Chapter 11

11.0 Implementation, Control and Evaluation of Change Programmes

Implementation is a critical stage in managing are of a change programme. There are certain specific managerial tasks to be performed during the implementation process since changes differ a lot in terms of nature and scope the implementation process and hence the managerial tasks requirements also vary from one change programme to another. In this section, the implementation issues related to small and major change programmes have been discussed. The complex (mega) strategic changes viz. turnaround and transformation changes have discussed in chapter 12.

11.1 The Implementation Process

Once the need for change and its nature and scope has been identified, the change implementation i.e., the actual execution of the change programme is to be initiated. There are several important managerial actions required to be taken in implementation of a change programme viz. creating appropriate structure for implementation, providing adequate communication and ensuring required level of commitment from all concerned. It also requires appropriate monitoring, control and evaluation for effective implementation of a change programme.

Change programmes differ in terms of number of people involved. There may be only a few people, confined to a small part of the organisation or there may be many people involved, spread throughout the organisation.

Changes also differ quite a lot in terms of clarity about the beginning and the end points. Only some changes are "stand alone" type. Most changes, especially those of "Turnaround and Transformation" type involve a series or even chains of changes. The chains may be simple one or highly complex, akin to botanical growth of plants.

Change implementation can, thus, be classified into three different categories of changes; namely: small, simple changes; large or major organisational changes; and turnaround & transformational type mega changes.

11.2 Implementing a Small Change

While strategic changes are normally large and significant, it is useful to start with issues in implementation of small changes in organisation for two reasons. Firstly it difficult to demarcate precisely small and major changes. Secondly, strategic changes often involve a series of small changes to be managed in different parts of the organisation. An appreciation of implementation of small changes helps in knitting/ integrating small changes associated with mega change programmes like mergers/ turnaround and transformation..

Small Changes are the ones which affect a small part of the organisation, in a small way. The number of people affected being less, the resistance to change is likely to be less. The changes are more of technical in nature and do not involve intensive changes in peoples' behaviour, habits, orientation etc. at least not of a significant mass. The barriers to change are thus, few and less powerful. These are more or less standalone kind of change programmes.

Small changes have a clear beginning and end. The time frame may vary, depending upon the

size and spread i.e., the parts of organisation affected, the level of complexities involved, resources available etc. The source of authority for approving the project is normally the change agent himself or his close superiors or counterparts. The change target is also not hostile to the change proposal as it does not affect them very adversely. The examples of such changes could be minor changes in a product feature, a change in office procedure or so on. Not too many elaborate arrangements are required for implementing small changes. The change may have to be explained to the few people who are closely associated with the change and their concurrence is to be taken so that the changes can be expeditiously and promptly executed. The success of the change programme lies in how well and clearly the change agent has been able to clearly establish relative superiority of the change programme to the existing state. Small changes may be introduced usually as a one shot process, after ensuring necessary administrative approval from the concerned authority. The key ability required for the change agent is to work out complete technical details of the change programme, asses the resources required, if any, and identify the key persons who are to be associated with the change. The change agent has to guard against the peer group jealousy, which might develop if the change programme is effectively implemented, especially if the change agent in not the final approving authority for the change programme.

The change tasks are unique to the organisations in terms of challenges they pose. A small change in one organisation, say in the office procedures, may not be a small one for another organisation, as the organisation settings in terms of barriers to change may be very different. It may be noted that the small changes do not mean they are small in terms of benefit that they may fetch to the organisation for example, a minor change in operating procedure in a service organisation may give substantial savings. In the case creation of a computer centre for training[1], there were substantial savings and opportunities for generating additional revenues. A change in a product feature may considerably increase the customer appeal and thus the revenue and profits.

11.3   Implementing a Major Change Programme

A major change programme is one that envelops a large part of the organisation, at times the entire organisation. It could be introduction of a new technology, a new system, a reorganisation and alike. The boundaries or the scope of such change programme are fairly clear. The beginning and end could also be well defined. However, if due care is not taken the visible or the mechanistic part of it may be completed, but the end results may not be achieved. For example, in introduction of a new performance appraisal system in an organisation, it was found that the elaborately designed, technically excellent forms were introduced for improving the appraisal system. But it did not help in improving the actual perform appraisal: the arbitrariness in the performance evaluation continued (indeed increased). The performance appraisal was reduced to form filling. Even the useful part of it, the self evaluation for developmental purpose was lost. The same happened in the case of introduction of performance budgeting system in a bank. The branch managers were required to fill up several forms, well designed. But they did so only as the last date for mailing it to head office approached. The figures of previous year were accurately furnished which were already available at the controlling (regional) office. The branch managers were supposed to do environmental analysis of their command areas, to identify and assess the business potential (for making the target setting for the branch a realistic one), which they could not do. Indeed, they did not quite follow the meaning of environmental analysis. Even many regional offices and some higher offices did not understand correctly the very purpose of the exercise. The branch managers continued to suggest less than what they could achieve by stretching themselves (expecting that regional office will any way demand 20% more higher targets). The regional managers also continued the older ways, demanding more under the assumption that branches must have built at least 10% cushion. Indeed, the target setting exercise

itself defeated the purpose as it started after the accounting year had already commenced and for the first quarter of the year, there were hardly any targets available to the branches. To cap it all, a resource allocation team followed the target setting team, often expressing inability to provide resources commensurate with the activity targets agreed. Nothing changed in the real terms except that the cost of paper work got added.

11.3.1 Implementation Requirements of a Major Change Programme

Implementing a major change programme is like a project work of constructing a building. There are several tasks and activities (often complex ones), which are required to be carried out, at large scale. It needs a team of facilitators. Managing transition from the existing state of affairs to the desired one requires an exclusive management structure for implementing the change programme effectively.

A major change programme affects a large part of the organization. It is rarely a "purely technical" change. It requires change in the habits, the attitudes, the orientation of people and the interpersonal relations. It creates tensions and anxieties on account of the ("delearning" and) "relearning" associated with the change. The people in change target normally have apprehensions about their ability to cope with the change. It requires conscious efforts to mitigate their apprehensions and enable them to adapt the change.

A major change programme has four critical pre-requisites for its successful implementation[2]. These are:-

(a)   creating a structure for implementation;
(b)   developing an Activity or Process Plan;
(c)   providing adequate communication about the change programme; and,
(d)   ensuring required level of commitment from all concerned.

A)   Providing Structure for Managing Transition

A change programme has three states; the existing one, the transition state and the ultimate desired state. Transition is a unique state in any change programme It requires a separate, exclusive structure and management, which is congruent with the tasks involved and organization of the resources. Its main task would be to do detailed action planning and to coordinate execution of the change programme, to solve the problems that may come in the way and then monitor the progress of implementation. There are several alternative structures possible. For example, the chief executive himself may become the project manager; a line or staff executive may be given a temporary assignment, who operates from the project executive office and has powers of executive officer to manage the change; the assignment may be given to the operations people as additional responsibility (thus enriching their job). But the most common and desirable form is to form a project group or task force.

The task force is a temporary group of appointed or elected persons. The members may be on a full time or part time basis.

What should be the composition of the task force? While it will depend upon the nature and scope of the change programme and availability of right kind of persons, the following general guidelines may be used for the purpose:-

(1)   There should be someone who is exclusively responsible as head of the change programme; i.e., managing transition should be his key responsibility.

(2)   He should have a high level of commitment to the proposed change programme.

(3)   The rest of the membership may be composed of representatives drawn from different organizational levels and areas based upon:

     (a)   the specialist knowledge or inputs required from different functional areas or organizational level for executing the change programme and availability of such expertise;

     (b)   the availability of the natural leaders, who enjoy the trust and confidence of a large number of their colleagues;

     (c)   the members are able to work with others in the group and are cordial to other members of the organization (whose recommendations are generally valued and adopted).

     (d)   each member should have a high level of commitment to the proposed change programme.

(4)   The membership should be solicited from people who have expertise and reduce/solve the problem rather than be entrusted to those who "available" on account of not having enough work or responsibility in their own area or domain.

(5)   The task force must have appropriate orientation as discussed below:

     (a)   Systems Orientation: The task force should have a clear understanding of the way the organization works internally and interacts with its environment.

     (b)   Problem Solving Orientation: The task force should have problem solving orientation to be able to find solutions rather than getting bogged down with unexpected problem which are bound to arise the implementation gets under way. They must be able to strike consensus.

     (c)   Multidisciplinary Orientation: The task force must have multidisciplinary orientation, to be able to have an integrated view of change programme and be able to develop an integrated implementation plan.

     (d)   Innovation Orientation: The implementation of change programme rarely involves walking over treaded path. It requires finding new and novel solution to apparently insurmountable problems, at times facing the dead end of the road.

     (e)   Change Orientation: The task force must have flexibility to be able to adapt to the changes proceeding around it, be it a change in the organizations' environment, political support initially available or envisaged, resource crunch or alike.

(6)   The task force must accept the boundaries of change programme, the objectives to be achieved and the basic premises on which the change has to be managed.

B)   Developing an Activity or Process Plan

Once the desired change objectives have been set up, it is necessary to develop an explicit plan, detailing specific activities which are to be undertaken and critical events or incidents that must occur to get it there. For example, if an organization has to switch over from manual system of operations to computer based system of working, the process plan for the same would have a time table covering issues like: by what time the computers will be installed, by what time training would be imparted, how long both the manual and the computer based system will run in parallel,

when manual system will be withdrawn etc. Similarly in the case of a major structural change, the process plan will have a timetable for: when the meetings will be held to clarify new roles, when information will be communicated, to whom all it be communicated and on what date, when new structure will be come in operation and so on.

The process plan is a road map of change effort. An effective process plan will have the following characterised.

1. It is purposeful -- the activities to undertaken are clearly identified with the goals and priorities of change.
2. It is task specific -- the activities must be clearly and specifically identified, rather than broadly generalized.
3. The plan is integrated one -- different activities must be clearly linked together.
4. It should be temporal -- each activity must be time sequenced.
5. It has reasonable speed -- the time frame for each activity and overall plan should be reasonable too fast paced (which may create overloading on the system and lead to distortions in terms of the end results desired). Too slow placed a plan may not create enough euphoria and enthusiasm for change.

C)   Providing Adequate Communication

Communication is one of the most important elements contributing to the success of a change programme. Poor communication may thwart an excellent change programme, peoples' behaviour or response to a change programme depends to a great extent upon the communicate they receive. Inadequate or improper communication may create apprehensions and anxieties in people's mind about their ability to cope with the change envisaged and result in their resistance to change, active or passive.

The purpose of communication is make each person of change target understand clearly the purpose, and objectives of the proposed change programme and the "what" and the "how" part of the change that he has to undergo i.e., in what way his present role, behaviour, actions, work flows (to and from him) would alter in the new situation, to enable him readjust to deliver the end result. Besides this, they should be able to have an appreciation of how it going to a benefit them directly/indirectly, immediately, or over period of time (at least not going to deprive them, the benefit they already enjoy). The communication must instill confidence in them that they shall be able to adjust and cope with the change.

The requirements of "whats", "whys" and "hows" of a change programme, especially of a large and complex change programme differ from one person (or a group of person) to another, and more than one/ different modes and methods of communication may have to be used. It could be office memorandums, conferences, meetings, presentations, dramas, discussion seminars etc. depending upon the requirement of the change programme and organization settings.

Communication has to be two way rather than one way from the change agent/clientele to the change target. Without two way communication it will be impossible to gauge whether the change target has received it in letter and spirit. If the communication is not owned by the change target, it affects their behaviour, orientation and attitudes. Feedback is important. Participation of people in the design of change process helps in improving communication. However, not all the time it is possible to involve people directly in change programme design. Alternative strategies therefore, become necessary to use for communicating the change programme.

Care should be taken that communication is precise, concrete, adequate and authentic. For want of that other unauthentic channels and grapevines may be used by the change target to supplement their information requirement. This may create confusion and information overload. Due care should be taken to guard against such an eventuality.

D)   Ensuring Adequate Level of Commitment to Change

No change programme can be successfully implemented unless the change agent has been able to secure adequate level of organizational commitment. What constitutes adequate level of organisational commitment? The commitment of the top management level is imperative for any organizationwide change programmes, at least people who have keen interest and/ or have major say in the decision making process regarding the change programme. They must unequivocally support it. So is the case with the key resource providers. This is imperative, but this alone is not enough. The change agent must be able to secure the commitment from the critical mass of the change target and the people being involved as "facilitator" (the project team members).

What constitutes the critical mass will depend upon the change programme proposed. The critical mass should not be worked out on the basis an overall majority of change target group, but majority in each of the heterogeneous representative groups in the organization, which are likely to be affected in one or the other way, by the change programme. The heterogeneity could be in terms of functional areas, levels in organizational hierarchy or other social groups like trade unions and the opinion leaders.

The level of commitment is not to be assessed only in terms of number of people, but the degree to which they have committed to the change programme. A high degree of commitment would be reflected in terms of peoples' behaviour: going out of way to support or help the change programme, actively promote it in their constituencies, bear extra pains in mobilizing support and resources for the change programme and so on. A moderate level of support would be manifested in people extending help which they can provide with relative case, making themselves available whenever required for meetings or collective action, helping out in finding solution, providing occasional advise if and required. A low level of commitment will be manifested by one avoiding one's availability when required, postponing decision making on flimsy grounds, withholding resources at his disposal from being used for the purpose of change programme and so on. A high level of commitment from 20-30% and moderate level of commitment from 50-60% of the change target is necessary to ensure before starting implementation of the change programme.

There are several alternatives ways, as described below, for developing or securing organizational commitment to the change programme, a combination of two or more of which may be needed in any change situation:

1.   Communication is found to help in increasing the level of commitment. As discussed earlier, it helps people in clarifying the change one has to undergo, removes unwarranted apprehensions, explains coping strategies and instills confidence in one's ability to cope with the change.
2.   Participation helps in enhancing commitment. It not only helps in improving peoples' understanding of various issues involved and the totality of the change programme, but also in people "owning" the change programme. The change agent, however, has to be extremely careful in securing commitment through participation. If he is not good in articulating his ideas about the change programme well, participation may be lead to highly

divergent, incompatible suggestions emanating which may be difficult to accommodate in the master plan of the change programme. Accepting them may cripple the well "elaborated" design of the change programme. Rejecting the suggestion may kill the change target's enthusiasm and lead to their withdrawal, which may result in decreased rather than increased commitment to the change programme.

3. Training courses and educational programmes may also provide the kind of awareness and commitment, which may be difficult to achieve through policy statements and directives.

4. Commitment to change can be expedited by starting the change process by treating properly the "hurting" systems, which deter people from coming forward and prove themselves. Relevant information not reaching in time, resources not allocated or released in time, approvals awaiting sanctions indefinitely etc. are some irritants which "put off" people.

5. Commitment to change can also be secured/ enhanced by modifying existing reward system or introducing newer ones in support of the change programmed. Peoples' behaviour and commitment to change programme depends a lot upon the perceived benefit(s) that are likely to occur to them on implementation of the change programme. This perception can be strengthened by reinforcing it with new and unexpected rewards as the implementation gets underway. Care, however, has to be taken that such rewards are not granted in a perfunctory manner, nor be of unsustainable type or order.

11.3.2 Execution and Control of Implementation Process

Once the structure for change implementation is created, the process or activity plan is developed, necessary commitment of change clientele and key resource providers are secured, the execution of the change programme starts. If the project team members were involved at the stage of identification the need and area/ scope of the change programme as well as the design of the change programme itself, the execution of change implementation would start with formal announcement of the change programme to the members of the change target. This may be done either directly by the project team head in a formal manner, or through the individual members of the project team to the respective/assigned constituencies, who may explain the nitty-gritty. The details of various activities that are to be undertaken and their starting and ending dates (at least those of the critical ones) must also be indicated.

If the members of change implementation team were not involved in the initial stages, but only at the implementation stage, the execution of implementation may commence through a workshop, in which the members may be explained the details of change programme, both it's conceptual aspects and the operational aspects. It would be necessary to have a feedback built in to ensure that every member of the project group has understood different aspects of operationalising the change programme. Conscious efforts should be made to ensure that there was no missing or loose ends left in detailing the execution of the change programme. However, despite the best efforts, there is always a chance of some loose ends remaining left, which would be realised during execution of implementation plan. Clear guideline should be provided to the project team members for facing the same. It will be desirable that the minor issues like meeting small resource requirements, adjustments in meeting one's personal preferences and conveniences etc. are left to individual team members, but any significant deviations (especially those connected with adherence to norms, values, premises and objectives of change programme, providing incentives etc.) should be decided by the project team or its head.

Every change programme has several contingencies associated with it. Some of them are on

account of wrong or inadequate understanding of the critical decisions involved and about the sources of resistance to change. This is likely to happen if the change agent's "elaboration ability" is low, or if the change programme involves long and complex chain of decisions. The length and the complexity of the chain increase from small changes (such as change in a procedure) to strategic changes. The other source of contingencies relate to change agent its inability to effectively take care of the barriers to change or ensure that all the decision were right so that the programme proceeds on the desired path and with pre-determined speed.

Every organisational change is only one time occurrence. As a result the problems of measurement for control are higher in the case of change programme than in the case of recurring, operational decisions. The control of progress of a change programme (involving setting up the levels of desired progress on a time frame, noticing the variance between the actual and desired performance and taking follow-up action if deviations took place) is quite complex and defused a task. It is necessary to set a time frame for measuring the progress in terms of task performed vis-a-vis planned. Setting time frame for various milestones to be achieved in the change programme is imperative.

One more care is required to be taken during the implementation phase. Often the monitoring and evaluation for the control purpose is done in terms of the tasks performed vis-a-vis planned one, rather than achievement on the scale of objectives of the change programme. The acid test for successful implementation of a change programme is whether the objectives of the change programme have been achieved or not. One must caution against the mistake of using the measures of completion of tasks involved in the implementation of the change programme as the measure of the effectiveness and successful completion of implementation of the change programme. For instance, the introduction of performance budgeting in an organisation involves the tasks such as development of forms, briefing the concerned executives on the purpose and process/procedure for doing environmental analysis, explaining and actual filling of the various form etc. In actual working, the forms may be filled, data collected and aggregated to arrive at the targets for a given period. But, in the end result nothing might change. The targets may still be set by hunch, rather than based on rigorous environmental analysis, and the actual performance may remain as unpredictable and at variance from the budget as earlier. Likewise, the new technology like Fax, Electronic Mail etc. be introduced, but it may not result in any improvement in decision making, speed, quality, and action. The Fax messages may be delivered to the concerned persons in 7 days and the electronic mail may never get connection when required. Thus, on the face of it, it would look that the change programme has been successfully implemented as all the tasks involved have been completed. But the success of the change programme is questionable, since the purpose of the change programme is not achieved. It is, therefore, necessary that the change agent explicitly measures performance of change programme on the purpose of the change programme (not only on the tasks performed) before concluding that the change implementation phase is over and thus withdrawing from the scene.

It may be noted that the measurement of the progress on the task performed is more akin to managing a project, or infrastructure creation rather than measurement for operational control. The successful introduction of a change programme requires a critical speed in the implementation stage, especially in case of strategic changes, which involves a large number of sub programmes of change, often intricately related. As a result the failure of any single sub-programme may jeopardise the entire change programme. It may also be noted that the project management approach to the change implementation is relevant only upto the "moving" stage[6]. The institutionalisation phase, especially in the case of change programmes having the techno- behavioural mix loaded more towards the behavioural side, are not so easily amenable to

quantitative measures.

The implementation of a change programme has one more element which is important and critical. Along with the expected (desired) consequences, there are frequently unexpected consequences which may not strike the change agent's attention, since the attention is typically focused on the tasks involved in implementation and on the purpose of the change programme. The unexpected consequences or developments may be positive or negative. If due care is not taken, then unexpected negative consequences in terms of wrong practices, norms and culture get (or allowed to get) evolved on the arguments of the exigencies of change programme, (as a short term solution to overcome problems that crop up during the implementation phase). In due course these tend to stabilise and freeze. The change agent must keep an eagle's eye on the unexpected negative consequences, nip them in the bud and not allow them to freeze. At the same time he should be watchful to capitalise on unexpected positive consequences that come as a bonus to the change programme, in the form of new opportunities. The case Fun of Case Writing (B) amply demonstrates the phenomenon[3].

11.4   Evaluation of Organisational Change Programmes

Evaluation is an extremely important task in a change programme. It is also one of the most difficult tasks. The evaluation of change programme is necessary for three different reasons. Firstly to help intervention as necessary, i.e, to enable the change agent decide the corrective action(s) to be taken if the programme is not progressing on expected lines, whether and when to cease or abandon action, or whether to expand the change programme to other areas if limited introduction or experimentation has been successful. Such evaluation may be called the **concurrent evaluation**. Second is the **post-implementation evaluation**, the purpose of which is to assess how good the change programme has been to improve the effectiveness and/ or efficiency of the organisation and to assess the capability of the organisation to effect changes. The third type of evaluation may be called **developmental evaluation**. The purpose of such evaluation is to enable identification and development of the capability of individuals as change agents and to foster internal change agents for continuous, ongoing innovations. This is especially so for the organisations which have innovation as one of the key element of the corporate strategy or organisations that believe in excellence as a way of life.

11.4.1   Concurrent Evaluation of Change Programme

The concurrent evaluation of change programme is an exercise, when implementation is taking place. This is to ensure that the change implementation is progressing in right direction, right manner and right pace. The need for concurrent evaluation arises due to the fact that major change programmes rarely have all the details worked out completely before action starts and seldom move exactly on the path initially thought of. Executives are also often faced with decision situations both as a change agent as also the change clientele, whether and when they should abandon a change programme, and if not to abandon, when to cease active intervention. They would like to be armed with the tools and techniques that could be used to ascertain the point of stopping of the intervention.

Towards this certain milestones are to be identified for the purpose of measuring progresses. These milestones are of two different types. One, the task related and the other the objective related. For example, if the purpose was to introduce computer for decision making one set of measurement would relate to timely placing of order, arranging money, getting system

installed, getting people trained etc. The other set of measures would to ensure whether the purpose of providing the system was accomplished. It is the second aspect, which often is lost sight of as the change implementation progresses. This leads to all the resources are sunk but no tangible gains to the organization and objectives of change not achieved.

11.4.2 Post-implementation Evaluation of Change Programme

Change programmes rarely achieve the results exactly as planned and realise benefits exactly as expected. As mentioned earlier, during the implementation phase, there are always unexpected developments (and their consequences) along with expected ones, which may be negative or positive. One has to take into account these unexpected positive or negative consequences of a change programme for concurrent and post- implementation evaluation.

Moreover, the changes differ a lot in terms of techno- behavioural mix. Some are highly technical, such as introduction of new production or process technology, requiring high amount of technical learning, but not behavioural unlearning and relearning (e.g., creating innovative culture). From the management of change point of view the introduction of a complex technology may be easier to handle than doing small looking things like ensuring punctuality in the organisation. The evaluation of change programme which have high technical components that facilitate visible, concrete, and quantifiable measurements to ascertain when the change has taken place, is easier than the ones having high behavioural component.

One must take care of unexpected outcomes associated with any change programmes both positive and negative. The positive unexpected consequences should be identified and fostered/exploited, while negative must be contained and killed. The positive are both in terms of new competencies developed, opportunities generated, increase in openness to change etc. Negative aspects take shape in the form of wrong organisation practices, procedure and system getting evolved which may lead to mal-performing organisation climate and culture later.

11.4.3 Evaluation of Change Programme for Developing Change Agents

The evaluation of change programme is equally important for the growth and development of change agents. Executives, with exception here and there, rarely work only as change agents. Neither are they identified for carrying out such assignments only. Typically they shoulder one or the other functional/operational responsibility. They are usually assigned or take upon themselves the task of introducing changes in the organisation, as an add-on responsibility. In contrast with the regular, routine operational tasks which have high level of clarity and certainty about the nature of job and possibility of success, the task of managing change is full of uncertainty and ambiguity. One is not very sure as to what extent he will be able to successfully effect the change and realise the change objectives. The risks are quite high. This creates problem in setting concrete targets or yardsticks against which the performance of change agent can be measured.

Furthermore, as the change progresses and towards the end of implementation phase, a large number of people get involved in the change process. Thus, the number of people claiming the success owing to them increases. Some of those who might have resisted, even actively attempted to sabotage the change, start making claims not only on the fruits of the change programme, but even for the success of change programme itself, as if it happened because of them.

The problem is more serious with self-ignited changes, as the change resistors would try their best

not allow the change to see light of the day. The change agent may undergo serious trials and tribulation while introducing the change, while the "non-doers" would be sitting pretty, resisting and sabotaging as and where possible: always in lookout for pointing out failure (whether real or projected one) due to "fool hardy" approach of the change agent. They, however, keenly watch and are always ready to make maximum claims on benefits arising out of the change programme. If the evaluation of the change programme is not done, or not done properly, the contribution of the change agents in the change programme may not be realised and he may get no benefit, be completely demoralised, resulting in the organisation losing a good change agent.

Before proceeding on the evaluation of change programme for the above purpose, it is necessary to bear in mind that a change programme normally requires two distinct kinds of persons: the change generators and the change implementers. The starting point is the change generators, the initiator, people who trigger a change programme. They are the key actors in a proactive change programme, who can sense, visualise and see the opportunities where none existed or which others could not see. They are a rare breed. They can and do think new solutions for any problem, drawing from wide variety of experiences. They must be distinguished from the casual suggestion makers. They are one who have high level of creative problem solving skills and are able to innovate given an opportunity. Organisations find it difficult to recognise them. Indeed often it is not possible even to locate them through routine appraisal systems based upon evaluation of performance on the jobs assigned to them. But, it is neither so difficult to identify such persons. They would not be doing anything routinely. An element of "newness" is always there, "newness" not for just cosmetic purpose or to add gloss, but by making real value addition (quantitative and/or qualitative), to the activity, the task or the assignment they may be involved in. They are not resource guzzlers. They do not wait to be told. Indeed, the problem with them could be of a different kind. The way they propose for an improvement may be so unorthodox, unusual and unbelievably simple, that it may deter, may even put off "ordinary" persons (especially the superiors and peer group members) who are comfortable with routine, familiar solutions. While typically people pour others with problems, such change agents drench others with possible solutions. While others think and cite constraints that forbid them to make bold moves, such change agents think of ways to overcome the constraints. Where others see threats, they are able to sees opportunities. It is not easy to get along with such persons who make other dumb by sheer flight of ideas and at the same time are able to provide elaborate details they have worked out in advance, which are good enough to give a try, but look farfetched or too risky to the others, including their superiors to allow using them.

The superiors, who have not been the change agents themselves, can't see and understand the change agents' confidence, as they have not done the detailed thinking that the change originator has done. No wonder he often gets beaten alike by superiors (if they were incompetent change agents) as well as colleagues (on account of peer group jealousy) and sometimes even by the subordinates. Worst is the fact that frequently the superiors, as patron, themselves take the credit coming out of success as their own, while passing failure to the change generator denouncing the him for the unsound idea mooted.

The way to evaluate the change agents is to let them make suggestions and provide them opportunity to create new things. The best way to identify them is to look at the track record. How many times he has taken initiative to do new things, not doing only when he was asked to do so. The next things is to see as to what extent the assignments have been instrumental in accomplishing in achieving the key objectives of the organisation in real sense, not in terms of glamorising the organisation. A key measure for the same would be "Would have the things happened without him? Why things did they not happen thus far"? The change agents should

not be measured in terms of providing supporting function.

11.5   Success of Strategic Change

Undertaking a strategic change, be it expansion, diversification, removal of strategic incoherence or turnaround and transformation or merger does not mean that the initiative will lead ultimately to the desired effects or state. The changing interplay of various restraining and facilitating forces may result in quasi-stationary equilibrium of the organisation to move forward and backwards (often several times, like a spring) until a new stable, equilibrium is achieved. There could be several states in which the organisation may find itself, from no success to full success (reaching desired state). To understand these states clearly, it is necessary to re-visit the concept of organisation Archetype (mentioned in previous chapter) in a bit more detail.

11.5.1 Concept of Organisation Archetypes

Every organisation has certain prescribed framework for interaction within itself and with outside, described in term of roles and authority relationship for carrying out various activities and task responsibilities. These typically form the basic elements of organisation structure design. Organisations allow prescribed systems and process to operate and support effective functioning within the allowed structure. The performance of organisation is greatly influenced by comprehensiveness, adequacy, appropriateness and coherence of the elements of organisation design. This point is well realised from the McKinsey's 7s model[4] of an organisation indicating the complexity and intricacy in the design of organisation discussed in previous chapter. The organisation performance depends not only on the design of these elements, but also and perhaps more importantly on the coherence among various elements, as the strength of cloth depends not only up on strength of the yarn but also on the way the cloth is woven.

A crucial point to note and realise here, however, is that no organisation even the most bureaucratic ones can develop so exhaustive and elaborate prescriptive framework (for organisation structure and systems) that it can take into account every possibility for interaction required and predefine authority system required for all situations[5]. Even if it is aimed, such attempts may be dysfunctional and may seriously impair the organisational efficiency.

The organisational members, therefore, "do" and "must" fill in the rules or ignore them, to aid performance. There is thus an emergent pattern of interaction (or behaviour) that evolves over a period of time which gradually gets established in the organisation. Any conceptualisation of organisation, thus, has to take into account not only the prescribed framework (formal organisation), but also the emergent interactions described variously as informal organisation or organisation culture etc. Ignoring either of these factors will result in inappropriate conceptualisation, since both formal and informal organisations are meshed together in an intricate web of relationships. Different elements of organisation should be conceived as whole, embracing both the prescribed and emergent structure and system.

A more important point to note here is that the emergent pattern or orientation of structure and system is provided by the set of ideas and values (i.e., the interpretive schemes, embodied within them). Structure and systems from this perspective are not neutral instruments, but embody intentions, aspirations and purpose. An organisation archetype[6], in this sense is a **particular composition of ideas, beliefs and values connected with structural and system attributes**.

Archetypes are defined as clusters of prescribed and emergent structure and systems given order or coherence by an underpinning sets of ideas, values and beliefs i.e., interpretive schems. These interpretive schemes set frames for appropriate domain of operations (organisation purpose or mission), appropriate principles of organising and the criteria for evaluation of performance of the organisation.

Table 11.1 Elements of a design archetype

Interpretive Schemes	Organisation Design
i. Domain i. Principles of organising i. Evaluation criteria	Prescribed framework 　Structure of roles & responsibilities 　Decision systems 　Human resources systems
	Emergent interaction 　Structure of roles & responsibilities 　Decision systems 　Human resources systems

It may also be noted that since the organisation structure and systems (both in terms of prescribed framework and emergent interaction) are held in coherence by the interpretive schemes (i.e,, organisation archetypes), the transition from one archetype to another is not easily achieved.

The failure or decline of organisation, thus, may occur on three counts. First, in terms of deficiency of initial design of prescribed framework. Second in terms of failure to design or control the evolution of emergent patterns of interaction. Third, in not taking due care in designing the interpretive schemes properly, and allowing the emergent structure and system to evolve in wrong way, which may defeat the prescribed frameworks totally. The organisation will then have operating systems that give false signals; indicating even outstanding performance when there is a disaster. In such a situation it will be difficult for a new person at the top to be able to analyse and see the invisible hand of emergent patterns in the non-performance of the organisation. He will experience lot of surprises and feel agonized over why things don't happen the way they should, and may helplessly bear unsatisfactory performance until a need for drastic measures is felt by some significant constituent member like the owners.

11.5.2 Managing Transformation: The Organisation Tracks

We now come to the end result of transformation efforts. Managing transition in organisation archetypes is not easy. What are the pitfalls in the process? What happens if the leader is not able to complete the task of unfreezing and refreezing well, in a timely manner? While making any change in organisation archetype, the organisations may follow any of the following courses which Hining and Greenwood call the six organisation tracks[7].

Before we get into the discussion of tracks, it is necessary to be clear with some of the terms used to describe the tracks. An organisation may at any time find itself in one of the following three states:-

i)　　　Archetype Coherence

Under the situation of archetype coherence, the organisation structure and processes consistently reflect and reinforce one interpretive scheme. In the situation of two archetypes, there will be two positions of archetype coherence.

ii)   Embryonic Coherence

Under this state the structure and processes nearly consistently reflect the ideas and values of an interpretive scheme. In this position, however, organisations have structures and processes in which significant design elements are discordant. Further, in a situation of two available archetypes, there would be two positions of embryonic coherence.

iii)   Schizoid Incoherence

In this state the structure and processes reflect the tension of the two contradictory sets of ideas and values.

11.5.3 Movement on Tracks

Transformation of any organisation means switching over from one archetype to another. Since organisation develop archetype coherence between the structure and processes with the interpreting schemes (the ideas and values forming the archetypes), it requires decoupling of existing coherence (between the archetype and structure and processes) and recouping of the modified archetype and structure and processes. Depending upon the managerial competences (for transformation) available in the organisation for effecting the desired decoupling and recoupling, it may follow any of the following six tracks[8].

1. Inertia (retaining existing archetype)
2. Aborted excursions
3. Reorientation
   - Linear progression
   - Oscillations
   - Delayed
4. Unresolved excursions

Thus the organisation may be able to achieve new archetype coherence (that it is able to transform itself completely as desired) quickly or in a delayed manner[9]. In certain cases the organisation may sustain efforts (unresolved excursions) or may not be able to achieve it at all and give up (aborted excursions). It is also likely that the initial archetype coherence is to strong that the organisation is not able to even move towards new archetype (inertia). On the other hand the organisation may start moving but instead of reaching the new archetype coherence, it oscillates for a long time before settling down to new archetype coherence, or reverts back finally to the original archetype coherence.

Review Questions

1. What are unique features of a small change programme, which make it relatively easier to implement?
2. Discuss various arrangements required for implementing a major change programme.

3. How execution of a major change programme should be started? What is importance of elaboration?
4. Discuss various purposes of evaluation of a change programme.
5. What is organization archetype? Discuss its significance for managing a major or mega change?
6. How should success of a change programme be measured?
7. Discuss various tracks on which a change programme might move, instead of reaching destination?

References

1. Krishna Kumar Establishment of a Centre for Computer Training
2. Zaltman G. et. al. **Strategies for Planned Change** New York (1977) Wiley, Interscience.
3. Ritu Srivastava, Fun of Case Writing
4. Thomas, Peters & Waterman, Roberts "Structure is not Organisation" **Business Horizon** June 1980

5. Hinings C.R. & Greenwood, Royston **Dynamics of Strategic Change** Oxford (1988) Basil Blackwel
6. ibid
7. ibid
8. ibid

Lewin, K. **Field Theory in Social Sciences** Cartright D. (ed.) London (1952) Tavistock Publication etc.
6. Lewin, K. op.cit
7. Krishna Kumar **Managing Strategy Implementation** op.cit
8. Watson G. "Resistance to Change" in Watson G. (Ed.) **Concepts for Social Change** Washington D.C. (1966) Cooperative Project for Educational Development Series, Vol.1.
9. Zaltman G., op.cit.
10. Kaulfman, H., **Limits to Organizational Change** Albama (1971) University of Albama Press.
11. Krishna Kumar & Ritu Srivastava Case: Scooters India Ltd. Vikalpa
12. Odiorni G.S. **The Change Resistors** Englewood Cliff, New Jersey (1981). Prentice Hall Inc.
13. Zaltman G., op.cit.
14. Zaltman G., op.cit.
15. Zaltman G., op.cit.