

# Organizational development and change critical thinking

[Business](#), [Management](#)



Using force field analysis, the case can be explained effectively. The analysis suggests that implementation of change in an organization requires evaluation of the costs and benefits of the proposed change. Changing the current bureaucracy in the organization to self managed teams leads to reduced turnover and lowered costs in the organization. The quality of work improves when teams are involved and the employee turnover reduces which reduces the costs in the organization. The change also facilitates easy decision making in the organization. The costs of the change are that some managers will lose their managerial authority. The analysis also recommends that the support of the proposed change should be strengthened and the resistance to change in the organization should be weakened. In this case, the resistance to change is the aged management. According to the case study, resistance to change can be weakened by educating them so that they can be aware of the advantages of changing the system. By this, they can accept the proposed change (Rothwell, 2009).

The analysis explains that there is a need to bring together the opposing forces so that the change can be implemented. The new generation of managers, which supports the changes on the case study, should be reconciled together with the old managers in the organization for effective implementation of the change. The figure below illustrates how the two forces can be reconciled to achieve the objective of change.

In this situation, I would recommend persuasion OD consultant style. In this style, one does not need to ensure that everyone in the organization is satisfied with the changes that are recommended (Rothwell, 2009). Instead, the person persuades the stakeholders to accept the changes regardless of

the fact that they may not be good for them. In this case, using other styles may lead to failure in the planned changes. This is considering that the management is strongly reluctant against changes. The only option Peter is left with is to persuade them to accept the changes without necessarily agreeing with them that the changes are necessary. The resistant forces will realize the importance of the changes that were undertaken later since convincing them currently to accept the changes can prove to be futile. Peter Sneed should accept the employment offer. Even though the job has challenges, Peter is qualified since he has the necessary experience and knowledge. He knows how different situations of an organization can be dealt with. In this case, the problem facing the organization can be solved regardless of the difficulties that are expected (Harris, 1998).

Large scale interventions are those that come from the top management and then are implemented by the lower level of employees. The best large scale intervention is strategic planning. In a strategic planning intervention, the management should assess its environment and make adjustments to ensure that its activities are in line with the external forces. In this case, the old management of Johnson is reluctant to change. These changes are necessary considering the current environment the organization operates in. Having a strategic planned intervention can ensure that the management will always accept changes according to the external conditions to ensure that the organization achieves its goals. Reluctance to change will be viewed as dangerous to the organization and adapting to changes will always result in great benefits to the organization (Cummings, 2009).

Using the strategy cultural matrix, several strategies can be applied in the

case of Johnson Company should implement changes within the organization. In the first place, one concept (formation of self managed teams) should be chosen and implemented for the benefit of the organization without coming to a consensus with all the employees in the organization. The implementation of the change should be implemented even though some managers oppose the change. The second strategy is to ensure that all the managers in the organization are allowed to retain their position and powers even after the change. This will give them time to understand the changes and accept them hence the change in the organization will have been implemented fully (Harris, 1998).

Various strategies can be used to address the problem of resistance to change on matters relating to union leadership. The first strategy is to educate the employees that unions are not the only organizations that can help meet the needs of the organization. Even though unions are important for employees, negotiations between the employees and the employer can be of great importance to ensure that the needs of both the organization and the employees are satisfied. If employees learn this, they will be willing to reduce the resistance to change. The resistance to change can also be reduced by reassuring the employees that their jobs will be secured and that their salaries will be reasonable. If the employees are reassured of this, they will find out that the unions may not be of great benefit to them. They will therefore accept the recommended changes in the organization making it easy to implement the changes.

## References

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2009). Organization development & change. Australia: South-Western/Cengage Learning.

Harris, P. R. (1998). New work culture: HRD transformational management strategies. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Rothwell, William J., Stavros, Jacqueline M., Sullivan, Roland L., & Sullivan, Arielle. (2009). Practicing Organization Development: A Guide for Leading Change, Epub Edition. John Wiley & Sons Inc.