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ABSTRACT

For survival and succeed change is mandatory. Without change no society can develop. Even knowing this the people is resistance to change. To find out the cause for resistance and how it can be managed is the purpose of this study. The authors conducted a primary research by taking the perpetual views from 100 respondents of executive and non-executive categories. The authors have considered various factors such as; experience, education, workers participation, etc. This paper concludes the main cause for the resistance to change.
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INTRODUCTION

Change concerned with making things different. From womb to tomb change is our constant companion. Mankind noticed the ever presence of change centuries ago. Change is the process, tools and techniques to manage the people side of change processes, to achieve the required outcomes, and to realize the change effectively within the individual change agent, the inner team, and the wider system which includes the organization. (Nandeshwar, R.L (2007). Change is beneficial process for the human beings, even though why the people are easily not accepting any change, to know the reason is the foremost purpose of this study.

WHAT IS CHANGE MANAGEMENT?

‘Change management’ is a strategic activity aimed at getting the best outcomes from the change process. Making the connection between ‘strategy’ and ‘change management’ Mitchell
(2002), in a review of effective strategy-making and change management for high-performing VET organizations, describes strategy as “making choices about which customers to focus on, which products to offer, and which activities to perform”, and describes it as “a dynamic and ongoing activity”. Strategic management is about identifying, choosing and implementing activities that will enhance the long term performance of an organization. ‘Change management’ is about managing the changes that are part of or a consequence of that strategy in such a way “to suit the particular organizations context and the type of change required”. Change management is a sub-set of Strategy making.

PURPOSE OF CHANGE

Change is very essential for survival. Change plays an important role for development and growth of society as well as nation as a whole. We cannot predict the change as the need for change often is unpredictable; it tends to be reactive, discontinuous, ad hoc and often triggered by a situation of organizational crisis (Burnes, 2004; De Wit and Meyer, 2005; Luecke, 2003; Nelson, 2003). Although the successful management of change is accepted as a necessity in order to survive and succeed in today’s highly competitive and continuously evolving environment (Luecke, 2003; Okumus and Hemmington, 1998), Balogun and Hope Hailey (2004).

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

To understand the real cause of the resistance to change

METHODOLOGY

Selected three organizations randomly, one each from manufacturing, service and administration, collected data by distributing the questionnaire fifty each. Out of that only 100 responded on segregating it is known that 60 and 40 executives and non-executives have put their views against each question asked for the purpose.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

For our study we have considered the individual and organizational factors for resistance to change. Under individual factors we have taken experience, social consequence, participation. Under the head of organizational factors sufficient resources, structure, climate, limited focus, needs etc., are considered. Make justice to the study we have applied statistical tools like percentage, mean, standard deviation, and F-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Below 5 years</th>
<th>5-10 Years</th>
<th>10-15 yrs</th>
<th>15-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-25 yrs</th>
<th>Above 25 yrs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-executives</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicated the perpetual view of the respondents about the experience and resistance to change. It is clear that more experienced employees are most probably resisting to the change because of their fear of coping with the new which inter alia exposed their weakness. A recent study supports this by showing that individuals with experience performing a specific task one
way will resist change more than individuals with less experience (Sagie et al., 1985). Change by an astute manager who made them consider the performance gap, showing them that automation would enable them to complete the work in a fraction of the time (Sagie et al., 1985, p. 160).

Table 2: Workers participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>No comments</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Strongly disagreed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-executives</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 depicts that 77 percent of non-executives are supporting to workers participation for decision taking on implementation of change, without which workers will resist to accept, whereas, only 8.33 percent executives favoured to the opinion of non-executives. Management can also lessen resistance to change by increasing employee involvement in the change process. Henry Lucas lists some of the strengths of encouraging employee participation in change. First, participation increases employee knowledge about the innovation thus lessening fear. Second, participation can be ego enhancing, intrinsically satisfying, and challenging, thus making workers feel needed and appreciated. Finally, participation encourages employees to believe that they have some control over a system that will affect them (Lucas, 1974, pp. 49). This last point is particularly important since psychologists have shown that even small amounts of individual control over adverse stimuli will reduce a person's opposition to these stimuli (Gratchel & Proctor, 1976). A recent article by Debra Shaw (1986) also supports the idea that participation can reduce resistance to change. In fact, Wilson Luquire (1976) found that attitudes relating to innovation (which in this case was the introduction of OCLC in academic libraries) were directly related to the real level of participative management in the libraries (p.48).

Table 3: Social Consequence (Security, Economic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>No comments</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Strongly disagreed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-executives</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 exhibits that social consequence place a vital role to resist change. 60 and 87 percent executives and non-executives respectively are opined in favour of social consequence effect with regard to security, economic, etc conditions of the employees.

Resistance will come from the people due to fear of facing social consequences, as human beings are very cautious on their social standing. The personnel psychology shows that employees respond better to change when management consciously tries to ease employee fears in a number of ways (Werbel, 1983; Weinbach, 1986; Malinconico, 1983).

Table 4: Failure to Commit Sufficient Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>No comments</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Strongly disagreed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-executives</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table indicates the none-executives are resisting more in comparison to executives with regard to failure to commit sufficient resources to the change.

Fine (1986, p. 92) suggests that it is not uncommon for resources (particularly personnel resources) to be overextended or withdrawn just when staff is experiencing the greatest stress of change. Moreover, she adds that administrators often skimp on really necessary items, e.g., complete training by experts may be viewed as an extravagance rather than as a necessary expenditure associated with change.

Table 5: Failure to Create a Climate Conducive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>No comments</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Strongly disagreed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-executives</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 indicates that 65 and 70 percent executives and non-executives opined that they are the fear of disturbance of nonviolent climate due to adoption of any change in the existing system. To lessen this type of resistance the clear cut pictures should have been provided by the change agent about the consequence of change to the people through professional development activities. Research has shown that employees resist change less when they are given opportunities to participate in continuing education activities, in professional organization activities, and in professional training—e.g., the MLS degree (Maag, 1975).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- Time, resources and administrative restriction is main constraint.
- 100 respondents and three sectors were taken only for this study.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

From the above it can be concluded that generally the employees are resisting change because of in security feeling to lose their job or loss of social status. Change means introduction of new things, which required gathering extra knowledge to complete the assigned jobs as per the desired of the management or otherwise the juniors can supersede the seniors and also fear of losing the job. From the above analyze factors like social consequences, experience, and resources are more dominant variables which create resistance to change.

The authors suggest that good organization climate, education and awareness the merits and demerits of change, training, establishing adequate reward system can reduce the magnitude of resistance to change by the employees. Fine (1986) originally implied that inept management strategies can cause resistance to change to accelerate. Both logic and research support this statement and show us the need for corrective management action. Corrective action can include providing adequate information about change and being generally sensitive to employee fears about change. The literature of management and of personnel psychology shows that employees respond better to change when management consciously tries to ease employee fears in a number of ways (Werbel, 1983; Weinbach, 1986; Malinconico, 1983).

When the employees become highly dissatisfied with some aspect of a task or obsolete process at that time change is needed. Management has to avail this opportunity as and when it needed. Change should only be implemented when a performance gap exists—that is, when people become highly dissatisfied with some aspect of a task or process. Discussions with people before implementing any change dilute the resistance. At the time of meeting general uncertainty employees accept change by knowing the consequences then resistance is less.
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