

PROOF

Organizational Change

8

Chapter outline

Introduction
The targets and context of organizational change
Factors associated with organizational change
 Organizational factors
 Personal characteristics
 Characteristics of the change situation
Organizational change strategies
 The fellowship strategy
 The political strategy
 The economic strategy
 The academic strategy
 The engineering strategy
 The military strategy
 The confrontational strategy
Reactions to change
Summary
Questions

Chapter objectives

The main objectives are to:

- identify and describe the various types of organizational change;
- understand the factors which either facilitate or inhibit organizational change;

(cont'd)

- explain the relation of organizational climate and culture to effective organizational change;
- describe the main characteristics of the change situation;
- consider change tactics that managers often use to bring about organizational change;
- describe the most common reactions to organizational change and explain why people tend to resist it.

Introduction

Changes in technology, markets and the world economy have meant that organizations have been forced to change dramatically not only what they do but how they do it (Furnham, 2002). Current issues range from managing mergers and acquisitions, downsizing and 'rightsizing', to business re-engineering or implementing new technologies (Fay & Luhrmann, 2004). Products and people skills are becoming obsolescent – a major task for all organizations is effectively managing change (Carnall, 1990). The psychology of organizational change is about various, very specific issues: the identity, ranking and weighting of the forces that act as stimulants to change and the sources of resistance to change, the main approaches to managing change, how organizations can become adaptive and learning systems, and how global forces effectively change.

The target of change can be both people and technology. It may focus on changing the structure of the organization or the way tasks are executed. It can be planned or unplanned.

Some changes occur gradually, other very dramatically. Small causes can have big effects.

Organizations and individual managers want changes in the way people think and act as well as in business processes. Change is both continuous and often ugly in organizations because of resistance. Clever business plans (about change) rarely survive the first attempts to put them into practice. Paradoxically, while it is often said that the aim is to improve well-being, the effect is often the opposite.

There are many drivers of change and vast sums are spent on change programmes but many fail. Although organizational change is pervasive, effective organizational change is rare (Armenakis & Harris, 2009). It has been estimated that in 2006 in the UK alone, \$6 billion was spent on change programmes but around three-quarters of the programmes failed. Half or even two-thirds of all mergers and acquisitions are not successful (Cartwright & Schoenberg, 2006; Marks & Mirvis, 2001). The reasons are numerous and include being too complacent, failing to find real and powerful and important champions of change and not anchoring new processes in the corporate culture. They fail because of

the change management process, be it design or delivery or simply a failure to understand the change psychology.

Some leaders attempt to bring about change to organizations, others change with organizations. Some focus on energy, others on tension. Some focus on ‘mind-sets’, others on potential. Change is about movement and involves complex and fundamental questions: Why is there a need for change? What is proposed? Who is involved in the process? Have all options been considered? What is the precise aim or goal?

Change is about innovation and adaptation. It often confronts all processes and procedures in an organization, asking fundamental questions about the basic goals and values of the organization.

Furnham (2005) has noted a number of predictions made less than 10 years ago (see Box 8.1). Of course we shall have to wait to assess their veracity.

AQ1

Box 8.1 Work in 2020

- Shorter working hours
- Twenty-five per cent working from home
- Business 24 hours a day
- Privatized automated roads
- Rail renaissance – 350 mph trains
- Space shuttle to Sydney in two hours
- Precautionary saving for nonworking hours
- Virtual companies – 10 per cent of FTSE 100
- Contingent and core workers
- One month per annum – no work
- Easier commuting
- Online recruitment
- Entrepreneurial renaissance
- Growth of friction-free capitalism
- Personal digital assistants
- Massive increase in PC power
- Community work one day per week
- Global personal networks

Box 8.2 lists some further speculations about changes from the world of yesterday to that of tomorrow (or today). Many of these are simplistic catch-phrases which can, and should be, challenged. Things change in different sectors for different reasons. Globalization, mechanization and legislation have changed some jobs dramatically while others remain almost untouched by the twenty-first century.

Emphasis on what has changed in the business world leads to focus on what needs to change in the way that organizations operate. There have been changes in the workforce in terms of cultural diversity, skill experience and expectations, which differ significantly from one country to another.

Box 8.2 Speculations about the old and the new world**Old world**

- Wired
- Office hours
- Corporate headquarters
- Local/global markets
- e-excitement
- Surplus of youth
- Departments and divisions
- Paid for attendance
- Attentive to boss
- Boss is supervisor
- Boss is scorekeeper
- Command, control and mistrust
- Labour, land and capital
- Fixed, hierarchical, stable
- Loyalty, compliance
- Work/life separate
- Norms, customs and laws

New world

- Wireless
- 24/7 – open all hours
- Satellite companies
- Web-based
- e-fatigue
- Surplus of wrinkles
- Flexible team
- Paid for output
- Attentive to customers
- Boss is coach
- Boss is leader
- Networks, self-managed teams
- Knowledge, information and response time
- Nomadic, equal, flexible
- Self-evaluation and responsibilities
- Work/life blur
- Relationships

Changes in customer expectations have clearly occurred, which normally means a rise in the quality and reliability of products, and the excellence of service demanded. It seems that there are consistent changes in the size, structure and international focus of organizations, and the managers needed to run them. Economic, legal, social and competitive forces mean that companies have to adapt, reinvent themselves and re-engineer simply to survive, let alone prosper.

Inevitably there are macro, sociopolitical changes in economic conditions governed by new inventions (the electronic revolution), raw material (the exhaustion of certain assets), and political cooperation and competition.

Such change has meant pressures and challenges facing both individuals and organizations. Individuals have to get used to no more jobs for life. They have to think of work as something you do, not somewhere you go to. They need to think of themselves as being employable, not being employed. They need to take more, if not total, responsibility for their own learning and development. Organizations face greater global competition, faster reactions and reduced product life cycles. They face a different workforce and therefore need to be flexible in the ways they manage their people.

Changes have taken place in working practices, processes, design and materials management. In the private sector Heller (2002) has identified seven major changes that have directly impacted on the profitability of firms. These include changes in the desirability (fashion) for particular products and services, changes in product price, changes in market size, changes in promotion awareness and availability, changes in the distribution of goods and service, changes in field support from suppliers, and changes in labour and operating costs.

Some change is proactive, other times it is reactive. Groups and organizations try to bring about change but change is also forced upon them. There is also episodic change, which is infrequent, discontinuous and occasional, versus continuous change, which is ongoing, evolving, and continuous.

The targets and context of organizational change

The targets of change are frequently the trio of organizational structure, the technology and the people. There are often both internal and external pressures for change. Organizations must have the courage to change the things they can change, the tolerance and adaptability to leave unchanged the things they cannot change and the wisdom to know the difference. Many hope to be adaptive and flexible. A major determinant is readiness for change (Armenakis *et al.*, 1993; Armenakis & Harris, 2009). One objective is to eliminate the typical structure in favour of an ever-changing network of teams, projects, alliances and coalitions, which adapt appropriately to internal and external forces. Organizations cannot change everything. They can, with difficulty, persistence and determination, change their goals and strategies, technology, structure and people.

It is useful to distinguish between planned, intentional, goal-orientated change and that which inevitably occurs. Change may be at different levels and applied to culture, structure, technology and products, as well as individual behaviours. Perhaps the four most common pressures to change are:

1. *Globalization*: There is an increasing global market for products, but, in order to compete effectively in it, many organizations have to change their culture, structure and operations.
2. *Changing technology*: The rapid expansion of information systems technology, computer-integrated manufacturing, virtual reality technology and robots; the speed, power and cost of various operations have changed remarkably.
3. *Rapid product obsolescence*: The shortened life-cycle of products occurs because of innovations and thus leads to the necessity to shorten production lead times. Hence organizations have to adapt quickly and constantly to new information, and facilitate transitions to new forms of operations.
4. *Changing nature of the workforce*: Depending on the demographic nature of the country, there are many important and noticeable changes.

Others, like Robbins and Judge (2010) have mentioned factors like economic shocks (e.g., sudden massive increase in the oil price) as well as competition from abroad. The influence of environmental factors such as industry regulation

and market concentration on organizational adoption of change has also been detailed by [Wischnevsky et al. \(2011\)](#).

Hartley (2002) has provided a useful framework for understanding organizational change which has four mutually interacting parts:

1. *The context*: External including political, social and economic forces and internal including organizational size, structure, culture, and history.
2. *Leadership*: Whether the key agents of change tend to be change strategists, implementers or recipients.
3. *Management of the change process*: The strategy and vision for change, the engagement of the different stakeholders, the timing and phasing of change, and whether the change is essentially cultural or structural.
4. *Outcomes of change*: Intended and unintended and how easy they are to measure.

Change is both ubiquitous and constant. Since it can be planned or not planned, some organizations are proactive and others reactive. Change can also come from the inside or the outside; or both.

There are a variety of things that can (and often need) to be changed in an organization (Randolph & Blackburn 1989). At the environmental level these include an attempt to change laws, entry requirements to the market, one's niche in the market or indeed the competition. At the organizational level one can change (with difficulty) the organization's goals, strategies, culture, technology, processes and structure. At the group level it may be possible to change group composition and cohesiveness, as well as leadership and conflict management styles. Finally, at the individual level, most managers have attempted to change attitudes, commitment, performance, skills and motivation.

Change tactics can be described on various dimensions: quick versus slow, unilateral versus participative, planned versus evolving, and aiming to eliminate resistance versus pacification. The choice of strategy inevitably depends on many things, including the importance of the required change, the distribution of power in the organization, the management culture and style, as well as the perceived strength and source of the resistance forces. Robbins and Judge (2010) note that it is fundamentally important to ask who in any and every organization is responsible for managing change activities. Who, in short, are the change agents: external consultants, top management, supervisors?

Besides the factors that seem to facilitate and encourage organizational change, we should note that resistance and reluctance to adopt – or even get involved in – change are common reactions of organizational members (King & Anderson, 2002). Individual employees tend to fear the uncertainty that surrounds change and often distrust the change agents (see Box 8.3). They are more accepting of change when: it is understood; it does not threaten security; those affected have helped create it; it follows other successful changes; it genuinely reduces a work burden; the outcome is reasonably certain; the implementation has been mutually planned; top management support is strongly evident.

Box 8.3 Factors for and against change**Factors**

For change (that facilitate, drive, encourage)

- Repealed or revised laws or regulations (often government-based) that lead to new opportunities, markets or ways of operating;
- rapidly changing environment (geographic, market, political situation) that makes old methods, processes or products redundant;
- improved technology or technology that can do things faster, cheaper and more reliably;
- new product development or selection by consumers;
- changed workforce (e.g., more educated, more women) with different demands and skills;
- more technically trained management who appreciate the possibilities of, and for, the new technology;
- organizational crisis (e.g., impending bankruptcy, purchase) that requires change of necessity;
- reduced productivity or product quality that leads to a change;
- reduced satisfaction or commitment by staff, which ultimately forces a crisis of morale and reduced productivity;
- increased turnover, absenteeism and other signs of organizational stress.

Against change

- individual distrust of change agents, be they consultants, new managers or technocrats;
- individual fear of change, especially fear of the unknown or fear that personal or occupational security will be challenged;
- individual desires for maintaining power in the present structure;
- individual complacency and believing all is well;
- lack of resources to support change so that early efforts collapse;
- conflict between individual and organizational goals;
- organizational inertia against changing the status quo.

Individuals and groups, like organizations as a whole, need to experience different things during the process of change. Old beliefs and behaviours need to be challenged, rejected, unfrozen and the new patterns established.

Change involves the unfreezing of old ways, the change then being established, and the refreezing into a normative pattern. When does change occur

and when not? Whether or not an organizational change will be made depends on members' beliefs regarding the relative benefits and costs of making the change.

In order to evaluate the efficiency of an intervention programme, researchers often give questionnaires to those involved before and after the change process. [Golombiewski et al. \(1976\)](#) proposed that changes in numerical ratings on the questionnaires typically used in evaluating interventions confound three types of change: alpha, beta and gamma change. 'Alpha change' is a shift in the numerical rating that reflects real change in the target of the intervention. 'Beta change' is a recalibration of the scale. 'Gamma change' is the redefinition of the construct underlying the scale.

There are many types of organizational change. [Burke \(2002\)](#) has listed six; revolutionary versus evolutionary, discontinuous versus continuous, episodic versus continuing flow, transformational versus transactional, strategic versus operational, total system versus local option. Change operates at the level of the individual, the working group and the organization as a whole. Strategies for change work differently at the different levels. You change individuals by training, coaching, appraisal, and change selection and recruitment strategies. You change work teams by team building processes and encouraging self-management. You change organizations by focusing on culture, structures and processes.

Over the years, various different approaches to organizational change have been proposed. These include the well-known three-step model of [Lewin \(1951\)](#) that involves unfreezing the status quo, moving to a desired end state, and refreezing or setting in place new processes, procedures and, sometimes, people. It also involves a close analysis of both the driving and restraining forces that bring about change.

[Kotter \(1995, 2007\)](#) essentially extended this model with eight steps: the first four are unfreezing, the next three change and the final freezing.

1. Establish a constant sense of urgency by creating compelling reasons for why change is needed.
2. Form a coalition with those with enough power to lead the change.
3. Create a new version to direct the change and strategies for achieving the version of the new organization.
4. Clearly communicate the vision throughout the organization to all those relevant to the process.
5. Empower others to act on the goal by removing barriers, to change and encourage appropriate risk-taking and creative problem-solving.
6. Plan for, create and reward short-term 'wins' that move the organization toward the new structure and process.
7. Consolidate improvements but reassess changes and make necessary adaptations in the new programmes.

8. Constantly reinforce the changes by demonstrating the relationship between new behaviours and organizational success. Change sticks when it is rooted in social norms, shared values and is reflected in the 'way we do things around here'.

Critical mistakes that change leaders often do in each of these eight phases of change are presented in Box 8.4.

Box 8.4 Critical errors related to each of the eight steps of change (Kotter, 2007)

Steps of change	Critical errors
1	• Not establishing a great enough sense of urgency
2	• Not creating a powerful enough guiding coalition
3	• Lacking a vision
4	• Undercommunicating the vision
5	• Not removing obstacles to the new vision
6	• Not systematically planning for and creating short-term wins
7	• Declaring victory too soon
8	• Not anchoring changes in the organization's culture

A third approach applies traditional organizational development methods such as survey feedback or process re-engineering. A more recent method is appreciative enquiry, which comes out of positive psychology. Positive psychology recommends a strength-based approach to change. The idea is to identify strengths, namely things that one is good at, and aim to exploit these more efficiently. The appreciative enquiry school aims to strengthen an organization's capacity to bring about change.

A central feature of this approach is to focus on positive emotions and experiences, which help people to embrace change.

Factors associated with organizational change

Some factors make organizations ripe for, and amenable to, change, but render others much more difficult to change in fundamental ways. Although these factors may include wider macroeconomic reasons (such as increased competition from the Third World), legal changes (protecting certain groups or markets or prohibiting products), or sociological changes (in attitudes to particular issues), it is simplest to divide these into various organizational and personal characteristics (Westwood, 1992).

Organizational factors

Centralization of decision-making: Where decisional prerogatives are concentrated at the highest levels of the organization, there is a natural tendency for those in authority to try to maintain and protect their position of power and to resist change. However, the likelihood of change in organizations, especially small ones run by owner-managers, depends in large measure on the personality characteristics of the person(s) at the top. In the hands of progressive and dynamic leaders, organizations tend to be quite flexible and adaptable. Radical individual leaders can also change large organizations, but centralization is usually a result of, and a contributor to, anti-change bureaucracy.

Organizational hierarchy: Tall organizations with high degrees of differentiation in terms of social status, administrative position and compensation levels tend to exhibit less change than do organizations with flat structures. In highly hierarchical organizations, people who are high up on the administrative ladder are typically insulated from operational problems that may require change. They have also spent a long time getting there and feel they deserve their current status. Such organizations tend to be unresponsive to changing forces within, and sometimes outside, the organization. This may account for the current enthusiasm for de-layering and downsizing middle-management jobs, although there is now much doubt about the wisdom of downsizing.

Degree of formalization: The greater the extent to which organizational activities are governed by formal rules and procedures, the less flexible the organization is and the less likely it is to respond readily to external changes. Local, national and international laws and customs may well inhibit change. Of course formalization is a factor that may be conducive to the implementation of change.

Degree of professionalization: The degree of professionalization of organizational members is understandably high in such organizations as law offices, medical clinics and engineering firms, and comparatively low in most mass-production manufacturing companies. Sometimes, because of their commitment to knowledge and quality of performance, professionals tend to favour continuous adaptation to changing technologies, and therefore exert a slow but positive influence on organizational change. But many are independently minded and can cause much internal disagreement. Thus, advertising and engineering firms tend to be more given to change than are law firms and financial institutions, which tend to be more tradition bound, partly because of the speed and nature of change in the profession. Because they have more to lose (years of poorly paid training), some professionals are strongly against change of any sort, because they want to recoup their losses.

Complexity: Organizations that undertake wide-ranging tasks or produce multiple products usually perceive a greater need for change than do organizations with simple structures and processes. Complex systems interact with many segments of the external environment, and the adaptive process therefore requires many and more frequent organizational changes. Furthermore,

they assume the habit of change more easily. But complexity of operation and structure certainly mitigate against speed and ease of change.

Organizational size: Small organizations tend to be less formal and less differentiated and therefore more flexible. Moreover, smaller organizations typically have fewer resources committed to specific activities or processes, and therefore incur relatively few sunk costs of change compared to large organizations. On the other hand, large organizations have the ability to absorb a possible failure of a change attempt because they have many resources, which, in turn, encourages adaptability and change.

Age of the organization: The older the organization, typically the greater the degree of formalization and standardization of procedures, and therefore older organizations tend to be less flexible. They have more formal and established commitments to their external environments (in the form of contracts or working arrangements with trade unions, suppliers, competitors, regulatory agencies, and other entities with which they regularly interact), thereby limiting their opportunities for change somewhat. But having seen the need for change previously, and having done so (simply in order to survive), they may have accumulated the experience necessary to cope with change more effectively. Indeed, it may be that, being in an old organization (staying alive in the business world) one has to be change-oriented.

There is a growing argument that organizational culture is central to understanding the processes that lead to successful organizational change (Detert et al., 2000). Culture is considered to impede or facilitate organizational change by shaping the way employees resist or adapt to change. Senior (2000) also makes a lot of the role of organizational culture in the change process. She sees culture as a web of various factors like power structures, organizational structure, control mechanisms, rituals and routines, stories and symbols. She distinguishes between segmentalist and integrative cultures. The former are specialistic, compartmentalized organizations with many different departments. They tend to avoid both confrontation and experimentation and have weak coordinating mechanisms. They differ from the more outward-looking, experimenting integrative cultures that are more holistic and future-oriented in their beliefs. The latter are more cooperative and happy to challenge the norm hence more change-oriented.

Previous research on the role of culture and climate on organizational change has shown that a climate for initiative – that is, a proactive working environment where employees are encouraged to take initiatives, as well as risks – facilitates changes in organizational processes (Baer & Frese, 2003). Similarly, computerized technology adoption was shown to be successful in the case of manufacturing plants holding a strong climate for implementation (Klein et al., 2001) and strong human relations values (Jones et al., 2005). Finally, cultures that are externally oriented, paying attention to innovations implemented by other organizations in their sector, to customer demands, to technology advancements, and to changes in the economic and legal environment, are considered to be ‘adaptive cultures’ that promote successful organizational

changes (Denison *et al.*, 2004; Denison & Mishra, 1995; Kotter & Heskett, 1992).

With regard to the issue of how organizational cultures change, Brown (1998) has put forward four key factors:

- *Crisis* An organization experiencing a crisis is what often initiates most mechanisms of culture change.
- *Leadership* The role of leadership in culture change is essential to recognize the nature of the problem, formulate a coherent strategy and action plans, establish new roles and responsibilities, and manage conflicts.
- *Success* For a new culture to become established it must be identified as the factor that solves the initial crisis.
- *Learning* Culture change is in essence a process of relearning, that is, the search for new cultural possibilities.

Burke (2002) has noted there are four types of change based on category (planned vs. unplanned) and order (first vs. second). Hence, change can be developmental, evolutionary, transformational, or revolutionary. As most is unplanned, he concentrated on evolutionary and revolutionary change. Further, he notes that this occurs at each of three levels: individual, group and organizational.

Personal characteristics

Age: Normally, younger people are more inclined to initiate and accept change than are older ones. They tend to be less risk-averse and are more willing to try out new things. More importantly, being new and low-ranking in the organization, young people have little to lose from change. For their part, older members of organizations tend to be more set in their ways, have much stake in the status quo and therefore tend to be more wary about change. Along with chronological age is deference to age, which may inhibit change. To the extent that older more conservative people occupy leadership roles in organizations, and to the extent that organizational members acquiesce to or despise them, organizational change may be slow in coming. A company's age profile may give some indication as to its attitude to change, and more particularly the age profile of its decision-makers.

Training and education: Well-trained and better-educated people tend to be more progressive in outlook and have a better appreciation of the need for the most appropriate time to set in motion effective strategies of change. They can be aware of the potential impact of change on the organization and have a clear understanding of the cost of implementing change. They base their judgements more on facts and analysis than on personal values and sentiments, and usually have more confidence in their ability to learn new skills.

Rank: People of rank and status at the upper reaches of the administrative hierarchy, along with those who wield power and authority, tend to be quite cautious in adopting change, for fear of losing their power and resulting rewards. Yet, the successful implementation of change in organizations requires the active involvement and support of the people who make the major decisions in the organization. For good or bad, organizational managers play a key role in the change process.

Values and beliefs: Certain values, such as conservatism, belief in a just world and work locus of control, may be expected to relate quite specifically to attitudes to, and indeed phobia about, change.

Management courage: To be successful, organizational change requires courage. Furnham (2002) argued that successful change-oriented managers need three types of courage: the courage to accept failure when their change efforts fail for whatever reason; interpersonal courage to confront poor performers and where necessary deliver bad news; and the moral courage to uphold ethical and moral decisions and eliminate various forms of corruptions and counter-productive behaviour.

Quite simply, habit, fear, need for security, self-interest, a different assessment of the selection, and natural conservatism often drive people to resist change. But it may be that attitudes to change are culture- and sector-dependent. Consider the following four questions and the extent to which they are culturally determined:

1. Do people believe that change is possible (let alone desirable)? Some fatalistic cultures may not believe it as strongly as those infused with instrumentalist beliefs. That is, for some, change is instituted externally and one must wait patiently for it to happen.
2. If change is possible, how long will it take and when will it seem necessary to change again? This relates to cultural difference in reactions to time.
3. Do some cultures resist more than others? This may be determined by how much a culture values tradition and is past-oriented as opposed to future-oriented.
4. Do cultures influence how changes can or should be implemented? This refers to top-down autocratic versus bottom-up democratic attitudes to change.

In some countries change is managed at the organizational level through restructuring, the introduction of new reward systems and attempts to change the corporate culture. Other interventions may be based on technology, job design and concern about socio-technical systems. Finally, some organizations prefer to focus on the individual through such things as sensitivity training, feedback, and personal performance and team-building.

One very popular 'people' approach to change is organizational coaching and mentoring for specific, usually senior, people in the organizations. Passmore and

Anagnos (2009) note various differences between coaching and mentoring, one of which is that the former is more performance-focused while the latter is more career-focused. They note the lack of robust empirical evidence concerning the efficacy of coaching to actually change performance over the long term. They also note its rather 'fuzzy' theoretical basis, drawing on such models as personal counselling, goal setting, adult learning, career counselling and techniques from sports psychology.

Characteristics of the change situation

Senior (2000) believes that an organization's capacity to change is a function of eight interrelated factors: general attitudes to criticism, conflict, sharing information and experimentation; the degree to which it is willing to give people autonomy and support them in their actions; the degree to which it encourages or disapproves of the discussion of sensitive issues openly; and finally management's openness to new ideas, especially from below. Thus the organizational culture affects attempts to change all sorts of functions, from appraisal and mentoring to innovation and decision-making. Thus one needs to match the change strategy to the culture which dictates the preferable or 'right' approach to change.

Certain aspects of the change itself affect the likelihood of its being proposed and the chances of its successful implementation. Some of these are objective and can be reasonably well managed, whereas others are based more on perceptions and attitude (Westwood, 1992).

Cost: Other things being equal, the higher the costs associated with a particular change proposal, the less likely that it will be put into effect. Cost is a major consideration in the installation of a computer-based management information system, or in the expansion of plant capacity. But once cost-benefit calculations are done, over a particular time-period even the highest-cost programme may look reasonable if not essential. Ultimately, the cost of not changing may be higher than the cost of change, although this calculation is difficult, speculative and often avoided.

Riskiness: The resource requirements and ultimate results of a change proposal are often difficult to ascertain in advance. As a rule, the less certainty surrounding a particular change, the less likely it is to be considered. This follows from the fact that people and organizations are all risk-averse in varying degrees. The 'no-pain-no-gain' philosophy of the 1980s has made more organizations less overtly risk-averse, but once they have introduced a costly and unsuccessful change, the experience of 'having their fingers burnt' makes them very cautious.

Adaptability of the change: Changes that are irreversible, or those which are difficult to modify once started, stand less chance of being adopted than changes that are easily adaptable. Note the way that some countries make changes in their currency or the use of the metric system. Some have a period when a 'dual system' operates, tending to favour adaptation, whereas sudden change favours more innovative behaviours. Many argue that adaptability is an enemy

of change because it allows those who resist change never fully to come to grips with changed circumstances.

Magnitude of the change: Changes that require substantial time and resources to implement, and those that result in major transformation of organizational structure and processes, are more difficult to adopt than those that entail little effort and few resources, or have minimal impact on organizational life. Moreover, the larger the size of the change, the greater the degree of risk associated with it. In this sense, all these factors listed above are interrelated.

Type of change: Administrative changes are those that alter positions, responsibilities, reporting relationships and compensation, whereas technological changes are those that affect the process by which inputs are transformed into outputs (Damanpour, 1991). These two types of change are, typically, implemented through different procedures. Administrative changes are typically initiated and enforced by the organization's top decision-makers, and technical changes are conceived and implemented by its technical, professional and operational staff. Administrative changes elicit more objections and controversy than do technological changes and are therefore more difficult to implement.

Organizational change strategies

Over the years, there have been many methods or interventions proposed to bring about permanent, structural and successful organizational change. Landy and Conte (2004) have noted that these different methods have similar things in common. First, they are strategic, in the sense they try and refocus all groups into achieving very specific organizational goals. Second, they are nearly always group- or team-centred, rather than attempts to change individuals. Third, they are empirical in the sense they try to set up sophisticated data collection gathering and analysis to give precise feedback on all the changes. Fourth, they attempt to be participatory, encouraging the full engagement of all parties. Fifth, they are always very clearly quality-focused in the sense that they agree to make processes, products and services more efficient and effective. These methods include:

- *Management by objectives.* This moves the emphasis from managing by years of service to actual performance. This involves setting clear objectives and measuring various aspects of performance against these objectives.
- *Matrix organization.* This is where individuals and groups have dual reporting relationships where they are part of both particular project teams but also regular members of traditional specialist departments. Thus, people may be members of more than one group at the same time.
- *Total quality management.* This is a work-group focused approach to encourage and support innovation to meet new customer demands. The idea is to get individuals to suggest and implement new strategies and processes that streamline business and help productivity.

- *Six sigma systems.* This was initially aimed specifically at manufacturing organizations that had quality control problems and many defects. The idea is that everything should be aimed at doing it right the first time, thus making all processes efficient and integrated.
- *Lean production manufacturing.* This focuses on reducing costs and wasted time. It has also been called just-in-time management.

Burke (2002) believes there are three very basic strategies aimed at change. These are:

1. *Empirical-rational:* Based on the idea that in response to an appeal to people's rational self-interest, they will be prepared to change.
2. *Normative-re-educational:* Based on the idea that people are prepared to learn and are interested in conforming to subgroup norms.
3. *Power-coercive:* Based on the idea that people respond to political and economic incentives and sanctions.

Furnham (2003) has identified seven organizational change strategies that senior managers often use to change organizational culture. Various points need to be made: First, the choice of strategy is part function of the culture of the organization as well as the personality and values of the change agents. Second, it is both possible and likely that organizations try more than one strategy, either at the same time or sequentially. Third, there may be other preferred strategies not specified here. Next, it is difficult to assert confidently and with empirical support, that one or more strategy is clearly more successful than others. Fifth, whatever strategy or strategies are employed it takes sustained effort, concentration and pressure to bring about the change.

The fellowship strategy

The fellowship strategy relies heavily on interpersonal relations, using seminars, dinners and events to announce and discuss what needs to be changed and how. People at all levels are listened to, ideally treated equally, and conflicting opinions and anxieties are expressed. This 'warm and fuzzy' approach emphasizes personal commitment over ideas. However, the process may have serious problems getting under way, if at all. Because this strategy is averse to conflict, it can miss crucial issues and waste time. It rarely succeeds in changing culture alone.

The political strategy

The power structure is targeted by attempting to influence the official and unofficial leaders: the 'keepers of the culture'. The strategy seeks to identify and persuade those most respected and who have large constituencies and who therefore shape the culture. Political strategies flatter, bargain and compromise to

achieve their ends, which is usually the introduction of new methods that reflect different values. But this de-stabilizes the organization because of continuing shifts in people's political stances. Maintaining credibility can be difficult because the strategy is often devious and paradoxically often is the very opposite of the values that the new company is proposing in the new culture.

The economic strategy

This strategy believes that money is the best persuader to change values and behaviour. Everyone has a price: a serious increase or decrease in money will change behaviour which reflects the values of the new culture if sufficiently incentivized. That approach assumes that people act more or less logically, but that their logic is based on entirely economic motives. However, 'buying people off' can be costly and the effects short term. The strategy also ignores emotional issues and all questions besides bottom-line profit. It too often is a strategy at odds with the new desirable cultural values of the organization.

The academic strategy

The academic strategy assumes that if you present people with enough information and the correct facts, they will accept the need to change and understand how to do it. The academic strategist commissions studies and reports from employees, experts and consultants. Although such strategists are happy to share their findings, it is difficult to mobilize energy and resources after the analysis phase. 'Analysis paralysis' often results because the study phase lasts too long and the results and recommendations are often out of date when they are published. Also, most managers do not really know what they should do, to whom, how or when. Many people often feel left out and ignored by the consultant academic.

The engineering strategy

This technocratic approach assumes that, if the physical nature of a job is changed, enough people will be forced to change. It is the process re-engineering approach. The strong emphasis is on the structural aspects of jobs: what people do, how and why they do it, and what the realistic alternatives are. A major channel of communication, such as the usage of an intranet, can prompt structural change, but fails to commit most people. Technology changes how, when and why people communicate. It determines the speed and the cost of jobs. Such change can also break up happy and efficient teams. The strategy is limited because only high-level managers can really understand it, it is impersonal and it ignores the question: 'What is in it for me?' It can work well once those who can't change leave.

The military strategy

The military strategy is reliant on brute force. The emphasis is on learning to use the weapons for fighting the law, the union and the media. Physical strength and agility are required, and following the plan is rewarded. But the change-enforcer cannot relax, in case the imposed change disappears. Furthermore, force is met by force and the result is ever-escalating violence. It only ever works when organizations are in real crisis and seriously struggling to survive.

The confrontational strategy

This strategy believes that, if you can arouse and then mobilize anger in people to confront the problem, they will change. Much depends on the strategists' ability to argue the points, as well as being able to stir up emotions without promoting violence – and control them. This approach encourages people to confront problems they would prefer not to address, but tends to focus too much on the problems and not on the solution. Anger and conflict tend to polarize and can cause a backlash.

Reactions to change

Inevitably, organizations are most concerned with resistance to change, which will be manifest in everything from strikes and sabotage, to a drop in motivation and morale, to no participation in, and commitment to, change initiatives. There is both individual resistance and organizational resistance for a variety of well-known and anticipatory reasons.

Change in organizations can be aimed at the individual, the team/group, or the organization as a whole level. Change at the group level involves a number of ideas and processes. Groups, like individuals, often start by vigorously resisting change. Burke (2002) has suggested four very typical responses to attempts to change the structure, functioning or make-up of work groups. First, there is protectionism, where groups muster 'arguments' plus guilt-inducing evidence to resist all change. Next, there is the closing of ranks where groups become interpersonally stronger and dedicate themselves only to resist outside forces of change. Next, groups may try to change allegiance or ownership to remain the same. They may also demand leadership change in the hope that new, stronger leaders will successfully resist change.

Sometimes, groups avoiding or resisting change will simply believe 'this bad time will (soon) pass'. They may also craftily attempt diversionary tactics.

Organizational change causes powerful emotions, from a sense of liberation to depression and humiliation. People's support of, or resistance to, change depends heavily on how they answer the following five questions:

1. Will this change cause me to gain or lose something of value?
2. Do I understand the nature of this change?

3. Do I trust the initiators of this change?
4. Do I agree with the advisability of this change?
5. Given my personality, personal values and attitudes, how do I feel about this change?

How they answer these questions may lead to one of seven responses (Greenberg & Baron 1990):

1. *Quitting*: The most extreme reaction an employee shows to a change is to leave the organization. For example, following the introduction of a major organizational change, such as a merger or a transfer in job assignment, many workers leave because they believe the change is so obnoxious that staying would be intolerable. Sometimes organization members depart even if the change is a good one, because they find it personally difficult to cope with the change. Early retirement is a convenient and acceptable way to 'let people go' who are unhappy with organizational change. Although leaving an organization may be the most extreme reaction to change, it is not necessarily the most damaging one to the organization. Indeed, things probably proceed more smoothly if the most adamant opponents of a change leave rather than stay to fight it.
2. *Active resistance*: Workers who actively resist a change may try either to prevent it from occurring or to modify its nature. At its extreme, active resistance sends the message 'No, I will not do this'. Active resistance often goes beyond personal defiance and includes attempts to encourage others to resist the change. Many organizational changes have been scuttled by active employee resistance. A strike is a good example of group-oriented active resistance.
3. *Opposition*: Somewhat less extreme than active resistance is behaviour that can be labelled 'opposition'. Usually somewhat passive in nature, opposition behaviour might result in no more than simple 'foot dragging' to delay implementation or to bring about a scaled-down version of a proposed change. Opposition is a tactic commonly used by those who control resources that are necessary for the change to be made. By withholding essential resources, people can slow or modify a change quietly without having to make their dislike for the change known actively or aggressively.
4. *Acquiescence*: Opposition reactions tend to occur when those affected dislike a change and engage in passive resistance to delay or modify it. Sometimes, however, those opposed to a change feel powerless to prevent or alter it and they allow the change to occur without interference. This acquiescence to an unwanted change may arise from an impending sense of its inevitability – like death or taxes. People put up with the inevitable as best they can, shrugging their shoulders, gritting their teeth and steeling themselves

to face the inevitable. They hardly welcome the change but understand its inevitability.

5. *Acceptance/modification*: Employees who demonstrate an acceptance/modification response accept a change to a certain extent but have some reservations about it. For example, suppose a manager has been told that her employer intends to move the company's headquarters to another European capital. She supports the idea of moving operations because local taxes and other restrictive ordinances are hurting the company's ability to compete in the marketplace. On the other hand, she is worried that the change may alienate many of its major customers and adversely affect its supply and delivery systems. At a personal level, she would rather not move her family too far from friends and relatives. One option available is to try to persuade her employer that there are sound reasons for finding a different site in the same country. Acceptance/modification responses to change usually can be characterized as bargaining over details (albeit, perhaps, important ones), rather than over principles.
6. *Acceptance*: This type of reaction is likely when people are either indifferent towards the change (i.e., they do not dislike it), or they agree with it. Acceptance reactions to change are characterized by passive support. If asked whether they like the change, for example, workers might agree that they do – but they are unlikely to volunteer such information. If asked to participate in the change, they will cooperate – but they probably will not initiate participation. They may see change as inevitable or that their jobs ultimately depend on it.
7. *Active support*: In this situation, organization members choose to engage actively in behaviours that increase the change's chances of success. Active supporters often initiate conversations, explaining why they support the change and think it is a good idea. They embrace, welcome and even rejoice in change.

Resistance to innovation and change occurs for different reasons. Managers may consciously or unconsciously resist the relearning and adaptation process that is part and parcel of change.

Insecurity may develop when changes occur. Sometimes this insecurity is caused by economic factors. Lower-level workers fear that automation will result in unemployment. Higher-level employees might view change as a threat to their status and eventually to their economic well-being. For example, doctors might resist the professional acceptance of paramedical personnel for fear that the increased volume of work paramedics would reduce the amount of work performed by physicians.

People often resist change because they believe that change is not in the best interest of the team and/or the organization. However, people occasionally do not change although it may be in their best interests to do so. The following is a checklist of factors that account for why this happens:

- *Because of ignorance:* Often, concerned individuals are simply not aware of the changes taking place. Manufacturers may continue to use a certain production process because they are unaware of a better method.
- *By default:* Sometimes people may reject a change, even though they are aware of another better technique, with little justification except a desire not to learn to use a new method.
- *On the basis of the status quo:* Change is rejected because it will alter the way in which things have traditionally been done.
- *Because of social reasons:* A manager may refuse to change because of a rationalization that the people within and society outside the organization will not accept it.
- *On the basis of interpersonal relations:* Because friends and even competitors have not accepted the change or are threatened by it.
- *Through substitution:* Another process or technique is selected in favour of the proposed change, because it seems easier, safer and less threatening.
- *Because of experience:* People reject a change when they try it but do not like it, or do it badly, wrongly or half-heartedly, thus self-fulfilling their prophecies.
- *Through incorrect logic:* People may reject a change on supposedly 'logical' grounds without having well-founded reasons. Collective rationalization is strong when passion is involved.

In short, people sometimes resist change through habit and the inconvenience of having to do things differently. Fearing the unknown, insecurity or indeed economic implications (having to work harder) are main causes of individuals resisting change. Resistance to change, on the other hand, may also be well-justified as, for example, in the case that the decision makers are removed from those at grass roots implementing the changes. In his force field analysis, Lewin (1951) believed all organizations were in a state of equilibrium as a consequence of various forces, some pushing for change and others resisting it. His technique was to attempt to identify all the salient forces for and against change, and next identify those that seemed controllable. Once the most important controllable forces were identified, they could at least be worked on. Lewin's process was then a three-step procedure: first to unfreeze the organization by reducing the forces holding the behaviour in the organization as stable; next to change structures and procedures; and then to refreeze by stabilizing the organization at a new state of equilibrium.

Essentially, most organizations are eager to create organizational culture that copes well with change and innovation. As Robbins and Judge (2010) note, there is data on innovative organizations. They tend to be structurally flexible; they give their managers long versus short tenure; they have a lean and mean nature with few resources and they have good internet communication. Culturally, they reward success and failure, the latter because it encourages risk taking.

They promote development, learning and training. They encourage individuals to become change agents.

Most of all, successful organizational change involves turning organizations into learning organizations that have the capacity and will to continuously change. It is proactive and not reactive, aiming to correct mistakes but modifying all processes and procedures which cause them. Learning organizations aim to prevent fragmentation into silos, competition which undermines cooperation and reactivity rather than risk-taking proactiveness.

Organizational cultures that are adaptive and change-oriented know about the stress associated with change and the delicate balance between demands and resources. Inevitably, stress arises but it is not long-term or dysfunctional.

Summary

Burke (2002) points out that there is always a paradox in planned organization change because it almost never goes to plan. He notes that the ability to change is essential to organizational success and survival. He favours a biological metaphor of the organization as a system which is commonly adopted. Further, he points out, as have many others, that you do not change corporate culture by trying to change culture. Rather, you focus on specific behaviours. Trying to change values and beliefs is 'fraught with difficulty, resistance and strong emotion' (p. 13). Beliefs follow behaviour.

The targets of organizational change are most often the structure, the technology and the people. It is important to distinguish between the process of change (i.e., how it is achieved) and the content of change (what is being changed). Inevitably, change agents need to focus on specific factors and procedures that maximize change. It is also advisable to have some model that allows one to understand the relationship between various organizational factors and predict what will happen in the future. Most importantly, it is essential that the change agents put in place a number of metrics so they can get some clear feedback on the progress on the change strategies at various crucial points. It also takes a determined, courageous leadership to plan how to launch and sustain change to ensure the survival and success of the organization.

External factors to the organization often require internal changes in organizations. The culture, function and history of the organization and the type of people in it dictate how change is best done. The leadership in the organization as well as its structure, reward systems, attitudes to training and development, size and, perhaps most of all, its history of performance are all crucial factors in how, indeed whether, it successfully adapts to change. Management has at its disposal a number of change strategies that can be utilized to achieve sustainable change, such as the fellowship, the academic or the economic strategy. Indeed a combination of various strategies seems to be the best way to proceed with change management after taking into account the cultural, structural and

technical aspects of a particular organization. Resistance to change is a common reaction of organizational members to change management programmes grounded primarily on the uncertainty associated with change especially when change agents have not earned members' trust.

Questions

1. Describe some types of organizational change.
2. Which are the factors that facilitate or inhibit organizational change?
3. How are organizational climate and culture related to effective organizational change?
4. List the main characteristics of the change situation.
5. Which are the change strategies that management can use in order to bring about organizational changes?
6. Which are (a) the reasons for resistance to change and (b) most common reactions reflecting resistance to change?

Case study

Resistance to change in a nursing home for the elderly

Hazel Hill is a private nursing home in Britain having an excellent reputation for providing a friendly and caring environment for highly dependent elderly residents of both sexes. Most of its residents are not able to care for their own personal hygiene requirements, dress or feed themselves, take themselves to the toilet, or even walk. Staff seems to cope well with both verbal and physical violence on a daily basis.

The managers, who are also owners of the home, have decided to introduce the National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) training and assessment established by the UK government. NVQ is a standardized proof of competence in a candidate's area of work assessed in their place of employment by trained assessors employed in the same workplace. It has five levels ranging from basic (level 1) to managerial (level 5) competencies. Management decision towards the implementation of this change was primarily a result of pressure from the outside. The local authority's Social Services Department that constitutes the major purchaser of care at Hazel Hill informed all private residential homes that they had to provide a policy document on staff training. NVQ is seen as key to establishing a formal training policy for the home, as well as a way to meet the assurance standards required for quality certification.

It is interesting to focus on the reactions to NVQ training and qualification of two key groups: the managers/owners who have introduced it, and

(cont'd)

those members of staff who are NVQ candidates. The three managers expect that members of staff will resist the introduction of the NVQ training and assessment, and consider this reaction a serious problem that they have to deal with. However, they also exhibit a rather contradictory stance towards the innovation. Although they were initially enthusiastic about the potential benefits of the training, and encouraged staff to take it up, they do not like the thought of the home changing significantly. They have also assumed that staff will strongly resist the introduction of this new policy, and have overestimated the amount of resistance, being disproportionately influenced in their perceptions by a vocal minority of organizational members. Their expectations of resistance to change may be seen to have acted as a self-fulfilling prophecy, in that they adopted an implementation strategy that was perceived to be overly coercive and not sufficiently informative.

Looking at personnel reactions to change, staff members who are NVQ candidates have a wide spectrum of responses towards the new training and assessment policy ranging from active resistance to adoption. Staff views of the pros and cons of NVQ depend heavily on what the individual employee most values in his/her working life at Hazel Hill. For example, placing a high value on patient care and doing one's job well are associated with a positive attitude towards the new training scheme, whereas being concerned with one's individual well-being, financial income and work status are indicative of a negative evaluation to the innovation. Moreover, evaluations of the innovation are not always translated into a matching response as organizational members think of the strategies and resources available to them before acting; in particular, their perceptions of how powerful and influential they are in their work environment seem to be a strong determinant of voicing negative attitudes.

Taking an organization as a whole perspective in making sense of responses to change in Hazel Hill, it is useful to think of the metaphor of 'family'. The managers/owners play the role of caring but firm parents of staff members; for example, management help employees out with personal loans on generous terms or pay for the organization of social events. As often happens in families, the staff can be highly critical of their managers without weakening their sense of identification with the family. Newcomers are seen as potentially distracting the attention of parents/managers and therefore old members of staff tend to be hostile towards them. Finally, the rigid role and responsibilities in the elderly home resemble that of a traditional family where most often roles are sharply defined and differentiated. If one accepts the family metaphor, a negative employee attitude to the new training and assessment can be interpreted as a reaction to the fact that they are being asked to prove something that they think should be taken on trust – that is, their commitment to doing their best for the home. Thus, for those employees who most value the family-like features of the home, strong and immediate resistance is a rational response.

(cont'd)

- (1) Did managers/owners' belief expectations regarding the acceptance of change by Hazel Hill employees influence their change strategies?
- (2) Individual employees seem to place most value on different aspects of the working life at Hazel Hill. Are these differences in value orientations among employees predictive of their reactions to change?
- (3) How does the 'family' metaphor describe the culture at Hazel Hill? Is it useful in understanding employees' responses to change?

Source: Adapted from Meston and King (1996).

References

- Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, *9*, 127–142.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, *46*, 681–703.
- Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations and firm performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 45–68.
- Burke, W. (2002). *Organisational Change: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Carnall, C. (1990). *Managing Change in Organisations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cartwright, S., & Schoenberg, R. (2006). Thirty years of mergers and acquisitions research: Recent advances and future opportunities. *British Journal of Management*, *17*, 1–5.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 555–590.
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, *6*, 204–222.
- Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., & Goelzer, P. (2004). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness: Is Asia different from the rest of the world? *Organizational Dynamics*, *33*, 98–109.
- Detert, J., Schroeder, R. G., & Mauriel, J. J. (2000). A framework for linking culture and improvement initiatives in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 850–863.
- Fay, D., & Luhrmann, H. (2004). Current themes in organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *13*, 113–119.
- Furnham, A. (2002). Managers as change agents. *Journal of Change Management*, *3*, 21–29.
- Furnham, A. (2003). *Mad, Sad and Bad Management*. Guildford: Management Books 2000.
- Furnham, A. (2005). *The People Business*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Golembiewski, R., Billingsley, K., & Yeager, S. (1976). Measuring change and persistent to human affairs. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, *12*, 133–157.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. (1990). *Behaviour in Organisations*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hartley, J. (2002). Organisational change and development. In P. Warr (ed.), *Psychology at Work* (pp. 399–425). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Heller, R. (ed.) (2002). *Manager's Handbook*. London: Dorling Kindersley.

- Jones, R. A., Jimmieson, N. L., & Griffiths, A. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*, 361–386.
- King, N., & Anderson, N. (2002). *Managing Innovation and Change* (2nd edition). London: Thompson.
- Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B., Sorra, J. S. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: An organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 811–824.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, *73*, 59–67.
- Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading change. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*, 96–103.
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Landy, F., & Conte, J. (2004). *Work in the 21st Century*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Marks, M. L., & Mirvis, P. H. (2001). Making mergers and acquisitions work: strategic and psychological penetration. *Academy of Management Executive*, *15*, 80–92.
- Meston, C., & King, N. (1996). Making sense of ‘resistance’: Responses to organizational change in a private nursing home for the elderly. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*, 91–102.
- Passmore, J., & Anagnos, J. (2009). Organizational coaching and mentoring. In S. Cartwright and C. Cooper (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Well-Being* (pp. 497–519). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Randolph, W., & Blackburn, R. (1989). *Managing Organisational Behaviour*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2010). *Essentials of Organizational Behaviour*. Boston: Pearson.
- Senior, B. (2000). Organisational change and development. In N. Chmiel (ed.), *Introduction to Work and Organisational Psychology* (pp. 347–381). Oxford: Blackwood.
- Westwood, R. (ed.) (1992). *Organisational Behaviour*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Wischnevsky, J. D., Damapour, F., & Mendez, F. A. (2011). Influence of environmental factors and prior changes on the organizational adoption of changes in products and in technological and administrative processes. *British Journal of Management*, *22*, 132–149.

PROOF

QUERIES TO BE ANSWERED BY AUTHOR (SEE MARGINAL MARKS)

IMPORTANT NOTE: Please mark your corrections and answer to these queries directly onto the proof at the relevant place. Do NOT mark your corrections on this query sheet.

Chapter 8

Query No.	Page No.	Query
AQ1	184	Please confirm insertion of “working hours” for clarity.