



Impact of Change Agent in Organisational Change Process

Chandrika

Research Scholar

Department of Commerce

M D University Rohtak

Abstract

The organization continuously interacts with the environment. The environmental forces force the organization to make changes in itself. At one point of time organization feel in affirmative and try to make changes. Change making is not so simple as seems to be. They have to look for a person who can make the change in the organization. The present study provides theory and evidence of the benefits of change agents' closeness to drivers and resisters for change adoption. The literature on organizational change has suggested that closeness to change drivers plays an important role in organizational change. On the analysis upon the contingent effect of strong ties to resisters on change adoption indicate that the business principle that efforts to convert resisters of change are futile should not be applied indiscriminately to all types of change. The present study indicates that when the change does not diverge from the institutional status quo, change agents who divert their influence efforts away from resisters may be ill-advised, as our findings says that strong ties to resisters may in this case facilitate change adoption. The study shows that change initiatives should be systematically considered for the extent to which they diverge from the present institutional status.

Key Words: Environment, Change, Change Driver, ill-advised, diverge.

Introduction

Change is a type of organizational development while the members of the association change by the input of new strategies, which in turn leads to behavioral change. The change will develop the association to more fit prognosticated unborn surroundings (Porrás & Silvers, 1991). Nonas (2005), and Silvers (1991) proposition indicates that the association has complete control over its development. Organizations are open systems meaning that they're characterized by continuously ongoing processes of input, metamorphosis and affair interacting with a girding terrain. It's insolvable to achieve complete control over an open system, while it's affected by external forces conforming of girding systems, like client, supplier, society etc. (Katz & Kahn, 1987). Change is constant revision that comes about of unanticipated events in everyday work. This proposition assumes that it's insolvable to have complete control over the association's development and that the result of a change will typically not be exactly as the prognosticated result. To realize effective and successful change, associations need both operation and leadership. Operation is a set of processes that keep a complicated system of people and technology running easily. The most important aspects of operation include planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling and problem working. Leadership on the other hand, is a set of processes that creates associations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Leadership defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision and inspires them to make it be despite the obstacles. To perform change it's important with competent operation and without this, the metamorphosis process can get out of control. But for utmost associations, the bigger challenge is to lead change. It's only leadership that can motivate the conduct demanded to alter in a significant way and anchor the change in the culture of an association.

In ultramodern, complex associations it isn't enough with only one leader; numerous people need to help the leadership task. The threat with too important focus on operation rather than leadership leads to an inward concentrate and bureaucracy takes over. In companies with success that creates some degree of request dominance that also leads to company growth, the physical expansion of the association leads to a much lesser need for operation. This focus, together with arrogant directors who over estimate their current performance and competitive position; can affect in a "slow" association that has great difficulty in making any metamorphosis or change. This above described pattern is especially apparent in large, established enterprises where getting a metamorphosis process started proves frequently more delicate. It's also a threat that, in these kinds of companies, the change programs are over managed and under led. (Kotter, 1996). The foremost important ethical issue that the association and its leader should deal with before enforcing any change strategy is that of defining the pretensions, behavioral issues or anticipated change objects. In a large association, it's likely that this kind of process will break down making it insolvable to realize the change. The spreading of too important information within the association can be a problem in a change process as the information may induce resistance that there's frequently not enough coffers to deal with. It's better to introduce the change gradationally within the association and in lower groups, thereby allowing for clear and correct explanations and avoiding misconstructions. (Brown, 1991). When a change is demanded, the leader must frequently take the part as a change agent. He or she must guide the association through changes, apply changes and support organizational members in conforming to the changes. Moment, when change is always present, leadership can be defined as the process of managing change. It's the leaders' responsibility to insure that the association and its members are flexible enough to manage an adaption of actions and chops to fit terrain changes. However, the leader must emphasize, encourage and give nonstop education and literacy, If the existent will manage to contribute to their changing association. (Howell & Costley, 2006).

The hazard of organizational failure increases with organizational change and such a change increases the liability of a fresh change of the same type. Both these goods decline over time (Amburgey, 1993). Kelly and Barnett(1993) exploration study is grounded on a model that was presented by Hannan and Freeman in 1984, which includes both internal and external constraints on organizational change. Organizations live as long as they're dependable and act rationally. When organizational pretensions are strong, institutionalized, and the conditioning in routines, the trust ability and responsibility are high within the association. Still institutionalization and reutilization also induce strong pressure against organizational change. This means, that the characteristics of associations stability also generates resistance to changes. Organizational change increases the failure rate of associations, independent of the goods of the changed characteristics. The reason for this statement is as stated over, that a change disturbs the routines in the company.(Barnett, 1993). Causes of workers' Resistance One or some of the causes can lead the change to severe resistance from workers. The consequences of workers' resistance are veritably important to be mentioned then, to reveal the miseries of resistance for association and the change program. The consequences of hand's resistance to change range from; decelerate down of the change(and therefore increase in cost)(Bryant, 2006), lower productivity (outgrowth), workers corruption, high workers' development, disturbance & trouble in change program, failure of change program, and in extreme situation it can indeed lead the association to destabilization & breakdown (Coetsee, 1999; Coch and French, 1948). Organizations may face the below problems in change due to workers' resistance. It should n't be denied that resistance to change might be a precious workers' passion that can be conducted more constructively(Dent Eric, 1999).

The Change Agent

The change agent is frequently a person whose charge is to make the provocation to make the change and help the association to identify changes in functions that must be done. The change agent also helps the association to carry out necessary changes for the future. The agent's task starts with a individual phase where the agent tries to evolve a model with being proposition that's acclimated to the particular association.

In short, the change agent's part is to act as transducer between scientific knowledge regarding organizational functioning and change processes and the particular situation during this phase. The developed model must be nicely complete, prophetic and acceptable to give the association with useful information.(Bowers & Franklin, 1972). The model must be presented to the members of the association in an excellent way, because the issue of acceptance is critical. Indeed if it's a really good model, it has no value without a good understanding of the

members of the association. To realize this, the change agent must be a good prophet and has enough knowledge about the groups' tasks to relate the model with these tasks, that's to say an understanding of the associations reality. In after stages, the change agent frequently helps the associations members with skill accession and perfection. The agent must not only know which chops are necessary, but also be competent in guiding the accession.

Association of a change agent

The association strength is a combination of the quantum of time, the emotional intensity, the closeness (collective confiding), and the complementary services which characterize the tie (Granovetter 1973). Organizational scholars following on Granovetter's steps have stressed the instructional counteraccusations of strong ties, arguing that emotional closeness between two actors motivates them to invest time and energy in sharing complex, wordless or nonpublic knowledge(Hansen 1999). The foundation of trust has been shown to increase cooperation among organizational subunits during a extremity, boosting an association's adaptive performance in response to exogenous and endogenous shocks(Stern 1998). Structure on this exploration, we argue that strong association give a change agent with a relational base to overcome resistance when trying to launch organizational change. Below we specify mechanisms through which strong ties to association members with the eventuality to ail change allow the change agent to reduce resistance and therefore, boost the chances of change relinquishment. We also identify conditions under which similar mechanisms are likely to affect hedge- babysitters and resisters differently. Strong ties can increase an actor's capability to introduce organizational change by furnishing her with an affective base for the cooptation of actors able of impacting the outgrowth of the change action.

Objectives of the study

The objects of the present study are to find out the impact of relationship of a change agent with the workers in reducing the resistance and increase the liability of change relinquishment. It also studies as to whether any diverge from institutional status quo lead to dwindling in the liability of change relinquishment.

Sample

A sample of 50 professionals working at different level has been put in the study. All participants had clinical backgrounds as well as managerial responsibilities, their levels of responsibility varying from mid- to top-level management. The participants also represented a variety of departments in their institutions.

Analysis

The change itself has no substantial downside in the eyes of resisters, complying with the change agent's request for support requires resisters to refrain from acting on their unambiguously negative station toward the change solely for the sake of their relationship with the change agent. Likewise, to push the change through, the change agent has to fail close connections, knowing that they see no benefit from the change. The intensity of a negative station toward a change action is shaped in part by the content of what's being defied. Understanding resistance therefore requires understanding what the change entails. Organizations bedded in the same terrain, and therefore subject to the same institutional pressures, tend to borrow analogous practices. We propose that the degree to which the change diverges from the institutional status quo in the association's field of exertion constitutes a boundary condition on change agents' realizing the benefits of strong ties to implicit resisters. When enforcing lower divergent changes, affective cooptation is likely to favor a change agent, because it may convert resisters to tolerate a change that doesn't alter significantly the functioning of the association. When the degree of change divergence is much lower, the advantages of strong ties accruing to the change agent are weaker, and may turn into arrears that reduce the liability of change relinquishment. Two mechanisms regard for this contingency. First, further divergent changes represent a lesser trouble for resisters, strengthening their opposition. hedge- babysitters have a balanced view of the change's implicit downside and strike, irrespective of the extent to which the change diverges from the institutional status quo. In their perception, breaking with taken- for- granted practices may greatly upset the association but may also greatly ameliorate it.

Findings and Conclusions

In the study measure for mean tie strength with endorsers, in particular, suggests that closeness to implicit influencers who are appreciatively inclined toward the change doesn't give a change agent with distinctive advantages. Endorsers may well prop change relinquishment by backing the action and generating support for it (Markham 2000). The benevolence toward the change agent and desire for their particular blessing are, still, doubtful to change their geste, because their station toward the change is positive from the launch, thereby posing no trouble to their relationship with the change agent. Our qualitative data handed several illustrations of this behavioral pattern. These checks indicate that it's the overall positioning of a change agent in relation to resisters and hedge- babysitters that influences the liability of change relinquishment, rather than other features of the distribution of tie strength with resisters and hedge- babysitters, similar as the variability of closeness, the absence of a particular alter type, or an especially close relationship to given individualities. To regard for the possibility that a close particular connection may be particularly salutary when implicit resisters, endorsers and hedge- babysitters enthral a high- rank position in the formal structure of the association, we ran models including three commerce terms for mean tie strength with implicit resisters, endorsers and hedge- babysitters, independently, and the mean hierarchical position of actors in each of these three groups. We set up no substantiation for any similar pattern. In addition to formal status, the change agent's informal status in the association may affect the probability of change relinquishment, because well- regarded actors may be more effective change agents and have further strong ties to influential members of the association. To regard for this possibility, we constructed a measure of an actor's elevation in the task- advice network using the difference between the number of entered advice ties and the number of transferred advice ties. The addition of elevation in the task- advice network altered neither the direction nor magnitude of the portions for our main predictors. The study set up that the goods of strong ties to potentially influential resisters on change relinquishment are contingent upon the extent to which the change diverges from the institutional status quo. The lower the situations of divergence the change entails, the further affective cooptation favors the change agent, because it increases the chance that the benevolence felt by resisters toward the change agent may convert them to tolerate a change they don't authorize of but which is doubtful to alter significantly the functioning of the association. As the degree of divergence increases, still, not only does closeness to resisters have dwindling positive goods on change relinquishment, but it can have mischievous goods too, as the violent disapprobation of close connections increases the psychic risk change perpetration takes on the change agent, dampening her own drive toward change. The findings demonstrate that the goods of tie strength can be contingent on whom the actor establishes a social connection with. The salutary goods of tie strength were confined to actors with the eventuality to repel the change. These findings indicate the need to theorize with lesser nuance about the contingent goods of different targets of strong and weak social connections in associations. It encourages network and organizational change scholars likewise to consider the affective interpersonal dynamics that uphold the effectiveness of individual agency in associations while counting for the nature of the change.

References

- Amburgey, T. L., D. Kelly & W. P. Barnett (1993), *Resetting The Clock: The dynamics of Organizational Change and Failure*, Administrative Science Quarterly, 38, pp. 51-73.
- Beer, M., R. Eisenstat & B. Spector (1990), *Why change programs don't produce change*, Harvard Business Review, vol. 6, No. 68, pp.158-166.
- Bennis, W. G & H. A. Shepard (1956), *A Theory of Group Development*, Human relations 9, pp. 415-537.
- Bowers, D. G. & J. L. Franklin (1972), *Survey-Guided Development: Using Human Resources Measurement in Organizational Change*, Journal of Contemporary Business 1, no. 3, pp. 43-55 .
- Carroll, G. R., & J. Delacroix (1982), *Organizational Morality in the Newspaper Industry of Argentina and Ireland: An Ecological Approach*, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 169-198.

- Dent, E. & Goldberg, S. (1999, March). Challenging "resistance to change." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 25-41.
- Folger, R. & Skarlicki, D. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: hardship as mistreatment, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 35-50.
- Gagliardi, P. (1986), *The creation and change of organizational cultures: Conceptual framework*, *Organization Studies*, 7, pp. 117-134.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993) *The dynamics of organizational culture*, *Academy of Management Review*, 18, pp. 657-663.
- Hendry, J. (1999), *Cultural theory and contemporary management organization*, *Human Relations*, 52, pp. 557-577.
- Jacobs, R. L. (2002), *Institutionalizing organizational change through cascade training*, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, pp. 177-182.
- Katz, D. & R. L. Kahn (1978), *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, Wiley, New York.
- Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2001, Nov). The real reason people won't change. *Harvard Business Review*, pp 85-92.
- Martin, J. & C. Siehl (1983), *Organizational Culture and Counter-culture: An uneasy Symbiosis*, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, pp. 52-64.
- Nielsen, W. R., N. Nykodym & D. J. Brown, (1991), *Ethics and Organizational Change*, *Asia Pacific of Human Resources*, vol 29, no. 1, pp. 82-93.
- Poole, M. S. & A. H. Van de Ven (2005), *Alternative Approaches for Studying Organizational Change*, *Organization Studies*, 26(9), pp. 1377-1404.
- Staudenmayer, N., M. Tyre & L. Perlow (2002), *Time to Change: Temporal Shifts as Enablers of Organizational Change*, *Organization Science*, vol 13, no 5, September – October, pp. 583-597.
- Strebel, P. (1996, May/June). Why do employees resist change? *Harvard Business Review* 86-92.
- Tichy, N. M. & T. Sandström (1974), *Organizational Innovations in Sweden*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Summer 1974, pp. 18-28.
- Utterback, J. M. (1994), *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Weick, K. E & R. E. Quinn (1999), *Organizational Change and Development*, *Annual Review Psychology*, 50, pp. 361-386.