sufficient and timely information about sensitive issues and needs to improved" had the lowest mean with 3.31 (Effective). The Style of EEI Power Corporation was effective, as shown by its grand mean of 3.41.

**Table 4.** Respondents' Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of Skills

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>Skills</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.3.1</b> Skills, Experience and Knowledge and people match the competencies required to Department.	3.31	Effective
<b>2.3.2</b> Training programs visible and accessible to all employees of EEIPC.	3.19	Effective

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>2.3.3</b> Training is aligned with the skills and knowledge necessary for the department.	3.19	Effective
<b>2.3.4</b> There are multiple training options to fit people management process circumstances and needs.	3.16	Effective
<b>2.3.5</b> Training programs evaluated to ensure that they are effective.	3.16	Effective

As illustrated, "Skills, Experience and Knowledge and people match the competencies required to Department" had the highest mean of 3.31 (Effective). Both "Training programs visible and accessible to all employees of EEIPC" and "Training is aligned with the skills and knowledge necessary for the department" had a mean of 3.19 (Effective). "There are multiple training options to fit people management process circumstances and needs" and "Training programs evaluated to ensure that they are effective" had a mean of 3.16 (Effective). The Skills of EEI Power Corporation were very effective, as reflected by its grand mean of 3.20.

**Table 5.** Respondents' Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of Staff

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>Skills</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.4.1</b> Employees have job descriptions that align with the values and code of conduct.	3.34	Effective
<b>2.4.2</b> Recruitment process emphasizes the value/code of conduct and seeks to align these expectations with that of the candidate.	3.28	Effective
<b>2.4.3</b> Employees feel that they have an equal chance of promotion based upon merit.	3.13	Effective
<b>2.4.4</b> Employees feel performance targets are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-Related).	3.25	Effective
<b>2.4.5</b> Staff appraisal process applied consistently and fairly.	3.13	Effective

**Table 5** shows that "Employees have job descriptions that align with the values and code of conduct" had the highest mean of 3.34 (Effective). "Recruitment process emphasizes the value/code of conduct and seeks to align these expectations with that of the candidate" had a mean of 3.28 (Effective). "Employees feel performance targets are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-Related)" had a mean of 3.25 (Effective). Both "Employees feel that they have an equal chance of promotion based upon merit" and "Staff appraisal process applied consistently and fairly" had the lowest mean of 3.13 (Effective). The Staff of EEI Power Corporation were very effective, as reflected by its grand mean of 3.25.

**Table 6.** Respondents' Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of Strategy

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.5.1</b> Strategy and Supporting objectives of business units clearly set out and aligned to those of the organization.	3.31	Effective
<b>2.5.2</b> Strategy and Objectives of business units are periodically re-assessed and re-aligned.	3.31	Effective
<b>2.5.3</b> Employees have job descriptions and performance objectives that align with strategy and objectives.	3.41	Effective
<b>2.5.4</b> Employees encouraged to understand risks and be involved in the risk management process.	3.47	Effective
<b>2.5.5</b> EEIPC's risk appetite is understood and applied to objectives and decisions by managers and employees.	3.41	Effective

**Table 6** demonstrates that "Employees encouraged to understand risks and be involved in the risk management process" attained the highest mean with 3.47 (Effective), followed by "Employees have job descriptions and performance objectives that align with strategy and objectives" and "EEIPC's risk appetite understood and applied to objectives and decisions by managers and employees" with 3.41 (Effective), "Strategy and Supporting objectives of business units clearly set out and aligned to those of the organization" and "Strategy and Objectives of business units are periodically re-assessed and re-aligned" with 3.31. The Strategy of EEI Power Corporation is very effective as reflected from its grand mean of 3.4.

**Table 7.** Respondents' Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of Structure

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>Structure</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.6.1</b> Structure of the business unit facilitates the flow of information upwards, downwards and across organization lines.	3.28	Effective
<b>2.6.2</b> Reporting relationships are clear and appropriate.	3.5	Effective
<b>2.6.3</b> Accountabilities are clearly defined.	3.38	Effective
<b>2.6.4</b> Responsibilities are properly segregated.	3.16	Effective
<b>2.6.5</b> Responsibilities and accountabilities are clearly communicated and understood.	3.28	Effective

**Table 7** depicts that "Reporting relationships are clear and appropriate" got the highest mean of 3.5 (Effective), "Accountabilities are clearly defined" with 3.38 (Effective), "Structure of the business unit



facilitate the flow of information upwards, downwards and across organization lines” and “Responsibilities and accountabilities are clearly communicated and understood” with 3.28 (Effective), “Responsibilities are properly segregated” got the lowest mean of 3.16 (Effective). The Structure of EEI Power Corporation is very effective as reflected from its grand mean of 3.32 (Effective).

**Table 8.** Respondents’ Assessment on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in Terms of System

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>System</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>Effective</b>
<b>2.7.1</b> Built the values and impacted the decision making processes.	3.41	Effective
<b>2.7.2</b> There is a common and clearly set of processes that underpin core business activities.	3.25	Effective
<b>2.7.3</b> The employees consider and apply the controls and regulations within the system.	3.25	Effective
<b>2.7.4</b> The security or personal data within the system are taken seriously.	2.88	Effective
<b>2.7.5</b> The organization takes customer service complaints seriously.	3.13	Effective

**Table 8** demonstrates that “Built the values and impacted the decision making processes” attained the highest mean of 3.41 (Effective), “There is a common and clearly set of processes that underpin core business activities” and “The employees consider and apply the controls and regulations within the system” with 3.25 (Effective), “The organization takes customer service complaints seriously” with 3.13 (Effective), “The security or personal data within the system are taken seriously” got the lowest mean of 2.88 (Effective). The System of EEI Power Corporation is very effective as reflected from its grand mean of 3.18.

**Table 9.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to age

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Age	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	25-30	3.17	0.73	0.55	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	31-35	3.47				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	3.70				
Style	25-30	3.33	0.76	0.52	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	31-35	3.87				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Age	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Style	36-40	4.00	0.76	0.52	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	40+	3.50				
Skills	25-30	3.16	0.49	0.69	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	31-35	3.13				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	3.40				
Staff	25-30	3.18	0.51	0.68	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	31-35	3.13				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	3.50				
Strategy	25-30	3.24	3.75	0.02	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant
	31-35	4.00				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	2.40				
Structure	25-30	3.24	0.91	0.45	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	31-35	3.67				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	3.50				
Systems	25-30	3.19	2.76	0.06	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	31-35	3.33				
	36-40	4.00				
	40+	2.80				

**Table 9** demonstrates that the highest weighted mean was given by the EEI Power Corporation Shared Values, Style, Skills, Staff, Strategy, Structure and Systems aged 36-40 with 4.00. Meanwhile, the lowest mean with ages 25-30 for Shared Service with 3.17, Style 3.33, Skills and Staff with 3.13, Strategy 2.40, Structure 3.24 and Systems of 2.80.

It can also be seen from the table, when the respondents were grouped according to age, their

assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values, Style, Skills, Staff, Structure and Systems; Shared Service had F-value of 0.73 and P-value of 0.55, Style with F-value of 0.76 and P-value of 0.52, Skills had F-value of 0.49 and P-value of 0.69, Staff with 0.51 F-value and P- value of 0.68, Structure had 0.91 F-value and 0.45 P-value, and Systems with 2.76 F-value and P- value of 0.06 had an assumed level of significance with P-value greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference when the respondents were grouped according to age. On the other hand, only Strategy with F-value of 3.75 and P-value of 0.02 got an assumed level of significance lower than 0.05; hence it differed 7S causes.

**Table 10.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to gender

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Gender	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	Female	3.36	0.55	0.65	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Male	3.28				
	LGBTQ+	2.80				
	Prefer not to say	2.60				
Style	Female	3.47	1.37	0.27	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Male	3.50				
	LGBTQ+	2.80				
	Prefer not to say	2.40				
Skills	Female	3.35	3.24	0.04	Reject $H_0$	Significant
	Male	3.29				
	LGBTQ+	2.30				
	Prefer not to say	1.80				
Staff	Female	3.25	0.19	0.91	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Male	3.26				
	LGBTQ+	3.00				
	Prefer not to say	2.80				
Strategy	Female	3.22	0.18	0.91	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Male	3.26				
	LGBTQ+	2.90				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Gender	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Strategy	Prefer not to say	3.00	0.18	0.91	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Female	3.29				
	Male	3.44				
Structure	LGBTQ+	2.80	1.52	0.23	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Prefer not to say	2.40				
	Female	3.11				
	Male	3.20				
Systems	LGBTQ+	3.50	0.80	0.50	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Prefer not to say	3.00				

**Table 10** presents that shared values with weighted mean of 3.36 and skills with 3.35 got the highest mean when they are grouped and identified themselves as female while style with 3.50, Staff and Strategy with 3.26, Structure with 3.44 and System with 3.20 got the highest mean when they are grouped and identified themselves as male. Meanwhile, respondents who prefer not to say their gender got the lowest mean of 2.60 in Shared Values, 2.40 in Style, 1.80 in Skills, 2.80 in Staff, 3.0 in Strategy and Systems, and 2.40 in Structure.

The table also revealed that when the respondents were grouped according to gender, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values with F-value of 0.55 and P-value of 0.65, Style had F-value of 1.37 and P-value of 0.27, Staff has F-value of 0.19 and P-value of 0.91, Strategy with F-value of 0.18 and P-value of 0.91, Structure had F-value of 1.52 and P-value of 0.23 and Systems with F-value of 0.80 and P-value of 0.50 had an assumed level of significance with P-values greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference when the respondents were grouped according to gender.

Meanwhile, Skills with F-value of 3.24 and P-value of 0.04 got an assumed level of significance lower than 0.05; hence it differed significantly.

**Table 11.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to status

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Status	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
	Single	3.18				
Shared Values	Married	3.52	0.41	0.75	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Widow	-				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Status	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	Separated	3.60	0.41	0.75	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Single	3.34				
	Married	3.72				
Style	Widow	-	0.39	0.76	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	3.50				
	Single	3.10				
	Married	3.56				
Skills	Widow	-	0.69	0.57	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	3.50				
	Single	3.14				
	Married	3.56				
Staff	Widow	-	0.57	0.64	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	3.50				
	Single	3.28				
	Married	3.00				
Strategy	Widow	-	0.36	0.78	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	2.90				
	Single	3.22				
	Married	3.72				
Structure	Widow	-	0.94	0.44	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	3.50				
	Single	3.18				
	Married	3.28				
Systems	Widow	-	0.54	0.66	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Separated	2.90				

It can be seen from the **Table 11** that EEI Power Corporation Shared Values with 3.52, Style and Structure got 3.72, Skills and Staff with 3.56, and Systems had 3.28 got the highest weighted mean has a status of Married respectively, while Strategy with 3.28 were Single respondents. Meanwhile, Widow status got no score.

In addition, the table revealed that when the respondents were grouped according to status, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values with F-value of 0.41 and P-value of 0.75, Style had F-value of 0.39 and P-value of 0.76, Skills with F-value of 0.69 and P-value of 0.57, Staff has F-value of 0.57 and P-value of 0.64, Strategy with F-value of 0.36 and P-value of 0.78, Structure had F-value of 0.94 and P-value of 0.44 and Systems with F-value of 0.54 and P-value of 0.66 had an assumed level of significance with P-values greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference when the respondents were grouped according to status.

**Table 12.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to highest educational attainment

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Degree	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	Doctoral	-	0.06	0.95	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Master's	3.00				
	Bachelor's	3.26				
Style	Doctoral	-	0.17	0.85	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Master's	3.00				
	Bachelor's	3.43				
Skills	Doctoral	-	0.04	0.96	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Master's	3.00				
	Bachelor's	3.21				
Staff	Doctoral	-	0.05	0.95	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Master's	3.00				
	Bachelor's	3.23				
Strategy	Doctoral	-	0.05	0.95	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	Master's	3.00				
	Bachelor's	3.22				
Structure	Doctoral	-	0.13	0.88	Accept $H_0$	Not significant

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Degree	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Structural	Master's	3.00	0.13	0.88	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Bachelor's	3.33				
	Doctoral	-				
Systems	Master's	3.00	0.13	0.88	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	Bachelor's	3.19				
	Doctoral	-				

**Table 12** shows that Bachelor's Degree as the Highest Educational Attainment of the respondents got the highest mean of Share Service with 3.26, Style has 3.43, Skills got 3.21, Staff had 3.23, Strategy with 3.22, Structure has 3.33 and Systems with 3.19 while Master's Degree got the lowest mean of 3.0 in the 7s and no score in terms of Doctoral Degree.

It can be seen from the Table that when the respondents were grouped according to the highest educational attainment, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values with F-value of 0.06 and P-value of 0.95, Style with F-value of 0.17 and P-value of 0.85, Skills has 0.04 F-value and 0.96 P-value, Staff got 0.05 F-value and 0.95 P-value, Strategy got 0.05 F-value and 0.95 P-value, Structure has F-value of 0.13 and P-value of 0.88 and Systems with 0.13 F-value and 0.88 P-value had an assumed level of significance with P-values greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference when the respondents were grouped according to highest educational attainment.

**Table 13.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to number of years of work experience

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	<1 year	2.89	1.37	0.27	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.17				
	>2 years	3.42				
Style	<1 year	3.20	0.63	0.54	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.30				
	>2 years	3.53				
Skills	<1 year	2.80	1.69	0.20	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.17				
	>2 years	3.36				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Staff	<1 year	3.06	0.38	0.69	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.13				
	>2 years	3.32				
Strategy	<1 year	3.14	0.05	0.95	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.00				
	>2 years	3.50				
Structure	<1 year	2.94	2.16	0.13	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.23				
	>2 years	3.48				
Systems	<1 year	2.94	2.55	0.10	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.33				
	>2 years	3.22				

From the **Table 13**, it demonstrates that the highest weighted mean were given by the EEI Power Corporation Shared Values with 3.42, Style has 3.53, Skills had 3.36, Staff with 3.32, Strategy has 3.50, Structure with 3.48 and Systems has 3.33 mean in terms of number of years work experience. Meanwhile, the lowest mean for Shared Service with 2.89, Style 3.20, Skills 2.80, Strategy 3.0 and Structure and Systems got 2.94.

The table also revealed that when the respondents were grouped according to number of years work experience, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values with F-value of 1.37 and P-value of 0.27, Style F-value of 0.63 and P-value of 0.54, Skills has 1.69 F-value and 0.20 P-value, Staff F-value 0.38 and P-value 0.69, Strategy F-value and 1.75 and P-value 0.19, Structure F-value of 2.16 and P-value of 0.13 and Systems with F-value 2.55 and P-value of 0.10 interpret an assumed level of significance with P-values greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference.



**Table 14.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to number of years in the EEI Power Corporation

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	<1 year	3.13	0.99	0.43	Reject H <sub>0</sub>	Significant
	2-5 years	3.54				
	6-9 years	2.80				
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	4.00				
Style	<1 year	3.37	1.43	0.25	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	2-5 years	3.66				
	6-9 years	2.67				
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	4.00				
Skills	<1 year	3.17	0.24	0.91	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	2-5 years	3.26				
	6-9 years	3.00				
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	3.80				
Staff	<1 year	3.16	0.52	0.72	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	2-5 years	3.36				
	6-9 years	2.93				
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	4.00				
Strategy	<1 year	3.23	0.16	0.96	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	2-5 years	3.28				
	6-9 years	2.93				
	10-12 years	-				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Strategy	>12 years	3.00	0.16	0.96	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	<1 year	3.26				
	2-5 years	3.48				
Structure	6-9 years	2.93	0.78	0.55	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	4.00				
Systems	<1 year	3.17	0.71	0.59	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	2-5 years	3.30				
	6-9 years	2.93				
	10-12 years	-				
	>12 years	3.00				

**Table 14** presents that the Shared Service, Style, Staff and Structure had the same highest mean of 4 while the highest mean Skills were 3.80, Strategy 3.28 and Systems 3.30. Meanwhile, 6-9 years got the lowest mean in Shared Service with 2.80, Style 2.67, Skills 3.0, Staff, Strategy, Structure and Systems have the same lowest mean of 2.93 and 10-12 years got no score in terms of number of years in the EEI Power Corporation.

It can also be seen from the table that when the respondents were grouped according to number of years in the EEI Power Corporation, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Style with F-value of 1.43 and P-value of 0.25, Skills 0.24 F-value and P-value 0.91, Staff F-value 0.52 and P-value 0.72, Strategy F-value 0.16 and P-value 0.96, Structure F-value 0.78 and P-value 0.55 and Systems F-value 0.71 and P-value 0.59 interpret an assumed level of significance with P-values greater than 0.05; hence the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference. On the other hand, Shared Values with F-value of 0.99 and P-value of 0.43 reveals that it differs significantly.

**Table 15.** Significant difference on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation as assessed by the respondents when grouped according to number of trainings' attended related to personal and professional growth

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	<1 year	3.24	0.02	0.98	Accept $H_0$	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.30				

McKinsey 7S Indicators	Duration	Mean	F	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Values	>2 years	3.23	0.02	0.98	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	<1 year	3.44				
Style	1-2 years	3.48	0.23	0.79	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	>2 years	3.23				
Skills	<1 year	3.22	0.52	0.60	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.40				
	>2 years	3.00				
	<1 year	3.20				
Staff	1-2 years	3.30	0.10	0.90	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	>2 years	3.13				
Strategy	<1 year	3.32	1.37	0.27	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	1-2 years	3.55				
	>2 years	3.00				
	<1 year	3.21				
Structure	1-2 years	3.18	0.22	0.81	Accept H <sub>0</sub>	Not significant
	>2 years	3.10				

**Table 15** showed that Shared Service with 3.30, Style 3.48, Skills 3.40, Staff 3.30, and Strategy 3.55 with 1-2 number of trainings attended related to personal and professional growth got the highest mean while Structure has 3.21 mean with less than 1 year training attended. Meanwhile, with more than 2 years of training attended related to personal and professional growth for Shared Service and Style got 3.33 mean, Skills 3.40, Staff 3.30, Strategy 3.55, and Structure 3.21 got the lowest mean.

On the other hand, when the respondents were grouped according to number of trainings' attended related to personal and professional growth, their assessments on the effectiveness of various indicators linked to the Organization Development and Change Management of EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Service, Style, Skills, Staff, Structure and Systems; Shared Service F- value of 0.02 and P-value 0.98, Style F-value 0.23 and P-value 0.79, Skills F-value 0.52 and P-value of 0.60, Staff F-value 0.10 and P-value 0.90, Strategy F-value 1.37 and P-value 0.27, and Structure F- value 0.22 and P-value 0.81 , had an assumed level of significance that the null hypothesis was accepted and there is no significant difference.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the overall effectiveness of the Organizational Development and Change Management practices of EEI Power Corporation as assessed through the McKinsey 7S Framework. All seven dimensions—Shared Values, Style, Skills, Staff, Strategy, Structure, and Systems—were rated as

Effective, indicating that the organization demonstrates a generally strong internal capacity to manage change and support strategic goals. This aligns with existing literature suggesting that organizations that maintain interconnected and coherent internal elements are better positioned to navigate dynamic environments (Waterman et al., 1980; Kaplan, 2005).

One of the most notable findings is the superior rating given to Style and Strategy, which received the highest grand means among the seven dimensions. This suggests that leadership behavior, decision-making transparency, and alignment of strategic objectives are perceived positively by employees. Such results reinforce the assertion that leadership commitment and clarity of strategy are essential drivers of successful organizational change (Anderson, 2011). The high score in “Issues are taken seriously,” for instance, reflects a leadership culture that is responsive and attentive to operational concerns, which is crucial in industries with high safety, regulatory, and reliability demands such as power generation.

Despite the overall effectiveness, several areas emerged as needing improvement. Systems scored the lowest, particularly in indicators related to data security and customer service handling. This implies that while systems are functional, enhancements may be required to strengthen regulatory compliance, mitigate operational risks, and elevate customer responsiveness. Similarly, Skills also ranked in the lower tier, reflecting gaps in training coverage, evaluation, and alignment of competencies with departmental needs. This is consistent with the literature, which emphasizes that continuous capability development is central to sustaining organizational competitiveness (Anderson, 2011).

The analysis of demographic differences revealed nuanced insights. Notably, Strategy differed significantly when grouped by age, with younger employees providing lower ratings. This could suggest generational differences in expectations regarding strategic communication, involvement, and clarity. Younger employees may desire more transparency and engagement in strategic planning, aligning with contemporary workforce expectations highlighted in modern organizational behavior studies.

In terms of gender, Skills showed a significant difference, with male respondents rating this component higher than other groups. This may be influenced by the nature of work in power generation, where certain technical roles historically lean toward male-dominated workforce participation. Nevertheless, this disparity signals a need for more inclusive and equitable training and development initiatives.

A significant difference also emerged for Shared Values when grouped by number of years in the company. Employees with longer tenure assigned the highest ratings, potentially indicating stronger internalization of values through deeper organizational socialization. However, findings also hint that some longer-tenured employees may feel overly familiar with the values and code of conduct—posing the risk of complacency. This reinforces the necessity of periodic reinforcement and renewal of organizational values to maintain consistency across workforce segments.

Despite the study’s comprehensive design, some limitations should be acknowledged. The sample size is relatively small (n=33), and responses are concentrated within a narrow age range (majority aged 25–30), which may restrict the generalizability of findings. Additionally, as the study relies on self-reported perceptions, employee assessments may be influenced by individual biases, satisfaction levels, or organizational culture dynamics that were not fully captured.

Future research should consider expanding the sample size to include more diverse employee groups and potentially compare results across multiple power companies to strengthen external validity. Qualitative methods such as focus group discussions or key informant interviews could also provide richer insights into employee perceptions and uncover deeper organizational dynamics. Further investigation into the relationship between organizational culture and change readiness, particularly across different generational cohorts, would also be beneficial.

## CONCLUSION

The results of this study contribute valuable empirical evidence on the role of the 7S Framework in assessing organizational development readiness within the Philippine power generation sector. The findings emphasize the need for EEI Power Corporation to enhance its training systems, modernize organizational systems—particularly data security and customer service protocols—and revisit its communication strategies to address demographic differences in perception. There is a need to re-align the strategy and objectives of EEI Power Corporation, as viewed by the regular employees from aged 31-4 with weighted mean of 4.0 and assumed as differed significantly. As to gender, the organization prefers male personnel in terms of skills since they are capable of heavy duties rather than female employees which has a significant difference and weighted mean of 3.35. As to the number of years in the EEI Power Corporation in terms of Shared Values, the longer the employee is with the company, the code of conduct and values becomes more relaxed to the point that not following can still be tolerated.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, D. L. (2011). *Organization development: The process of leading organizational change* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Bartunek, J. M., & Woodman, R. W. (2015). Beyond Lewin: Toward a temporal approximation of organization development and change. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 157–182. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111353>
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2018). Cracking the code of change. In D. A. Thomas, S. G. P. M. Van der Stede, & R. L. M. V. M. E. E. Thomas (Eds.), *Management classics: A selection of the most influential articles* (pp. 165–182). Wiley. (Focuses on the Brown, T. M. (2021). The influence of psychological capital and employee involvement on affective commitment during organizational change [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas at Austin.need for both hard (E) and soft (O) change, essential for people-focused iteration.)
- Best, J. W. (1983). *Research in education* (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Bruch, H., & Gerber, M. (2016). *Ours is the problem: How organizations can learn to tackle complexity, volatility, and change*. Jossey-Bass. (Addresses the agility and learning required for dealing with continuous change.)
- Burnes, B., & Cooke, B. (2019). The organizational development practitioner's view of the future of OD. *Organization Development Journal*, 37(3), 51–64. (Explores current trends, including the shift toward faster, iterative change.)
- Ceschi, A., Costantini, A., Scalco, A., Charkhabi, M., & Sartori, R. (2016). The relationship between the big five personality traits and job performance in business workers and employees' perception. *International Journal of Business Research*, 16(2), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.18374/IJBR-16-2.5>
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2015). *Organization development and change* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning. (Standard OD textbook, detailing modern interventions like Teaming and High-Involvement Work Systems.)
- Dahlin, K. B., & Behrens, S. K. (2019). Lean data: How small insights drive big data innovation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 48(3), 100722. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.06.002>
- Dei, D. J., & van der Walt, T. B. (2020). *Strategies for managing knowledge in organisations: A conceptual study*. University of Nebraska - Lincoln. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4073/>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Dunphy, D. C., & Stace, D. A. (1988). Transformational and coercive strategies for planned organizational change: Beyond the OD model. *Organization Studies*, 9(3), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068800900302>
- Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley. (This book is foundational for understanding "people iteration" as it requires psychological safety.)
- Ellet, W. (2007). *The case study handbook: How to read, discuss, and write persuasively about cases*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Hughes, M. (2020). *The complete guide to successful organizational change*. Kogan Page. (A practical guide emphasizing the human dynamics of change.)
- Kaplan, R. S. (2005). How the balanced scorecard complements the McKinsey 7-S model. *Strategy & Leadership*, 33(3), 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570510594442>
- Kerman, U., & Öztop, S. (2014). Change management and organizational change. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(9), 372–383. <https://doi.org/10.35629/8028-1304122125>
- Küpers, W., & Weibler, J. (2018). *Contemporary organization development: The human side of organizational change*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Macaspac, L. G. (2024). *Employees' participation in decision-making, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior*. Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities, 3(4), 970–995. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v3i4.92>
- Maharao, C. S. (2024). *The influence of Agile practices on project outcomes: Performance, stakeholder satisfaction, and team dynamics*. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts, 5(1), 2176–2186. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i1.2024.2286>
- Napier, E., Liu, S. Y. H., & Liu, J. (2024). Adaptive strength: Unveiling a multilevel dynamic process model for organizational resilience. *Journal of Business Research*, 171, 114334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114334>
- Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(4), 461–524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886310396550>
- Patil, R., Raheja, D. K., Nair, L., Deshpande, A., & Mittal, A. (2023). *The power of psychological safety: Investigating its impact on team learning, team efficacy, and team productivity*. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.2174/18743501-v16-230727-2023-36>
- Porfeli, E. J., & Savickas, M. L. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale–USA Form: Psychometric properties and construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(3), 748–753. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.09.007>
- Prosci. (2024). *Best practices in change management - 2024 edition* (E. Stiffler, Ed.). Prosci, Inc. (An authoritative report that annually confirms the people side is the biggest predictor of project success.)
- R. R. Sinclair, & L. F. Tetrick (Eds.), *APA handbook of non-patient-focused psychological services* (pp. 531–551). American Psychological Association. (A contemporary overview of OD theory and practice.)
- Sull, D., & Sull, C. (2022, February 16). *Why strategy execution fails—and what to do about it*. MIT Sloan Management Review. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/why-strategy-execution-fails-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

- Taşlıyan, M., & Karayılan, D. (2011). The effect of change management on organizational performance. *Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 11(21), 353–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12215-011-0037-3>
- Waterman, R. H., Peters, T. J., & Phillips, J. R. (1980). Structure is not organization. *Business Horizons*, 23(3), 14–26. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813\(80\)90027-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(80)90027-0)