CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION
Change is an inevitable part of human life. It is all around us, in the atmosphere, in social environment and in the human biological processes. Having enjoyed just first few moments of life, a person learns to meet change by being adaptive. A person's very first few breaths are dependent on his capability to adapt from one environment to another. "Each hour is different, offering people new experiences".\(^1\) Again, the pace of change is so rapid that no one can jump twice into the river at the same time from the same point because much water has flown during the intervening period. The world we live in, is witnessing rapidly accelerating change occurring in many fields. "There are lots of explosions, like knowledge explosion, technological explosion, economic explosion and communications explosion, etc. These explosions affect our organizational environment also necessitating it to act and react."\(^2\) "The rapid growth of technology, expansion of economic markets, social and political changes become constant pressures for organizations to change, adapt and grow."\(^3\)

Like a human being, an organization also has a

---

life cycle but with a difference, while after maturity a human being is bound to decay whereas an organization can be managed in a way that the process of decay can be arrested and directed towards growth again.

We can identify the following broad steps in the life cycle of any dynamic organization.

Figure 1.1
Life Cycle of an Organization


During the introductory phase, an organization plans, organizes and executes its various operations and establishes an equilibrium with the environment. With the passage of time and accumulation of experience gradually it expands multi dimensionally, along size, operations and complexities. Its resources are utilized
more productively leading it to the optimal or maturity stage. Gradually, it attains a plateau. This is the critical stage in the life of an organization. Unless care is taken to arrest the negative influences, it is bound to decay and gradually move to oblivion. This figure also illustrate the phases that successful technologies such as products, policies, principles, processes etc. go through.

To optimise expertise and standard operating procedures, it is necessary that an organization adopt, for a time, a particular way of doing things. Thus at times its methods of operations may be relatively static in relationship to its environment. Instead of constantly making the incremental changes, necessary to maintain perfect adaptation, the organization may instead from time to time make a number of structural or technological changes at once. This idea is illustrated in the figure 1.2 which depicts the adaptation of a long term viable organization to its environment. The steep portions of the curve represent periods soon after the organization made major successful changes. The flatter portions represent the periods of relatively stable operations that were becoming obsolete. The changes of an organization that improve its adaptation can be of several types, like technological changes, product changes, structural changes etc. None of these is necessarily most important, what
counts most is their total mix.⁴

Figure 1.2
Adaptation of an Organization through time


The step function idea of adaptation just described can be seen frequently in organizations that make major changes in their operations after experiencing unsatisfactory results. Such rejuvenation frequently is required. "Only birth can conquer death .... there must be if we are to experience long survival - a continuous recurrence of birth, to nullify the unremitting recurrence of death".⁵ As regards technology, long term viability

---

may require periodic replacement of declining technologies with technologies which are viable in an evolving environment". If question raised is, why does something that is successful eventually declines? The answer is fairly simple: because the demands of the environment change. If one compares the figures 1.1 & 1.2, figure 1.2 has number of steps. Each of these is caused by the introduction of new technologies whose life patterns are similar to figure 1.1. As long as an organization replaces declining technologies with new viable ones, it can remain viable. On the other hand, failure to introduce new technologies will eventually cause the organization to decline with its present technologies. Organizations do not have an inherent life span, but the technologies upon which they are based do have limited life. Thus an organization that fails to change is headed towards certain extinction, although its death may be far away if its present technologies have relatively long term viability. Progress is a process of changing from one favoured technology to another. Too frequent changes even if they are good ones, may not be good for the organization. There are periods of relative stability in organizations, in which, technologies are efficiently employed by standard procedures, developed markets and so on. The
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proper mix of successive change and stability contributes to organizational viability. It may be the same for other dimensions of change.

The Models of Change

The concept of change has been used in many different ways. Sashkin et al. have developed a typology of change which describes five models of change process in terms of the ways the users manage information flow and data use. "These five different models of change are:

i) Research, development and diffusion.

ii) Social interaction and diffusion.

iii) Intervention theory and method.

iv) Planned change.

v) Action Research".

While examining the assumptions, key issues and problems attending each model Sashkin et al. have argued that there are a number of different change models in vogue but these five are the most significant in terms of the theory and application of behavioural science approaches to the change process. Though these five models overlap each

other some what, however, the last three models are most prevalent in the organization development.

"The key focus in "Research development and diffusion" model is on innovation or new information based on research. It lays more stress on the development of new knowledge rather than its dissemination. It is presumed by the protagonists of this model that new and essential knowledge which is made available by the scientists and if the users or clients make use or receive the new knowledge properly, in the right way and time, they will accept it."9 The implication of this model is that the clients can accept the new knowledge only if it follows a rational and co-ordinated sequence. According to Huse, "the basic problem with this model however, is, that it is too rational, it ignores the major aspect of the communication process namely that there is a long time lag between innovation and adoption which can be as long as two decades or four decades".10

The second model of "Social interaction and diffusion" makes the opinion leaders and others as the centre of focus in an effort to ensure that new information is communicated into a social system by way of an opinion leader. The assumption underlying this model is almost

the same as in the first model as regards the generation of data. However in this case the new information is communicated to the appropriate users through key opinion leaders. "The basic problem with this model is that it concentrates on the individual user while ignores much of the information on group dynamics and the influence of the group on individual".  

The user or client assumes a passive role in this model.

The third model of intervention theory and method, originally developed by Argyris, focuses on changes internal to the organization. While articulating his intervention theory and method Argyris has attempted to present a theory that is both internally consistent and also empirical verifiable. While acknowledging the absence of empirical research in his book, the author has stated that his objective is to help develop a theoretical frame work to make more clear the empirical research required to confirm or modify the theory.

Argyris defines "intervention" as a step "to enter into an on going system of relationship, to come between or among persons, groups objects for the purpose of helping them". In other words the term "intervention"
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assumes a special meaning thus implying that in the intervention theory the intervenor and the client system exist independently of each other and thereby client can make its own decisions. Intervention entails three basic requirements and three basic tasks which are to be performed by an intervenor.

In the first place an intervenor must help the client system to generate valid information which should be clear and can be verified. It is also desirable that the valid information and resultant diagnosis must represent the client system in totality and not in segments. According to Huse, "from a systems point of view the focus may be on a particular subsystem considered as a system in its own right."\(^{15}\)

In the second place, the client system often having the valid system should have free choice among the alternatives. The choice of decision making lies with the client system and not with the intervenor.\(^{16}\) The concept of free choice in this context entails that the client system, having acquired the valid information can choose freely from the wide range of alternatives. In other words, the client system is not dependent on the intervenor.

---
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At the third level, the client system must also have a high degree of ownership to decide its course of action or choose from the available alternatives. Such internal commitment can be had by an individual or an organization only which the individual or client system perceives the choice as worthy of meeting the requirements, values and objectives of the individual as well as that of the broader system.

However, these basic requirements - valid information, free choice and internal commitments also entail a number of implications, regarding the basic tasks involved in intervention activity. Existence of congruence between effective client system and effective intervention system is essential. An aggressive client system is essential for the development or valid information free choice and internal activity. A defensive client system can render the intervention activity as incongruent.

According to Argyris, "Change is not a primary task of the interventionist".\(^{17}\) Rather the primary task of an interventionist is to generate valid information, help the client system, make appropriate and free choice and develop internal commitment to those choices. Then it is upto the client to decide to change specific aspects of the

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p.21.
system. When the choice is a responsible one, the interventionist can assist with the change.

It is thus that Argyris has accorded preference to the term "intervenor" to "change agent". It is his belief that most of the "change agents" envisage instability, laying emphasis on interventions which breed internal tensions and dissonance with a view to bring change.\textsuperscript{18} He further opines that some people have the tendency of equating organization development with change, a view which Argyris does not subscribe to. He lays his emphasis on the "fact that a change can be brought only when three basic requirements of valid information, free choice and internal commitment have been met satisfactorily."\textsuperscript{19} Unilaterally directed change especially from the top, is prone to augment defensiveness and future resistance to change.

Argyris also holds that when the basic tasks of intervention theory are: "the generation of valid information the establishment of free choice and the promotion of internal commitment, thus these tasks should assist the intervenor in respect of his own values. By adhering to these basic requirements an assistance can be rendered by an intervenor without letting his own system to be compromised."\textsuperscript{20}

\hfill \footnotesize{18. Argyris, no. 12, p.29.}
\hfill \footnotesize{19. Ibid.}
\hfill \footnotesize{20. Ibid.}
of assistance in helping the organization evaluate itself, and perhaps change its direction. If it does not happen or occur then the intervenor can leave the system without being compromised.

Adherence to these three basic tasks can render the possibility or probability of manipulation remote. The antagonists of organization development have generally raised the question of values, ethics and manipulation. But according to Argyris, "adherence to and accomplishment of the three basic tasks relegates the possibility of the client system or the intervenor becoming manipulative as almost into oblivion." 21

The third type of intervention activity entails the rarest intervention strategy in which the resources of the intervenor and the client system are pooled together to develop a new intervention. This rarest intervention strategy not only helps the client but also adds to basic theory. Huse is of the view that currently there is a lack of such theorists who can elaborate this aptly. 22 There is the possibility of the intervenor tending to look upon the client as being primarily an object of experiment. Thus this type of intervention activity calls for an added emphasis on developing new and better strategy which should augment the basic theory.
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The basic assumption underlying the intervention theory and method entails that the client system contains within itself most of the basic resources essential for bringing about a change. The primary role of the intervenor is to assist the client system in solving its own problems through the use of valid information, making a free choice based on valid information, and developing internal commitment based on valid information and free choice.

Planned Change

One of the first detailed and systematic models for change was developed by Lippitt, Watson and Westley. Later, Frohman and Sashkin and Kolb modified and redefined the strategy. However the basic concept of planned change entailing seven-step process is still in vogue. This seven-step process include scouting, entry, diagnosis, planning, action, evaluation and termination.

Scouting is the first stage in which neither the change agent nor the client system are committed to each other. Both are exploring the potential relationship whether they can or should work together and accordingly have the choice of an appropriate, and formal entry into the client system.

After making selection of the entry point, the change agent and the client develop a contract with each other about the expectations, goals, roles and methods of those involved in the change effort. In other words, the second step entails that both the change agent and the client must be frank in sharing their expectations and that they reach at least preliminary agreement as to the contributions both parties would make. This stage of negotiations involves one of the important issues as the issue of power and as to who will gain enough influence to work in the client system.26 Edgar F. Huse has cited "four main sources of power- legitimate power derived from the organization, expert power or the power of knowledge; coercive power or the power to punish and power based on trust and mutual collaboration".27

The third stage of "diagnosis" commences with the prior presumption that problems of the client are known and it involves the clear identification of specific improvement goals to be reached. The process of diagnosis encompasses four basic elements - the problem as perceived by the clients; goals of the client; resources of the client including time and knowledge of the change agent. It entails the identification of the sub-system wherein

27. Huse, no.10, p.96.
the perceived problem is to be located along with the inter-relationships between the subsystem and the other parts of the system. Another issue involved in the process is as to extent and degree the client system can willingly count its resources for tackling the problem. Another significant issue to be considered at diagnosis stage is to ascertain the resources of the change agent, his expertise and the availability of time with him.

Use of methods like questionnaire, interview, personal observation and the organization's previous performance data etc. is generally made in the diagnosis. Change agent is another diagnostic instrument.

A change agent, irrespective of the fact, whether he is internal or external, can "realize" or sense the response of the organization whether it is receptive or resistant and whether the overall atmosphere of the organization is congenial or hostile. In majority of cases, diagnosis is not really diagnosis because the change agents can adopt a specific technique or method which he has been frequently using in almost every situation. Edgar F Huse has cited the example of the Managerial Grid which is a highly formalized and structured programme to bring about a change, which can be used, with little modification, in any organization. He has further cited the case of the
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University of Michigan which while practising Survey Feedback, has made use of the same basic questionnaire and feedback approach in almost every situation. Some change agents have placed heavy reliance on team-building or sensitivity training as the basic approach to organization development. However Huse is of the view that the approach should be varied to suit the situation.

The fourth stage is that of planning which follows diagnosis. The planning stage involves the attainable goals to be identified and action steps to be taken, alongwith possible problems of resistance to change. Scrutiny of the data gathered during the diagnosis stage and examination of alternative possibilities for change are undertaken as the first step before establishing the change goals or intentions. The planning process is facilitated in active cooperation with the client system to ensure that the plans thus worked out and keeping in consonance with the needs and expectations of the client system. This is essential to obtain the internal commitment.

The fifth stage is that of action which entails the implementation of the intervention strategies considered in the preceding stages. Failure usually results from inadequate diagnosis, failure to involve a key person or
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group, or failure to anticipate the consequence of the proposed action. A significant noteworthy point with regard to systems point of view is that any action taken in one subsystem generally is applicable to the whole system. It has been generally observed that the top brass in the management is unable to understand as to why someone resists a "logical change". A change can envisage social changes in inter-relationships which are objected to by the people and which escaped the scrutiny at the "diagnosis" stage. In this regard, Edgar Huse has cited the "case of a woman who was considered as the most productive woman in her group and following the installation of a computer, she became the least productive and finally left the job. She interpreted the change in social relationships as she was no longer taking orders from her boss, but "taking orders" now from a machine". 31

The next stage is that of stabilization and evaluation in which the change is stabilized and the results of the change are evaluated. The underlying objective of conducting evaluation is to determine the desired success and progress of the change as well as whether the change project should be terminated or returned to the planning stage for further action planning. The evaluation stage should be conducted throughout the change process. It also

31. Ibid., p. 97.
involves both the client system and change agent to make use of evaluation method with a view to determine whether further work is essential or whether the change agent should terminate the relationship with the client. It is disgusting that most evaluation is subjective and there are few ways to systematically evaluate the extent to which the work has been successful.

The last stage in the planned change is that of termination which may mean for both internal and external change agents as leaving the system or may mean stopping of one project and starting another one. In other words, ending of helping relationship between the client system and change agent or it may mean the return of the change agent to the scouting stage.

Kurt Lewin's Model

Kurt Lewin's model of typology of change envisages three stages - unfreezing, change and refreezing. It is superimposed on the most refined model as seven-stage model of planned change. This can be better illustrated as in the Fig. 1.3.

The figure 1.3 shows the original Lewinian notion of unfreezing, change and refreezing superimposed on the more refined model of planned change. It is worth noting here that the seven-step model of planned change
should be combined with three-step model. However the typology of change as envisaged in the above figure is seldom followed in actual practice. In majority of the cases, either one or the other type of change strategies are applied or not applied at all. Generally, the change agent and the client system with open communication with each other, can change strategies and modify approaches based on their continuing diagnosis and rediagnosis of the problem facing the client organization.

The planned change system suffers from some
deficiencies, though one of the objectives of the planned change is the client organization's internalization of the process but this objective is seldom applied in an operational sense. The Grid approach developed by Blake and Morton represents the most specific example of making internalization an explicit goal. It aims at providing intensive training to internal change agents so as to be able to take over the organization development programme. Another lacuna in the "planned change" model is that it lays primary stress on creating specific changes to solve specific problems. As Sashkin et.al. have opined: "perhaps more serious is the fact that while the model is extensively grounded in theory and research evidence, there is little emphasis on research measurement and no significant treatment of research designed to validate the model".

"According to Frohman, et.al., there are various reasons as to why planned change should occur as a change model rather than as action research.

One of the reasons is that some practitioners of the organization development having acquired adaptation in a specific technique can ignore other action strategies".
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programmes and sensitivity training are some of the techniques generally applied in this category. "Another limitation in this model is that sometimes some organization development consultants wish to specialize in specific activities. For one consultant, the organization development may be his "thing" and he can be reluctant to learn or apply other techniques". 35

"In this model, comprehensive, action-research diagnosis requires both time and money and there is a possibility of the client being reluctant to make necessary investment". 36 The client can also reject the diagnostic research as unnecessary, believing that he "knows" what the problem is. In this case, the client looks for a consultant with a particular kind of expertise. 37

The adoption of this type of predetermined intervention strategy is also prone to lead to some negative consequences. Some people regard organization development as being very limited and specialized while for some others the term means only sensitivity training or going through a Grid Seminar. Its consequential outcome is that many programmes are doomed to failure, because the approach having not been undertaken on a system wide basis.

35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., p. 74.
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As Greiner et al. have argued "that sending a limited number of persons to laboratory training sessions can have little impact on the organization as a whole, and the results quickly "wash out".\(^{38}\)

Another negative consequence in the "pre-arranged" programme occurs when relevance on a single type of change effort is placed. There is a likelihood of its resulting in a strong tendency for the content of the change efforts rather than with the process that are involved. According to Edgar F. Huse, "many management-by-objectives programmes fail because the people involved get "overly concerned" with ensuring that the forms are properly filled out and neglect to closely examine the interaction between the manager and his subordinates."\(^{39}\)

Another negative consequence of the "pre-determined" programme is that it can be non-adaptive of dysfunctional. In other words, once an organization gets committed to a definite programme it may continue with that programme without caring for the consequence. Most of the so-called programmes of organization development lack flexibility because the organization is looked as a static system rather than as a dynamic one.

\(^{38}\) L. Greiner, D. Leitch, L. Barnes, "The Simple Complexity of Organizational Climate (Boston: Harvard University, 1968).

\(^{39}\) Huse, no. 10, p.100.
The action research model is very similar to the planned change model and its roots are almost the same. The outcome of the action research model closely resemble to those developed by Lippitt et.al.\textsuperscript{40} and modified by Frohman et.al.\textsuperscript{41} The action research model is illustrated clearly in the figure 1.4.

It is evidenced from the figure 1.4 that the model of Action Research is a cyclical process which lays emphasis on many main issues like joint collaboration between client and change agent, heavy stress on data gathering and preliminary diagnosis power to action planning and implementation, careful evaluation of results, power to taking action, and the development of new behavioural knowledge which can be applied in other organizational settings instead of making use of the existing behavioural science knowledge.

The model of Action Research entails seven main steps: (i) Problem(s) Identification; (ii) Consultation with a behavioural scientist expert; (iii) Data gathering and preliminary diagnosis by the consultant; (iv) Feedback to key client or group; (v) Joint Diagnosis of problem(s); (vi) Action; and (vii) Data Gathering After Action.

\textsuperscript{40} Lippitt, et.al., no. 23.
\textsuperscript{41} Frohman et.al., no. 24.
Figure 1.4
A Diagrammatic Model for Action Research
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(i) **Problem(s) Identification:**

The necessity for this step usually arises when the top executive in the organization or someone else commanding power and influence feels that one or more problems being faced by the organization could be solved or alleviated by a change agent. Edgar Huse has cited the example of a "manager of a manufacturing plant who had been involved in the organization development before. It took him almost two years to convince the plant manager to avail the services of a consultant".  

(ii) **Consultation with a Behavioural Scientist Expert:**

The second step entails that after having established the initial contact, the change agent, whether he is external to the system or an internal one - an employee of the organization, and the client system carefully assist each other. According to Beer and Huse, "the change agent has his own normative, developmental theory or frame of reference". This implies that the change agent should be conscious of his own set of assumptions and values and share them with the client system and thus help in establishing openness and collaboration.

42. Huse, no. 10, p.104.

(iii) **Data Collection and Preliminary Diagnosis by the Consultant:**

This stage involves the role of the change agent or the consultant. A consultant is called upon to gather data by applying four methods—interviews, process observation, questionnaires, and organizational performance data. Cannell and Kahn have suggested the ways and means of collecting data by interviewing. The collection of data through questionnaire has been suggested by Goode and Hatt. Selltiz et al. show how to collect data by observation.

Interview provides an opportunity to establish direct and face-to-face contact with individuals and groups within the organization. It can be either open-ended and unstructured or structured with set questions.

The technique of process observation entails the observance of one or more groups in action which also involves who talks to whom, who listens to whom or who interrupts—determining whether the climate is authoritarian or egalitarian, open and trusting or closed and defensive and like that. The use of questionnaire with

---


proven reliability and validity is generally recommended.

If at a certain stage the consultant realizes the likelihood of the questionnaires being proved to be impersonal, then the use of interviews or observation is preferably advisable. The use of "research questionnaire" is generally recommended before the initiation of any action so that the same questionnaire could be used subsequently for making comparisons. Huse and Kay, in their evaluation of the effectiveness of a management-by-objectives programme, have provided a good illustration of the pre and past questionnaires in this regard.47

The possibility of action research entailing conflict between (i) data gathering and diagnosis; and (ii) data gathering for promoting new behavioural science, can not be ruled out. At the stage of conflict between data gathering and diagnosis and action, the interview can provide the advantage of facilitating an opportunity of knowing and meeting the consultant with the key people within the organization, thus providing basis for an open, collaborative relationship. According to E. Schein, "every act on the part of the ... consultant constitutes an intervention" which wields some impact on the organization.48

The typology for data gathering and preliminary diagnosis, as developed by R. Beckhard can be helpful for a consultant who should endeavour to ascertain the change problem, attitudes, behaviours and structural change. Edgar F. Huse has aptly paraphrased Beckhard's typology in question form:

i) What is the appropriate subsystem involved in the problem? Which individuals, groups or units are involved and affected? This may or may not be related to the organizational chart.

ii) What's the willingness and capability of the system to change? What are the competencies and environmental constraints? Is the person or persons that want to bring about change in the right location? What is his influence potential?

iii) What are the motives and resources of the change agent? To what degree is he an advocate or a methodological consultant? What is the desired change from the consultant's point of view? What resources does he have and/or not have for the problem?

iv) What are the intermediate change goals and strategies? What should be done in the short run? In the long run? If for example, it seems appropriate to 49

start with team building or goal setting, where should it start? What is an intermediate strategy, starting with the top team? What other approaches should be considered?

v) What are the central entry points? What leverage does the change agent have within the system? What is the readiness of the system to change? What accessibility is there to the change manager? What is the linkage to the system? What approaches can balance the three (readiness, accessibility and linkage) to provide an optimal effect.  

Beckhard is of the opinion that any consultant who can answer these aforementioned questions is certainly deemed to have done a good job of preliminary diagnosis and he can be sure of making the project more successful.

(iv) Feedback to Key client or group:

Action research being a collaborative activity entails the feeding of the data back to the client. Though there are various approaches of feeding back the data but usually group or work-team meetings are utilized for feedback. According to Katz and Kahn, most organizations have at least one kind of feedback from the environment to

guide their operations and indicate the need for organizational change.\textsuperscript{51} Such a feedback is derived from the reception of their product accorded by the clientele or market. There is another kind of feedback which is derived from the internal functioning. According to Katz and Kahn, two types of feedback is generated from the internal functioning of an organization. One is the technical side of internal function which implies an accounting for each product job in the organization while the other - internal information concerns the human side of the productive and production - supportive process of the organization.\textsuperscript{52}

The feedback measure, in which the consultant passes on the information gathered by him to the client system, aims at helping the client decide about the strengths and weakness of the organizations or the organizational unit where the change agent is operating. The entire useful and relevant data is made available to the client by the consultant. Sometimes, the consultant, without divulging his sources of information, and at times, can withhold data if he finds that the client is reluctant to receive the information or it would make the client overly defensive.


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
(v) **Joint Diagnosis of Problems:**

At this stage, the feedback data is available to a group comprising change agent, consultant and other members of the management who discuss whether or not the problem is real on which the group intends to work. This process envisages a close relationship between data gathering, feedback and diagnosis. Because in this process the basic data emanates from the client group, then sifted and pruned by the consultant and then presented to the group for validation and further diagnosis. According to E. Schein, the action-research process is very different from the "doctor-patient" model wherein a consultant examines the things, makes a diagnosis and then prescribes a selection. He further notes that inability to forge a common frame of client-consultant relationship can result in a faulty diagnosis or a communication gap whereby a client is sometimes "unwilling to believe the diagnosis or accept the prescription.... I suspect most companies have drawers full of reports by consultants, each loaded with diagnosis and recommendations which are either not understood or not accepted by the 'patient'." 53

In this regard, suggestions systems are usually adopted to ascertain ideas about technical improvement and

---
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to get feedback on the human problems of the organization. With a view to make feedback effective for organizational change, Floyd Mann and his colleagues at the Survey Research Centre developed a plan for group discussion of survey results by appropriate "organizational families". The use of Mann's approach was first made in a fairly large company in which there had been a thorough survey by questionnaire and interview of all officers and workers. The very concept of the organizational family connotes a supervisor at any hierarchical level and the employees reporting directly to him. In this way a supervisor is represented in two organizational families. At the first instance he is involved in a group under his supervision and he would be a member with his coordinate supervisors of the family which would make a report to officers above him. Thus, "the concept of organizational family takes into account of the linking of subgroups in an organizational structure through the dual membership of their top men".

The use of group discussion by organizational families as suggested by F.C. Mann is similar to that of Tavistock's approach which take into account the realities of organizational structure. The feedback material

prepared for each session by the research team assumes special relevance for the particular organizational family into which it is fed. In an enterprise the chief of a branch meeting with his department head is furnished with companywise totals of employee ideas and feelings about all issues as well as branch totals, but, in addition, the branch totals will be further split-up for the departments represented in the meeting. In this process, the representatives can discern as to how their branch stands apart in comparison to the company as a whole and it will be helpful in ascertaining the strong and weak points of the departments within the branch. In this way each organizational family is "presented feedback about its own problems in detail and comparative information about the company as a whole or the larger company to which it belongs."56

According to Katz and Kahn, the feedback technique, making use of group discussion and group involvement, ought to be used under certain conditions in order to realize its potential strength. These conditions involve; necessity for a factual, task-oriented atmosphere, discretion of each organizational family to consider the implications of findings at its own level; and area of freedom required to utilize group process.57

56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., p. 320.
The technique of feedback in group discussion is advantageous as it facilitates the utilization of existing organization structure whereas to secure information and implementation of policy does not entail the bypassing of the executive line. It envisages effective working relationships between supervisory levels and facilitates two-way communication. As Mann has aptly reiterated that improving organizational functioning means dealing with the system properties of organizational structure.

Organizations, as systems of hierarchically, ordered, interlocking roles with rights and privileges, reciprocal expectations, and shared frames of reference, contain tremendous forces for stability or change in the behaviour of individuals or subgroups. Change processes need to be designed to harness these forces for creating and supporting change. Mann has further pointed out five other related sets of facts which can contribute for the efficacy of systematic feedback through organizational families:

i) Participation in the interpretation and analysis of research findings;

ii) The feedback of information and its discussion by the appropriate organizational family;

iii) Knowledge of results;

58. Mann, no.54, p.162.
iv) Effective group support; and

v) A hierarchical ordering of roles with respect to authority.\(^{59}\)

The feedback technique developed by Mann primarily aims at improving both personal and role relationship within the organizational family. It does not aim at envisaging a systematic change but to improve the relationships among the members of each organizational family and between organizational families, by facilitating the discussion of their common problems. The specific changes that take place can vary from one sector of organizational space to another and the sum total effect can be to create better understanding and communication in the organization as a whole.

However, the adoption of this approach gives rise to the question of the effective limits of change which is not systemwide in its character. In this regard, Lippitt, Watson and Westley, in their incisive analysis of planned change, have pointed out the problems emanating from the interdependence among the subparts of a system with respect to change process.\(^{60}\) Change in one subpart can be instrumental in generating forces in other parts to envisage related modifications, but interdependence can also mean that more sources of resistance are mobilized against any alteration of established procedures. While

\(^{59}\) Ibid.

laying emphasis on the need for defining the unit in the organization appropriate to the change attempted, Lippitt et al. write:

"If the subpart is too small to cope with a given problem, it will be unable to change because of resistance originating outside the subpart, coming either from the larger systems in which it is embedded or from parallel systems to which it is related. If the unit is too large and includes semi-autonomous sub-systems which are not directly involved in the change process, it may be unable to change because of resistance originating within the system. On the other hand, if the size of the unit selected as a client system is appropriate for a particular change objective and if several subparts of this system become committed to achieving the same objective, the motivation and energy available to the system for working on change will be intensified by the interdependence and interaction among the subparts." 61

(vi) Action:

After having passed through above mentioned stages, the next phase comes where the consultant and the client system jointly agree on further course of action to be taken. This envisages the starting of the "unfreezing" process, in that the client system is beginning to move

61. Ibid., p.77.
to a different "quasi-stationary equilibrium". At this stage, one cannot be specific about the action to be taken, since this depends on the culture, values, and norms of the client system; the problem diagnosis and the time and expense of the intervention.

(vii) **Post-action Data Gathering:**

Action research being a cyclical process, calls for gathering of data even after the action has been taken over, with a view to monitor, measure and determine the effects of the action. This will enable to feed the results back to the client system, which in turn leads to rediagnosis and new action.

**RESISTANCE TO CHANGE**

Resistance to change is a usual phenomenon in an organization which can be found throughout the organizational milieu. All types of employees tend to resist change because of the psychic costs that accompany it. It may be resisted both by managers and workers irrespective of the nature of the job. The various sources of resistance to change can be categorized into either personal or individual sources and organizational sources. Richard M. Steers has listed some of the

---

prominent personal and organizational reasons responsible for resistance to change.

**Figure 1.5**

**Personal and Organizational Sources of Resistance to Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Sources</th>
<th>Organizational Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Misunderstanding of purpose, mechanics or consequences of change.</td>
<td>1. Reward system may reinforce status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Failure to see need for change.</td>
<td>2. Interdepartmental rivalry or conflict leading to an unwillingness to cooperate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fear/unknown.</td>
<td>3. Sunk costs in past decisions and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fear of loss of status, security, power etc., resulting from change.</td>
<td>4. Fear that change will upset current balance of power between groups and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of identification or involvement with change.</td>
<td>5. Prevailing organizational climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vested interests in status quo.</td>
<td>7. Past history of unsuccessful change attempts and their consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Threat to existing social relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conflicting personal and organizational objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the figure 1.5 that on a personal level, the resistance by employees to the introduction of new technique or methods might be because they feel secure under the prevailing conditions and apprehend that the changes would destroy the existing interpersonal relationships that have developed through the years. In certain cases, some employees may not appreciate the reasons behind a change or how it will affect their own particular situation. There is also a possibility of group norms operating as resistance to any change in work procedures for fear of it leading to higher output without adequate remunerations.

It is also discernible that the nature and character of the organization itself can also influence the extent to which change is accepted in the organizations. When various departments view each other as rivals, they may try to upset the cooperative endeavours aimed at changes for fear of being superceded or ignored. The managers may disapprove of the change because of their commitment to past discussions and acts in which large investments in a particular product or technology have been made. According to Steers, "It is sometimes easier to live by past decisions than to admit that a mistake was made or conditions have changed".63 Apart from this, the

past organizational efforts at change having been ill-conceived and unsuccessful can also lead to lack of sufficient confidence to initiate new attempts on change.

Davis and Newstrom have analysed three different types of resistance to change, which working in combination produce each employee's total attitude toward a change. These are shown in the following figure.

**Figure 1.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Types of Resistance to Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical or Rational objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Time required to adjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extra effort to re-learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Possibility of less desirable conditions such as still change agent downgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Economic costs of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Questioned technical feasibility of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is discernible from the figure 1.6 that the logical factors leading to resistance to change emanate from the time and effort needed so adapt to change, including duties attending new assignment. The employer has also to incur the costs of providing training to the employees to make them skillful as per requirement of change. Though change is favourable for the employees in the long run, yet these short-run costs have to be paid first by the employer.

Psychological resistance represents attitudes and feelings of individual employees about change. The employees may have the fear of the unknown, mistrust about management and entertain a sense of insecurity. Though management leadership can regard these feelings as superficial or unjustified, but these are real and must be recognised.64

The sociological factors leading resistance to change are manifested in terms of group interests and values. Social values as potent forces in the environment must be given careful consideration. There are political coalitions, opposing labour union values and even different community values. There are "work-friendships" at a small group level that can feel disrupted by changes.

Questions like whether change is consistent with group values or does it maintain group team work etc. can be asked by the employees and the management leadership should try to make these conditions as favourable as possible in order to successfully tackle the sociological resistance.

Mann has developed a number of principles of change which must be taken into consideration in attempting to change the attitudes and behaviour of an individual or a group of individuals in an organizational setting.65 Huse has expanded Man's seven principles for use in an on-going action-research programme.66 Edgar F. Huse has divided these principles into three main categories:

i) Factors increasing resistance to change;

ii) Consequences of Resistance to change; and

iii) Factors decreasing resistance to change.67

(i) Factors Increasing Resistance to Change:

Change, as such, does not portend a threat, if the individual involved perceives it as helpful. A sudden announcement by an organization that its employees will receive 15 per cent hike in their pay, few or no one would object to it. Generally individuals perceive change as

65. Mann, no. 54, p. 162.
having actual or potential threat. In such cases, individuals resist change. The threats emanating from proposed changes are many and manifold. For one the threat can be probable loss of job security and for another it may be loss of prestige through lessened authority or responsibility. An individual can not perceive all the threats inherent in any proposed change. Though an individual may not be able to recognise some of these threats which remain at the unconscious level.\textsuperscript{68}

Unless a supervisor has requested for a specific change, any other change is likely to be opposed by him as a real or imaginary threat to his prestige or authority. The supervisors, basically being human beings are conscious of their status in the organization. A proposal or recommendation from outside or a consultant for change entails an implied indication that the performance of the supervisor has not been satisfactory. Similar analogy is applicable to lower level employees.

Any change would be opposed by the affected group unless the members have made specific request for change. Effect of change not only affects an individual but all members of the unit. According to Mann, the group opposition is usually more than the sum total of the individual

\textsuperscript{68} Mann, no.54, p. 162.
oppositions, since the behaviour of work group is not identical to that of individual.\textsuperscript{69}

The magnitude of the opposition to change by individual, group or supervisor manifests a direct reflection of the magnitude of change. A small change evokes relatively little opposition because its effect is confined to fewer people. The greater the change, the greater the opportunity for the change to threaten the group concerned and the greater its potential effect on the security, prestige, status, authority, and responsibility of those affected.\textsuperscript{70}

E. Huse has provided a beautiful illustration of such resistance to change.\textsuperscript{71} Integrated manufacturing Company contemplated a plan to envisage an integrated information system (IIS) which would cut across departmental lines in developing a computerized management information system. As the system analysts and computer programmers did their work in isolation, its resultant impact was that every middle manager in the organization was opposed to the series of computerized programmes despite top management's support. In this case, as Huse wrote: "The success of such programme is highly dependent upon the

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{70} Edgar F. Huse, no. 10, p.111.
involvement and the reactions of the users at a number of levels...the person most affected and most resistant to the change, is the middle manager. This programme which involved millions of dollars worth investment failed owing to lack of involvement and participation of middle managers.

(ii) Consequences of Resistance to Change:

The consequence of resistance to change depends on the amount of resistance to change and can be overt, implicit, immediate or deferred. When change poses a threat to an individual, then the latter having been aroused by defensive behaviour may attempt to maintain the status quo. Thus the overt defensive behaviour can manifest itself in the form of strikes, slowdowns, unionization, and the like. Implicit defensive behaviour may take the form of loss of loyalty to the company, loss of motivation to work, increased errors or mistakes increased absenteeism due to "sickness" and the like.

These cases of resistance, both overt and implicit, can be either immediate or deferred. In certain cases, the immediate reaction can be very mild or gradual and precipitation of action may require piling up of number of changes. Huse cites an example of an oil refinery

72. Ibid., p. 302.
73. Edgar F. Huse, n. 10, p. 112.
where a number of changes were made with little different effect, the first overt sign of such resistance was the overnight unionization of the group. 74

As Goodwin Watson has asserted:

"Resistance to change has sometimes been interpreted as simple inertia in human nature. It is said that people are in a 'rut' or set in their ways. Almost everyone is eager for some kind of change in his life and situation. He would like better health, more money and more freedom to satisfy his desires. Excitement is more attractive than humdrum existence. If people in organization do not change, it must be that natural drives toward innovation are being shifted or held in check by countervailing forces. 75 Now the question arises as to what are the countervailing forces to natural drives for individual and organizational innovation. There are a number of specific forces relevant to particular situation. Kerr and Kerr have grouped them under major subheads like sunk costs, misunderstandings, group norms, balance of power and diversity. 76

The term "sunk costs" encompasses time and energy as well as money, becomes a potent force in resisting change. Irrespective of the merits of proposed

74. Ibid.
change, it is difficult to write off the endeavours that have gone into the existing system. For example, a football coach who has invested a great deal of time and energy in developing individuals who can play both offense and defence (one platoon era) is likely to resist changes which permit a two platoon approach. An experienced manager is prone to resist suggestions for changes from internal or external consultant. The "sunk cost" concept is also helpful in explaining the different propensities to change for various age groups.

The concept of misunderstanding of purpose, import, mechanics or consequences of change is also significant. Poor communication among the employees themselves or between the employees and top management is one of the major factors that keep organization away from being effective, efficient and suitable place to work.\textsuperscript{77} The "illusion" of communication is generally the essence of the problem.

The factors falling under group norms and balance of power which contribute to resistance to change have been analysed in the preceding pages. Established rules and procedures both formal and informal are powerful forces for resisting change. Besides one kind of equilibrium in an organization is a balance of power among individuals,

groups, departments or divisions. Any change posing threat to the autonomy of a division or product group may be resisted because the group perceives a decrease in control over its own affairs.

If organizations depend on consensus formation in order to enable significant change to occur, different values and diverse goals among the participants will affect the change process. According to James Q. Wilson, some empirical research results to date lead to the following hypotheses.

i) The greater the diversity of the organization the greater the probability that members will conceive of major innovation;

ii) The greater the diversity of the organization, the greater the probability that major innovations will be proposed.

iii) The greater the diversity of the organization, the more difficult it will be to get proposals adopted.78

Change usually affects members differently depending on their role in the organization.