

When the only way in  
which we



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

When we talk about change, is it necessarily a good thing? Some often perceive change is always for the greater good and advocates change as a good thing. But are those, always right? Change is often inevitable. It is the only way in which we need to adapt and anticipate in order to improve ourselves.

Some way or another we are constantly changing. We grow. We age. And alongside with this, our mentality and lifestyle changes. " Was the game we used to find amusing when we were 10 still appears to be the same while giving us the similar thrill or experience when we are 30? " Are we still as active and agile as we age being able to perform those acrobatic movements that we were able to do before?" These are some of the questions we can ask ourselves if we think change does not happen. With technology advances and reinvents each day, not all are willing to relinquish these changes. Reluctance to change is fairly normal yet a destructive thing. In some cases when managers or stakeholders fail to realize the possible consequences of change such as low morale/lowered productivity, conflict, mistakes, would lead to significant impact to the organization itself.

Thus, decision makers often need to ask themselves " By implementing these changes, what additional value do I bring to my customers, employees and other stakeholders involved?". Living in a global fast-paced global environment, businesses, be it big or small is often hit with the intervention of the need to change. Change in brand identity, such as image, logo, slogan may seem to be minor to stakeholders, but in most cases, it will impact end users on how they perceive the product or services. Large scale change such as organizational change, acquisition or collaboration of

companies is often a complex and lengthy process. This kind of change often has a major impact to the many aspects of the business and one is required to keep changes under control while supporting these changes to transform the business. One of which that occurred in the past decade was the acquisition of IBM by Lenovo. It was referred to as a “snake eating an elephant” site.

I will first mention about how IBM rose to success through change as well as how the resistant to change to adapt was one of their major pitfall. After which I will focus about the vast change that Lenovo had to readjust in terms of their organization goals and vision when they acquired IBM in 2005. Being one of the pioneer in the PC industry, it was a huge move for a company to sell its business to Lenovo for xxx billion especially with its roaring success in the 1980s with majority of equity of the company was indirectly coming from that line of sales. <http://www.tech-thoughts.net/2014/09/samsung-learning-from-pc-era.html#>. WmAN\_KiWY2w.

What made IBM PC so successful back then was due to the fact that the IBM PC was a highly modular design and as such, graphics hardware or storage technology could be easily inserted if an upgrade was needed. It was the first PC back then in the market that was able to do this in comparison to the PC such as the Atari 800 which was built as a highly integrated personal computer. What this meant to consumers is that they are given the flexibility to upgrade their systems when needed. With its huge reputation that IBM established over the years, consumers were more inclined to trust the product with being such a huge organization backing it up. However, what led to their downfall and later, a full acquisition <https://assignbuster.com/when-the-only-way-in-which-we/>

of the PC sector by Lenovo was more of a strategic move. According to Ex-IBM CEO Samuel Palmisano, "IBM's personal computing business would have minimal room for innovation, so he decided to sell".

Though still making marginal profit, IBM decision to sell to Lenovo was because of its location, where it hopes to establish its name within the country's lucrative market. site <https://www.theverge.com/2012/1/3/2677691/ex-ibm-ceo-revisits-selling-pc-business-samuel-palmisano>

Little thoughts goes to the team of 12 when they built that

revolutionary computer system. They did not expect that this would change the future of the computing world and as such they released the full details as an open-source license giving other manufacturers a "referencedesign" that they could start off with. This left the PC industry to give rise to clones.

Who knew an open architecture, thus inviting companies to make knock-offs, and thus lower prices would make to dominate the industry? However this will be another story on its own.