

Change process and models



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

CHANGE PROCESS AND MODELS It has been indicated that the change that took place in the organization was one that pertained to recruitment and placement for vacancies that were created as a result of three employees laying down their positions. Two of these positions were top departmental positions and so instead of employing new employees from outside the organization to take up the two top departmental positions; two people within the organization were promoted to those top departmental positions. Subsequently, there became three lower ranked positions with vacancy. Three new employees came in but they all came to take up the positions at the lower rank. Without any iota of difficulty, the change that took place can be explained using three change process theories. These change process theories have carefully been enumerated below; in relation to the change that took place within the organization.

The first theory that explains the change that took place is the expectancy theory. In an expectancy theory, it is generally said that people are induced to act in specific ways because they are motivated to act as such (Johnson, 2012). What this means is that expectancy theory demands that people pay off the motivation they receive by giving back excellent delivery. Looking at the fact that two people were promoted as a form of intrinsic motivation (Homik et al, 2008), it can be said that the expectancy theory was applied in this instance. This is because by motivating these two employees with the promotions, they will become obliged and expected to work with certain levels of output expectations. If for nothing at all, they will be expected to work above their means as a way of proving to their superiors that they deserve the promotions that were granted them.

Another change process theory that comes to play in this instance is that of

equity theory. According to the equity theory, people within an organization will be expecting to judge whether or not there is being fair distribution of available resources (Fuchs et al, 1997). With the present scenario, fairness and equity can be judged from the fact that the employees of the organization who were promoted can be labeled as resources because they form the basis of the human resource of their organization (Gardener, 2008). Secondly, fairness was attained because their hard work for their organization was acknowledged and rewarded. Indeed, there had been situations within the same organization whereby some employees were very aggrieved because they felt that their efforts were not recognized when it came to promotions and that new employees were recruited to take up vacant top departmental positions.

Finally, the goal setting theory is rightly applied in the given situation. This is because the leadership had a perceived goal of using the promotion that brought about the organizational change to invoking hard work, commitment and healthy competition within the organization. The specific goal was to bring about increased output of work while the means to measure this was to use the annual financial returns of the organization (Wade et al, 2009). Again, the leaders of the organization found the said goal to be very achievable and realistic because there are precedents of how other people have been able to use similar situations to achieve results. What is more, a time bound of two years was set for the goal. All in all, it can be said that the goal setting theory was met because the goal was specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2003).

REFERENCE LIST

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Phillips, N. B., Karns, K., & Dutka, S.
<https://assignbuster.com/change-process-and-models/>

(1997). Enhancing students' helping behavior during peer-mediated instruction with conceptual mathematical explanations. *The Elementary School Journal*, 97, 223–249.

Gardener, J (2008). *Global Labor Relationships. The International Laws on Labor*. New York: Wiley, Ebrary Reference

Homik, R., Jacobsohn, L., Orwin, R., Piesse, A., & Kalton, G. (2008). Effects of the national youth anti-drug media campaign on youths. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98, 2229–2237.

Johnson R, (2012). 5 Different Styles of Leadership Styles. Accessed September 20, 2012 from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/5-different-types-leadership-styles-17584.html>

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2003). *Research Methods for Business Students*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Wade, N. G., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Haake, S. (2009). Comparison of explicit forgiveness interventions with an alternative treatment: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87(2), 143–151.