

**RESISTANCE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE
-SURREY CAMPUS
EXPANSION PROGRAM AT SFU**

by

Wensong Li

Bachelor of Economics, Capital University of Economics and Business 1992

and

Qi Dong

Bachelor of Management (Accounting), Shandong University 2001

**PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

In the Faculty
of
Business Administration

© Wensong Li/Qi Dong 2004

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

August 2004

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

Approval

Name: Wensong Li and Qi Dong

Degree: Master of Business Administration

Title of Project: Resistance in Organizational Change-Surrey Campus Expansion Program
at SFU

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Gervase Bushe
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor
Faculty of Business Administration
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Bert Schonert
Professor Emeritus
Faculty of Business Administration
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved:

August 4, 2007

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY



Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this field study is to evaluate the current change process of the Surrey Campus Business Program Design and to identify the associated risks, challenges and opportunities in relation to the impacts it has on the faculty members at SFU Burnaby Campus. By choosing a project charter as a model to develop a contract to commence this project, we attempted to give a clear image about what, why, when, how, and where we will do this project to satisfy our client's needs. We embarked on a series of interviews with both committee and faculty members to glean data about the different perspectives towards this change initiative.

We used the eight factors of the Inspire Action Method for Leading Organizational Change to analyze the collected data and to make a comparison between committee and faculty members. The eight factors are Strategic alignment, Business case, Change leadership, Communication, Stakeholder perspective, Create commitment, Resilient teams, and Aligned performance. We found a large gap between the knowledge and perception of committee members and those of professors who will be impacted by this change.

From the results of our field study, we were very interested in the resistance to the organizational change so we reviewed the relevant professional and research literatures on sources of resistance to change, the contribution of the resistance, types of resistance and made some suggestions for how to manage resistance in this specific case.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express my gratitude to the professors who cordially accepted our interview for their support and assistance in developing this project. We are grateful for the valuable suggestions and comments from our colleagues who friendly shared the useful information from their experience. We want to acknowledge the inspiration we received from our project supervisor, Dr. Gervase Bushe, who he helped us clarify the purpose of the project, choose the methods of collecting data, and develop a set of criteria that would be used in the analysis. We are also grateful to our Client, Dr. Bill Wedley, who provided much more constructive suggestion on how to process our field study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1 Contract	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Overview of Process.....	4
1.2.1 Scope and Objectives.....	4
1.2.2 Project Organization.....	6
1.2.3 Project Charter Signoff.....	9
Chapter 2 Surrey Business Expansion Program at SFU - An Investigation of Faculty Awareness and Alignment.....	10
2.1 Summary.....	10
2.2 Introduction	11
2.2.1 Purpose of this field study	12
2.2.2 Background.....	13
2.2.3 Method used in this field study.....	14
2.3 Interview Data Analysis	15
2.3.1 Committee members.....	15
2.3.2 Professors.....	25
2.3.3 Comparison between committee and faculty members.....	29
2.4 Recommendation	32
2.4.1 Suggestions in terms of the eight factors.....	33
Chapter 3 Literature Review	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Sources of resistance to change.....	38
3.2.1 Different Perception.....	38
3.2.2 A sense of cost and loss.....	39
3.2.3 Communication barriers	40
3.2.4 Lack of involvement.....	41
3.3 Contribution of the resistance.....	42
3.4 Types of resistance	44
3.4.1 Overt and covert resistance.....	44
3.4.2 Rational and Irrational Resistance.....	44

3.5	Managing resistance	45
3.6	Conclusion.....	46
Chapter 4 Reflections and Learning on Studying Organizations.....		47
Appendices.....		53
4.1	Appendix A-Eight Factors.....	53
4.2	Appendix B- Interview Questions for Change Committee Members	56
4.3	Appendix C- Interview Questions for Faculty Members	58
Reference List.....		59

LIST OF TABLES

Table	1.....	6
Table	2.....	8
Table	3.....	9

CHAPTER 1 CONTRACT

1.1 Introduction

This contract is for initiating our project. After interviewing our client to clarify what data we will collect and how, what kind of feedback we will provide and who will receive that feedback and when, we chose a project charter as a model to develop this contract, including the background, scope and objective, project organization and terms. We attempted to give a clear image about what, why, when, how, and where we will do for this project to satisfy our client need.

1.1.1 Background

1.1.1.1 An overview of SFU

1.1.1.1.1 Simon Fraser University

The University, named after explorer Simon Fraser opened in September 1965. In less than 40 years SFU has gained an international reputation for its strengths in the liberal arts and sciences, as well as for its innovative interdisciplinary and professional programs. It has been rated as Canada's best comprehensive university five times (1993, '96, '97, '98, and '00) in the annual rankings of Maclean's magazine and has consistently placed at, or near, the top of the publication's national evaluations.

The University has three campuses: the main Burnaby campus, the Harbour Centre campus in downtown Vancouver, and Surrey campus in Surrey. SFU offers programs at the graduate and undergraduate level to approximately 25,000 students.

1.1.1.1.2 SFU Surrey Campus

Simon Fraser University Surrey opened its doors in September 2002. The SFU satellite campus currently offers undergraduate degrees in Interactive Arts and Technology, Computing Science, and Business Administration and graduate degrees in Computing Arts and Design Sciences. Continuing Studies programs, including Liberal and Business Studies, are also offered. In September 2004 it will move to a new facility at Central City, an award-winning architectural development close to the Surrey Centre SkyTrain station.

There are more than 610 undergraduate and 80 graduate students at SFU Surrey. The number of undergraduate students is planned to increase to 800 in September, 2004. There are 36 faculty members and 41 administrative staff.

1.1.1.2 An overview of the change

In February 2002, The Government of British Columbia offered Simon Fraser University the opportunity to amalgamate Tech BC operations into a SFU campus in Surrey. Subsequently, the SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee was formed to deliberate and make proposals. One of its recommendations of April 2003 states: "...the Faculty of Business Administration should develop, as part of its undergraduate program, a degree program at SFU Surrey with a concentration in the Management of Technology, thereby permitting students to access a complete BBA degree at the Surrey campus." In May 2003, Senate approved this recommendation in principle.

The Faculty of Business Administration then created the Surrey Business Design Program Committee (<http://www.bus.sfu.ca/surrey/Minutes.htm>). The members of the committee are: J C, D C, M F, J H, B R, B W (Chair), and N S (Secretary). Since March,

2003, the committee has held 14 meetings where they reviewed existing programs and possible programs for the Surrey campus.

During its deliberations, the committee interpreted its prime mandate to be the creation of a complete BBA degree at the Surrey campus. Its secondary mandate was to incorporate a Management of Technology concentration within that BBA degree. Projections are for the Surrey campus to have 3000-5000 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) within 10 years. Of this number, 400-450 are expected to be BBA students. The Faculty of Business Administration will expand by about 16 - 22 tenure-track positions.

The Surrey Campus can be characterized as a branch operation of the Faculty of Business Administration that has distinctive features. The standards established at Burnaby apply equally as well to Surrey. Course numbers, admission procedures and the program requirements for the BBA degree are identical on both campuses. Common committees residing at the Burnaby campus determine both curriculum changes and promotion and tenure decisions. Faculty members will have their principal office at one campus, but their teaching assignments could be at any campus. Support staff for undergraduate students will be located at Surrey as well as Coop education advisors.

As a branch operation, there will be distinctions that create a different flavour. The Surrey campus will give greater emphasis to managing change, particularly technological change. Teaching pedagogy will be enhanced through the use of multimedia computer technology and that same technology will be used to keep professors connected across campuses and in research networks. In keeping with procedures of other faculties on the Surrey campus, cohorts will be used to create teamwork and efficient progression of students through their programs. As well as some

of the current concentrations at Burnaby, Surrey will host concentrations in Management of Technology and Entrepreneurship.

Service courses at the 200-level are to be offered in the 2004-2005 academic year for current Surrey students who want to transfer to the BBA program at Burnaby.

Starting in the same academic year, about 50 high school students will gain direct entry to Business at the Surrey campus. After completing their first year courses, they will start taking 200 level business courses in earnest in the 2005-2006 academic years. From that time and thereafter, a regular flow of BBA students will transfer or enter the Burnaby campus. The first Business@Surrey graduates are expected in 2008.

1.2 Overview of Process

1.2.1 Scope and Objectives

1.2.1.1 Business Objectives

Surrey Business Design Program Committee focuses on establishing a BBA program at SFU Surrey campus that is equal or better quality than at Burnaby. The new program will provide prospective students with the new learning experience via the cohort system and technology-oriented teaching method.

1.2.1.2 Project Objectives

To evaluate the current change process of the Surrey Business Program Design and to identify the associated risks, challenges and opportunities in relation to the impacts it has on the faculty members at Burnaby Campus, by July 31, 2004. Through assessment and analyses of the data collected in the interviews with faculty members a report will be

produced. This report is intended to capture professors' opinion of which changes are going well and which changes are not going well.

1.2.1.3 Scope

1.2.1.3.1 The Project Scope will include:

- A written report documenting the findings of:
Interview with the key stakeholders of the change, including 3 of the 6 committee members, 10 professors at Burnaby Campus
- The interviewees will be kept anonymous in the report
- The data collected during the interview will be revealed only to the committee members, academic supervisor, and other key stakeholders upon their approval

1.2.1.3.2 The Project Scope will not include:

- The implementation of the new program
- The feasibility of the new BBA program at Surrey campus

1.2.1.4 Project Assumptions

The successful accomplishment of this project is based upon the following assumptions:

- 3 of the 6 committee members will be available to discuss the initiative
- Some faculty members from Burnaby and Surrey campus are available for the interview

- Interviewees will feel free to provide accurate and objective information
- Information provided by the client will be assumed to be accurate

1.2.2 Project Organization

1.2.2.1 Project Team

Following is a table listing the project team members:

Table 1

Steering Committee	Dean of Faculty of Business Administration at SFU
Project Sponsor	Dr. B W
Academic Supervisor	Dr. G B
Project Team	Wensong Li, Qi Dong and Sophie Wang

1.2.2.2 Stakeholders

1.2.2.2.1 Internal Stakeholders:

- Faculty of Business Administration
- Surrey Business Design Program Committee
- Administration at the University
- Staff
- Coop coordinate
- TechOne Program
- Faculty of Applied Science (SIAT program, etc)

1.2.2.2.2 External Stakeholders:

- Students
- General public
- Government
- Parents

1.2.2.3 Project Reporting

The Project Team will inform all the development of the project to the Project Sponsor and Academic Supervisor via email, telephone, or meeting throughout the entire length of the project

1.2.2.4 Change Control

The project team, the project sponsor and the academic supervisor must agree to all changes in scope.

1.2.2.5 Risk & Issue Management

Any risks or issues that are found by any member of the project team will be communicated to the project sponsor within 48 hours. Types of risks to be identified include risks to Project: Scope; Timescales; Deliverables; Resources; Milestones

1.2.2.6 Phases, Schedule & Work Plan

Table 2

Phase / Activity	Duration	Target Completion Date	Deliverables
1 –Initial meetings with project sponsor	<i>1 days</i>	<i>May 20, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discuss scope and deliverables ▪ Acquire documentation
2 –Create and sign off project charter	<i>1 week</i>	<i>Jun 20, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review documentation ▪ Sign off P.C. with Academic Supervisor and Project Sponsor.
3 – Interview project primes	<i>1-2 weeks</i>	<i>Jun 30, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interview guide created ▪ Interviews completed
4 – Analyse findings	<i>2 days</i>	<i>Jul 3, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data compiled and analyzed
5 – Create report outline and acquire project sponsor approval	<i>2 days</i>	<i>Jul 5, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report outline complete and approved
6 – Complete report	<i>2 weeks</i>	<i>Jul 19, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report completed for academic supervisor review
7 – Report revised and presented to Project Sponsor	<i>1 week</i>	<i>Jul 26, 2004</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completed report provided to Project Sponsor

1.2.3 Project Charter Signoff

1.2.3.1 Terms

The project team agrees to conduct research and analysis at the project company, upon the issue as outlined in this document. The project team agrees to present its findings to the project company on the dates as agreed above according to mutually agreed-upon project plan and statement of scope. The project company agrees to provide resources and access as agreed above. The project company agrees to allow a version of the project team's academic report to be published by Simon Fraser University and placed in the University's library, according to the terms specified in this document.

1.2.3.2 Approval

Table 3

Title	Signature	Date
Project Sponsor	<u>B W</u>	<u>June 18, 2004</u>
Academic Supervisor	<u>G B</u>	<u>June 18, 2004</u>
Project Team Member	<u>Wensong Li</u>	<u>June 18, 2004</u>
Project Team Member	<u>Qi Dong</u>	<u>June 18, 2004</u>
Project Team Member	<u>Sophie Wang</u>	<u>June 18, 2004</u>

CHAPTER 2

SURREY BUSINESS EXPANSION PROGRAM AT SFU

- AN INVESTIGATION OF FACULTY AWARENESS AND ALIGNMENT

2.1 Summary

This field research was conducted by three MBA students from Simon Fraser University with the support of the Surrey Campus Change Committee at SFU. The main purpose of this project was to evaluate the current change process of the Surrey Campus Business Program Design and to identify the associated risks, challenges, and opportunities in relation to the impacts it has on the faculty members at SFU Burnaby Campus.

We embarked on a series of interviews with both committee and faculty members to determine the different perspectives towards this change initiative.

The Inspire Action Method for leading organizational change was employed to analyze the data collected from the interview and to make a comparison between committee and faculty members. The eight factors of the Inspire Action Method are: strategic alignment, business case, change leadership, communication, stakeholder perspective, create commitment, resilient teams, and aligned performance.

The analysis and comparison showed that the change committee did a good job in terms of 'change leadership' and 'resilient teams'. However, since there was not a clear strategic alignment amongst the faculty members, most faculty members had different

ideas from those of the committee members. These discrepancies were the main source of resistance to the projected organizational change.

A number of recommendations to overcome the problems identified are provided. We recommend to the change committee that they clarify the change roles, enhance communication, create commitment, provide training, and establish a reward system.

2.2 Introduction

In today's business environment, the topic of change is more relevant than ever before. What change is, how to deal with resistance, the role of leaders in change, whether the change will be successful and how to make it successful, whether restructuring is necessary, how to manage employee's to maintain high performance during the change, and so on – these are all questions to which there are no clear answers.

We, as MBA students in the leadership and organizational change area, have been studying these questions throughout the length of our program. We realize that most organizations fail in strategic human resource planning because they are not aware of the complexity associated with change and the resistance generated by employees who prefer to stay in their 'comfort zones'. We have learned some practical strategies to solving the contradiction in redesigning organizational culture to reduce costs while at the same time respecting and valuing the employees that work in the organization. We understand that it is important for leaders to apply leadership skills, such as communication, listening, team work, negotiation and charisma to manage change.

In theory, we know that change can be managed; a statement which is supported by many theories and cases that we have reviewed. However, the ability of these theories to mesh with practical experience still remains to be tested. SFU's expansion program serves as an ideal real-life situation that allows us to assess the practical relevance of the theoretical change management models we have studied.

2.2.1 Purpose of this field study

The purpose of this study is to determine the opportunities and challenges the Change Committee will likely face in garnering the faculty member commitment to the change. Our investigation focuses on those who will most likely be impacted by the change in the short term - those in the two current concentrations (finance and marketing) and those who teach core courses.

We assume that professors who teach core course at the Burnaby campus will teach the same courses at the Surrey campus as well. This means that they will face certain risks and opportunities as a result of the change. On the other hand, we know the professors are not forced to take those risks and opportunities. They can decide by themselves. It is our objective to explore how they will deal with this change. More specifically, we look at questions such as: "Will they accept the change?", "How do they see the change?", and "Do they have some suggestions to expedite this change?"

2.2.2 Background

2.2.2.1 SFU

The university has enjoyed an international reputation for its strengths in the liberal arts and sciences, as well as for its innovative interdisciplinary and professional programs. SFU has three campuses: the Burnaby campus, the downtown campus, and the Surrey campus. SFU offers programs at the graduate and undergraduate level to approximately 25,000 students.

2.2.2.2 Surrey Campus

SFU Surrey Campus opened its doors in September 2002. This satellite campus currently offers undergraduate degrees in Interactive Arts and Technology, Computing Science, and Business Administration and graduate degrees in Computing Arts and Design Sciences. Continuing Studies programs, including Liberal and Business Studies, are also offered. In September 2004 it will move to a new facility at Central City, an award-winning architectural development close to the Surrey Centre SkyTrain station.

There are more than 610 undergraduate and 80 graduate students at Surrey Campus. The number of undergraduate students is planned to increase to 800 in September, 2004. There are 36 faculty members and 41 administrative staff.

2.2.2.3 The change

In February 2002, the provincial government offered SFU the opportunity to amalgamate Tech BC operations into a Surrey campus in Surrey. Subsequently, the SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee was formed to deliberate and make proposals. One of its recommendations of April 2003 states: "...the Faculty of Business

Administration should develop, as part of its undergraduate program, a degree program at SFU Surrey Campus with a concentration in the Management of Technology, thereby permitting students to access a complete BBA degree at the Surrey campus.” In May 2003, Senate approved this recommendation in principle.

The Faculty of Business Administration then created the Surrey Campus Business Design Program Committee. Since March, 2003, the committee has held 14 meetings where they reviewed existing programs and possible programs for the Surrey campus.

During its deliberations, the committee interpreted its prime mandate to be the creation of a complete BBA degree at the Surrey campus. Its secondary mandate was to incorporate a Management of Technology concentration within that BBA degree.

Projections are for the Surrey campus to have 3,000-5,000 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) within 10 years. Of this number, 400-450 are expected to be BBA students. The Faculty of Business Administration will expand by about 16 - 22 tenure-track positions.

2.2.3 Method used in this field study

We held an initial meeting with the chairman of the Surrey Campus Change Committee to set up the field study. We agreed that our study would consist mainly of interviews designed to collect data in the eight areas of the Inspire Action Method for Leading Organizational Change (Nancy MacKay, 2004). The target interviewees included the professors who are teaching core courses at the main campus and the change committee members. Five subject areas provide core courses to the students: Accounting, Finance, Marketing, Management Information Systems (MIS), Management and Organizational Change, and Policy Analysis. Because Marketing and Finance will be the

two concentrations in the new campus, we decided to interview 2 professors in these two areas. Although Management of Technology will be taught as well (although not as a core course), we decided to interview two professors in the related MIS area and one professor in other three areas. The change committee is composed of six members. We thought that it would be sufficient to interview three of them.

Data collected from the interviews were analyzed against the eight factors in the Inspire Action Method for Leading Organizational Change (Nancy MacKay, 2004). We developed two sets of questionnaires according to these eight factors to target committee members and faculty members respectively.

We will categorize the responses of interviewees into each factor in the two sets and then compare the data between these two groups to determine the similarity and differences. Finally, we will provide recommendations for the change committee and discuss some aspects we think are very important to pay attention to.

2.3 Interview Data Analysis

2.3.1 Committee members

2.3.1.1 Strategic alignment

Refers to a process in which the organization develops an innovation strategy with cooperate vision, mission, value and goals based on a compelling vision created by the business leader to align the overall company strategies. By this factor, we will clarify whether the change agent: 1) has clear vision; 2) performed a SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities, and treats) analysis, and; 3) took the necessary to align the goals of those affected by the change.

The committee members' perceptions of the vision varied. Some were not sure what the strategy of the faculty as a whole was. They thought that it was the responsibility of the dean, rather than their own, to determine the future direction of the school. Others claimed that "...there is no stated or generally understood faculty strategy in the undergrad area". However, some members did have a general vision of the whole organization. For instance, "[to] be internationally known, be nationally known, ...for our research and for our quality of program." Others had a more specific vision of "a BBA program (Surrey) that is equal or better quality than here (Burnaby)" and "getting students coming through there with a significant learning experience that they can graduate and take jobs and contribute to the economy".

However, these differences do not prevent all committee members we interviewed from believing that the Surrey program is aligned with the strategy of the whole business faculty. They believed this is a good program and it is a great place to promote entrepreneurship in BC. The new program will "broaden the existing attraction to students" and allow them to do what was previously not possible at the Surrey campus.

All members believed that top support from the President and Dean will ensure that the new program aligns effectively with the whole strategy of the university.

2.3.1.2 Business case

A robust case describes what's happening and why concisely and is generated using the inputs from relevant the source document for many other materials. If the business case for change isn't clearly recognized, it's going to be hard or impossible to explain and support the changes. The inputs of case should be from leaders, key staff involved in the planning process, internal documents and other sources. This change

component concerns 1) the clear business case and project success measures owned by business leaders, and 2) the stakeholder roles and responsibilities necessary for the project to succeed.

Committee members believed there are some very important and obvious reasons that justify the emergence of this program.

- It is a unique program in Canada. There is “no comparable undergraduate program in management of technology” in Canada.
- We have students at Surrey who are already in the technology area, such as information technology or Interactive Arts.
- There is a lot of synergy that can be created between the new program and the existing business program. For example, there is a Management of Technology program at the downtown Campus and professors there will have opportunity to work in various areas, downtown or Surrey.
- The Surrey program should get the same quality and reputation as programs in Burnaby. The degree from Surrey will be the same as the Burnaby degree. The course requirements and contents are the same. However, it is not “a clone, a copy of Burnaby”. There will be two new concentrations, Entrepreneurship and MOT, which are not available at the main campus. The primary difference will be the increased focus on technology at the Surrey campus.

- The geographic location of Surrey gives it a competitive advantage. The unique location of Surrey allows students in Surrey and the Fraser Village to have a SFU campus closed to them. Even for students not living near Surrey, they get there via SkyTrain from downtown or somewhere in the Greater Vancouver to take the unique programs.

2.3.1.3 Change leadership

Identifies a change leadership structure to lead and sustain the project, clearly defines change leadership roles, responsibilities and accountability. We can check based on following roles: effective change leaders should 1) respond to the setting and situation of the company; 2) design organization structure and culture, the strategic prerogative of the business and the resource variables of the business, and 3) connect with strategy management, resource management, organization issues and corporate development.

Committee members agreed that there should be a person who “has the authority to act on anomalies” in this change, like early low intakes or pockets of resistance, and to establish guidelines. This leader will also “monitor faculty to ensure good quality and good feedback from students”.

Meanwhile, there is a clear perception of individual responsibility among the committee. It has been “working on this new program for a little over a year,” since March 2003. They did some research of MOT and Entrepreneurship type courses around the world. They also looked at what the previous university taught and then decided which of those courses to keep and which not to keep. They also developed detailed

long-term time schedules and arranged for teachers – both from the current faculty and from the faculty of the previous school.

2.3.1.4 Communication

Refers to well-organized, logical plan that uses appropriate methods to communicate the content of policies and procedures to target people, develops the communication strategy and implementation plan, and follows an appreciative inquiry approach to organizational change. We will clarify: 1) the scope statement and audience selection, 2) appropriate communication methods and contexts, and 3) the schedule and timeline that apply continually over the life of business process, policy and procedure.

The committee members admitted that it is “very critical to involve people in the program” and “communication is the key to build this kind process”. People need to “understand what is going on, have opportunity to create vision to buy into it, and look at opportunities to improve self”.

The committee established a website to introduce the change, which includes almost all information regarding the change - from minutes of committee meeting to reports about what has been done.

However, the committee had more communication with top management than faculty members. For example, the committee discussed the change initiative with the P&P (Planning and Priority Committee, consisting of the Dean, Associate Dean, Academic Directors and Area Coordinators) three to four times to advise the members of what was going on in the program. The program including the implementation plan will be reported to P&P on a regular basis.

For the faculty members, the committee only held one faculty meeting to discuss the program and it did not plan to have another one. Some said that these kinds of meetings had not been “pleasant in the past”. Some faculty did not even know that such meetings had been held in the past, while others thought that it was not necessary for everybody to have complete information.

On the other hand, some members would have liked to hold “one to one or small group meeting in the areas” to clarify any concerns. They thought that they would have to communicate effectively to “change other’s perceptions”, and to make use of “success stories to communicate with them, such as how great a place Surrey is, how great the faculty is, and how wonderful research is going on there”.

2.3.1.5 Stakeholder perspective

The natural propensity for individuals and groups to defend the status quo presents a set of challenges that management must overcome to bring about desired change. In addition, it refers to the myriad of problems that may result if employees are not responsive to workplace issues. Mapping individuals, groups and business units on the continuum provides an informative topography of stakeholder sentiment and behaviour, and allows those who are resistant to change to be identified and monitored.

Most committee members said they knew some faculty members who were interested in teaching at the Surrey campus, but they also admitted that this number is small and that most professors resisted the change. They also thought the reason for this was lack of understanding of the change on behalf of the faculty.

Some committee members thought that the change would not have a big impact on faculty members because there would be little need of professors in the first years of the change, and that new faculty members could be hired in the subsequent years. But some worried this may run the risk of “ghettoizing Surrey”. Other committee members worried that the new program will be regarded as “inferior and it will end up being a back-door for accepting inferior students to the Burnaby campus”.

Committee members perceived many potential advantages of teaching at the Surrey campus. The new campus will rely heavily on the internet to instruct students. Professors would be able to “try something new, challenge their pedagogy, change their lectures to let students work in group, and put their stuff on-line”. They would have the opportunity to “do something different” like on-line teaching. The ‘Greenfield’ expansion benefits (the benefits of starting things with the freedom to do whatever you like) are also good. This is not totally the case, but this is an opportunity to do things differently and better (using cohort, technology). These are maybe more opportunities than advantages.”

Another advantage was that professors have the ability to collaborate with new faculty members at the new campus. People coming from a business field add business components into the research to interact with those coming from arts and technology. As such, there is a good opportunity for faculty is to do innovative research in the Surrey environment.

Committee members admitted that issues of safety and transportation may be on the list of disadvantages, but the majority of them did not think these problems would be too substantial. They thought Surrey would become safer overtime and there was no any difference between travelling to Harbour Centre and to Burnaby.

2.3.1.6 Create commitment

We need to consider three conditions: 1) the goal, project or activity taps in some item employees can be excited about. That is, people see a benefit for themselves or something they care about and there is not a negative consequence that overshadows the benefit; 2) there is a mutually agreed upon goal, or at least one where the other person has a chance to give input about how the goal will be met; 3) there is communication that the person has been listened to.

The committee members realized the importance of building commitment and to establish “champions for this change”. One member said that the reason some faculty members didn’t have an opinion on the change was that that they didn’t feel “the impact on them directly”. The committee agreed that this change could not be effective unless the professors were motivated. The committee would like to put efforts to get professors involved at early stage.

Committee members said professors would not be forced to teach at the new campus and professors who will teach in this program obviously need to be committed to it as there are some unique characteristics such as more technology involvement. They thought this would benefit the professors because they would be given choices to have more flexibility. Professors who are interested in teaching technology would be the ones to teach at the Surrey Campus. People who are interested in developing the new program will be interested in the technology for teaching on-line.

Committee members agreed that this new teaching method required unique skills to be implemented successfully, and saw the necessity of having support for faculty delivering programs on-line.

Some committee members thought there should be funding attached to the Surrey program. This would imply having “more money for research, more faculty members, and more money for teaching”.

2.3.1.7 Resilient teams

Identifies a team coaching approach to increase team resilience and productivity; reduce team conflict and increase team creativity, trust and performance. Based on this factor, we need to clarify: 1) an understanding of the prevailing patterns that influence how people operate in certain situations; 2) respecting these patterns; 3) conserving assets; 4) liberating latent resources.

Most committee members thought the committee worked well so far. They got the “right person for the right position”. There was a general perception that everyone is clear about his/her own responsibilities. The committee leader’s authority was respected and his capability was trusted by other members. The leader was also committed to the new program.

The committee has had a lot of discussions about the new program, like what the new campus should be and could be, what concentrations should be there and what faculty members should teach there. These meetings were well organized and prepared. Every member got specific tasks beforehand and they brought the results in to discuss them. Everything was passed based on all members’ agreement.

Although most members agreed that the commitment and involvement of the committee was generally speaking high, they thought some members worked harder than others. There was also concern that some individuals’ primary commitment was to their

town teaching and research ambitions, and not to the goals and objectives of the committee as a whole.

2.3.1.8 Aligned performance

Aligns to the company performance management strategy; identifies and creates the competencies and behaviour to ensure project success. Based on this factor, we will discuss: 1) the competencies needed to support the change; 2) training strategies to develop new competencies; 3) the organization structure, reporting relationships and HR processes.

All committee members agreed that in order to make this change effective, they would have to align performance measures. All of them agreed that the appropriate instruction of the course is very important, like how to teach the course in on-line environment, while they didn't exactly have an idea about what instruction is.

Regarding compensation, the views of committee members varied substantially. Some believed that it would be necessary to reward professor for using technology, and that without rewards instructors would not want to adopt new teaching practices. Others expressed their opinions more discreetly, claiming that "good performance strategies [will] enable professors to do the job well".

Some thought it would be hard to reward the change supporters because "the purse-strings are held by the upper administration". Other committee members were totally against the concept of financial rewards, arguing that "money isn't effective". These people believed that all professors should be paid in the same way and that

rewarding people for accepting new changes will set a dangerous precedent which will have far-reaching effect on any future changes.

Some committee members thought there were already some rewards, but not in the form of money. These included things such as new offices, the exciting faculty and doing great things in a new place.

Moreover, committee members agreed that there were no obvious ways to punish the recalcitrant in a university system, since the educational environment typically tolerates a high degree of independence for professors.

2.3.2 Professors

2.3.2.1 Strategic alignment

Almost all professors agreed that a clear, compelling vision and goal is crucial to this change. However, only two of the seven professors we interviewed knew either the vision or the goal of this new change. They thought the purpose was to be flexible and provide broad business knowledge for students, or just to expand. Although both of them knew there would be something different at the new campus, neither of them knew what this difference would be.

All other professors said that they lacked a clear vision and goal regarding the change. One professor said he doubted if there was a “coherent strategy” among the business faculty. Two professors were not even aware of the change.

2.3.2.2 Business case

Most professors said they were not told why the committee wanted to implement this change, although they had their own interpretations. Perception of the change differed between individuals. Some professors thought this change was only being done at the request of the government. Other thought it is because the former campus was in trouble.

Most professors were not optimistic about this change. Some complained that even the Burnaby campus had a hard time finding enough quality professors, not to mention the new campus. They believed that this reality may force the university to agree to lower standards at the new campus, and that the faculty members working there would be of lower academic quality as compared to their peers at the main campus.

Some professors regarded the new campus as “Siberia” or a “poor cousin” of the main campus. Other stated this change was a “wrong decision” from the beginning and predicted that “at some point Surrey will separate from SFU”.

2.3.2.3 Change leadership

Some professors complained that they even did not know who the committee members were or what they had been doing.

Some professors doubted the university’s capacity to manage multiple campuses. SFU will have three campuses after taking over the new one. Each campus has its unique culture and it will be a big change to integrate them together.

2.3.2.4 Communication

The majority of the faculty members had some limited communication with the change committee, but they did not think they had gotten enough information and they did not feel that they were being kept sufficiently updated.

Four of the seven professors attended that general faculty member meeting. But there was “no follow-up meeting for feedback”.

Regarding the change website containing the minutes of change committee meetings, most professors agreed it was a good idea. But 6 of 7 professors did not even know that such a website existed. The only faculty who had ever looked at this website told us “it was really hard to find” and he did not find anything he wanted there.

2.3.2.5 Stakeholder perspective

In the eyes of most professors, the advantages of teaching at the new campus included a new environment, new equipment, and a different experience.

As for disadvantages, all professors expressed the concerns of transportation to some extent. “People want to work near to where they live. The new campus may be closer for some faculty and clearly it won’t be for others”. We found that the farther the professors live from new campus, the stronger the resistance. In contrast, professors who live in the vicinity of the new campus did not think transportation was a big issue.

Teaching at new campus will be “far away from familiar academic surroundings”. One professor said that “I prefer to work with colleagues for fun. If you are there, but no one else, it will be no fun”. This isolation would inevitably result in “less interaction with colleagues on Burnaby campus” and most professors worried this would undermine the

quality of their research and teaching, which is the core part of their careers. The faculty as a whole needs to be in one place to communicate with one another, whereas “different locations decrease this kind of interaction”. Moreover, there is a deep-seated belief among professors that Burnaby is the best campus.

As for the new technology based teaching methods such as e-learning, most professors thought there were a lot of disadvantages, at least “in practice”, and only a few believed it would bring the new campus a cutting-edge advantage. One professor described e-learning as “nonsense”. There were a few professors who were “excited about a combination of on-line and face to face”, and they thought there had been already some successful precedents set for this type of instruction.

2.3.2.6 Create commitment

Most faculty members lacked commitment to the new change and thus resisted it. Some professor said that since there was a clear lack of vision for the change, they had little interest in teaching at the new campus. Most professors stated that their priority is to produce “high quality research”; this implies that their commitment to the new campus would be closely tied to their ability to do effective research in the new environment. More funds for research was also mentioned by some professor as a means of creating more commitment.

In our interviews, we also found that young instructors were less reluctant to use new teaching methods since they “had to develop new courses anyhow”.

2.3.2.7 Resilient teams

Most professors believed that the change committee was competent and that the committee members were experts. In general, the professors were satisfied with the work the committee had done so far.

2.3.2.8 Aligned performance

Some professors thought that inviting them to see what the Surrey campus looks like may be helpful for them to change their perceptions. They complained that although there were some discussions about the new campus, they had very little practical understanding of the change and the new campus.

Technology may be a useful way of aligning the three different campuses. Through internal structure, providing the same working environment in three locations by using technology to build connection, faculty members can feel that they are in the same work environment regardless of their physical location.

Some professors stated that they needed more support to accept this change. Some said that this faculty has to “wake up to the reality that we need to support teachers with more than a chalkboard, a phone from the 1970’s”.

2.3.3 Comparison between committee and faculty members

2.3.3.1 Strategic alignment

We found that not all committee members or faculty members were clear about the vision, goal and strategy of this change.

While the committee members could still have confidence regarding the change initiative, it is hard for the faculty members who were not sure about the vision and strategy of this change to do so.

2.3.3.2 Business case

While committee members were excited about the new changes, most faculty members did not think they had received convincing information. As a result, the personal interpretations of faculty members were largely different from the compelling reasons in the minds of committee members.

2.3.3.3 Change leadership

We discovered that most committee members were competent and each of them had clear individual responsibilities. They had put a lot of effort into this change initiative and the whole committee cooperated well. Most faculty members also thought that the committee members were the right person's for this change, and they were satisfied with the committee's performance and job.

However, some faculty members were not confident with this change and they doubted the university's capacity to manage multiple campuses.

2.3.3.4 Communication

Our interviews show that both committee and faculty members realized the importance of communication. Both sides showed strong interests in exchanging their ideas and thoughts. For example, for the non-mandatory general meeting, six of seven interviewed faculty members attended, a significant percentage considering the faculty

members for our interviews were randomly selected. The data also showed that the professors were looking for more channels of communication.

2.3.3.5 Stakeholder perspective

There are some discrepancies between faculty and committee members' stakeholder perspective.

Some committee members thought that the change would not have a big impact on faculty members. However, faculty members perceived substantial personal challenges regarding transportation, research, teaching, and so on, if they were to accept this change.

Moreover, most committee members underestimated the deep-seated belief amongst faculty members that Burnaby campus is superior to other SFU campuses.

2.3.3.6 Create commitment

The change committee put significant efforts into creating commitment. Both sides had a consensus that improved researching and teaching had a big impact on commitment. But other factors such as new environment, new technology, etc. were not so appealing to faculty members as committee members thought they would be.

2.3.3.7 Resilient teams

Both committee and faculty members reached an agreement on this factor. They were satisfied with the change committee's performance. The committee fulfilled its responsibility to assess the initiative and implementation.

2.3.3.8 Aligned performance

It is obvious that the change committee had done a lot to support and facilitate the change, including the instruction of E-learning and course design.

But faculty members did not think there were enough supports for them to champion and accept this change. They looked forward to more support to better understand this change. Some aligned performances they wanted were very simple, like just visiting the new campus to see what it looks like. Professors said they “like to see the school pay to educate instructors on how to teach using e-learning hard and software”.

2.4 Recommendation

According the above analysis the performance of the change committee did not completely comply with the eight factors; however, this does not mean the committee did something wrong. In the process of the field study, we found out that it had very clear goal for the new campus, created a plan for what business faculty will do at the new campus (up to the year 2010), understood the problems associated with the change, and built commitment among the team members. We believe that this committee almost finished its mission to project a plan for developing a BBA program, as a part of current undergraduate program, to provide the same degree in Surrey campus.

In terms of our understanding of the eight factors, we attempt to provide some suggestions to the current or future change committee to improve their performance; to let them know what could be done differently and what should be done to enhance the introduction of this program in the future and to build a model for dealing with change.

Based on our interviews with professors and committee members, we think there are some things which have an impact on the change which would be worth the committee's time and attention to address. We discuss these in the following section.

2.4.1 Suggestions in terms of the eight factors

2.4.1.1 Clarify the change roles

In the change process, it is very important to identify each of the roles in a change effort and assess their behaviour and communications, which can help explain why the change efforts succeed or fail. There are four basic roles: change leader, change sponsor, change agent and change target. The relationship of those roles, how they interact, and what responsibilities they have, need to be understood during the change process.

- Change leader: one who commences the change, carrying the virtue of the certain event, strategy of the development or motivation of the change.
- Change sponsor: one who is the director of the area that will be changed; consults with the change leader to establish a form of 'contract' to deliver the project against agreed terms; is responsible for monitoring project progress and works with the change agent to keep the project on track; gives advice to the project manager on issues regarding technology and technology priorities.
- Change agent: one who facilitates the change in the front line, possessing the ability to solve problems, to bring the knowledge to the change area, to help the members find out solutions for their problems and to transfer the information between the high level and target.

- Change target: one will be directly impact by the change.

2.4.1.2 Communication

Currently the committee uses e-mail and faculty member meetings to deliver change information to the faculty members and to let them discuss the project. We suggest increasing the awareness of the details of the change through a monthly e-mail and newsletter from the change committee to the all faculty members, or by an on-line discussion forum to discuss certain interesting topics, to provide the constructive suggestions for the course design or teaching skills in technology and to give feedback. We also recommend holding another faculty members meeting to discuss the change program again. It is important to let the faculty members know what the committee has done and what they will do, and to give feedback to members who express their opinions on the change.

Another suggestion is to establish the communication channel between the committee members and the area coordinators. Regularly convey the policy, requirement, documents and other relative materials about the new campus to area coordinators. Then the coordinators pass that information to the professors in their area by formal or informal ways. The committee members can do the same job to use his/her network to diffuse the information broadly. In turn, the coordinators and committee members should bring the feedback to the committee to clarify what is good and what need to improve.

2.4.1.3 Create commitment

Broadly discuss the vision and goal of this change, including all faculty members, to figure out at least one goal in which 60 percent of the members see a benefit for themselves or something they care about and there is not a negative consequence that overshadows the benefit. Involve the professors in specific areas in the decision making process for building up a concentration in the new campus. Listen to their opinions about the course design, new technology and change program. Inviting faculty members to see the Surrey campus and providing some successful examples will be helpful for the change.

2.4.1.4 Build a reward system

To encourage professors to use technology, some rewards may be required; otherwise they probably will not change their teaching styles. Appropriate instruction is very important, such as how to teach on-line and support to develop a course acknowledgement, the course content and on-line environment. As such, design of an incentive system is very important.

Time release: Professors who design the course on-line could be released from teaching other courses. For instance, professors need to teach four courses. If they are new to designing an online course, then maybe this could count as a course. This means in that year they would teach 3 courses, and spend the extra teaching load time in the development of the online course.

2.4.1.5 Provide training

The e-learning and cohort system are new ideas for the faculty members. They need information to know how to use e-learning in teaching and what the implications of the cohort system are. Some professors worried they will bear a heavier burden than expected if they use e-learning. They don't have a clear idea of what is e-learning. For the cohort, some professors just know the name but have less understanding of what would happen if such a system is launched. Providing a training strategy for the faculty members, such as the standard for e-learning and the impact of cohort systems is imperative to improving instructor performance.

CHAPTER 3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

The issue of resistance to organizational change has received a lot of attention over the past decade. Resistance to change has long been perceived as a barrier to organizational change attempts. Connor (1993, P25) stated that “resistance at its most obvious is a slow-motion response to meet agreements or even a complete refusal to cooperate with change. In an organization, resistance is opposition or withholding of support for specific plans or ideas. It can be either intentional or unintentional, covert or overt”. Few changes completely follow a straightforward path, initial idea to the desired result.

Whenever there is an important change, it often coexists with the resistance. Leaders of the organizations who expect everyone within the organizations responds to the change easily and enthusiastically will feel frustrated with unexpected resistance. As early as 1954 Lawrence mentioned, "One of the most baffling and recalcitrant of the problems which business executives face is employee resistance to change" (p. 4).

Change resistance may behave in many forms from passive resistance to active resistance or even aggressive resistance (Coetsee, 1999), but there is no doubt that any form of resistances will stymie the change process to some extent.

Resistance will affect the change process, like delay or slow down change progress, obstruct or hinder change implementation, and increase change costs (Ansoff, 1990). On the other hand, resistance is a conduct that tries to keep the status quo

(Manuela Pardo del Val, 2003). In this sense, resistance is equivalent to inertia, as the persistence to avoid change (Maurer, 1996; Rumelt, 1995; Zaltman and Duncan, 1977).

However, it does not mean that resistance is an inherently negative behaviour, because the corresponding change is not definitely beneficial for the organization.

3.2 Sources of resistance to change

3.2.1 Different Perception

There are two fundamental questions that arise when people deal with changing: Why do we need to change? And how can we make the change work? (Rick Maurer 2002) Many leaders consciously or unconsciously bypass the why question and move directly to the how question with an expectation of accomplishing the change initiatives quickly. Ironically, this strategy is often counterproductive in that people will not follow how to do something when they don't see why it's important.

Since change starts with the perception of its need, the perception of change play a fundamental role in the process of change and thus in the creation of resistance. A different perception between change agents and change targets is the first barrier to change. It is not unusual for people to refuse any change that is not expected or desired

This is consistent with our observation in the field research. Our research showed that this change was implanted before the targets were ready. The targets and the change committee members had different perceptions for this expansion. The committee members were enthusiastic about this change. They believed this expansion would lead the University to be known broadly. However, in the eyes of the targets, they thought this expansion was merely a demand from the government. The business in the acquired

location was in deep trouble and the University just played a role of fire fighter to take over it. These remarkably different perspectives showed that change initiative was not clear to the targets that were going to have to implement this change.

3.2.2 A sense of cost and loss

When perceived as a threat to one's security or ingrained habits, or even as loss of status or as fear of the unknown, a change will generate resistance (Neck, 1996). The association of change with loss of one's control, one's routines, one's traditions and relationships, is cited among the main motives for resisting change (Isabella, 1990; Kanter, 1995; Wolfram Cox, 1997). People are used to everything being done in a certain way. Most of them are reluctant to leave the familiar. It seems to be human nature to suspect unfamiliar things, especially if the change will involve learning something new and risking failure.

In our interview, most resisters expressed their concerns about potential losses and costs in this expansion. Some professors worried that they would be isolated from their peers or difficult for access to research resources if they accepted this change. To teach in the acquired location, in their opinion, was like being exiled to "Siberia". The established relationship with other professors would be broken by teaching there and the new relationship was still uncertain.

Moreover, all interviewees mentioned that the cost of additional driving time to that location was one of the major issues to trigger the resistance. On the contrary, people who lived near there or who planned to buy properties in the vicinity did not think the cost

of transportation was their major issue to teach there. It is obvious that latter group would lose less to accept this change.

Similarly, employees who are "fully burdened" resist this change because they are afraid that new change will add more work. And some of them agreed that it will help lower the level of resistance if keep their similar workload for teaching there.

Karyn (2002) stated that changes that satisfy one group often reduce satisfaction of other groups because the survival of one set of values and visions may be at the expense of the other. This is consistent with the theory of cannibalization costs (Rumelt, 1995), that is to say, change that brings success to a product but at the same time brings losses to others, so it requires some sort of sacrifice.

In our interviews, some professors believed that this change may be in the best interest of students, but not in the best interest of them. We believe that expected losses or costs have a positive relationship with the level of resistance.

3.2.3 Communication barriers

Communication barriers are another source of resistance in that it can lead to information distortion or misinterpretations (Hutt et al., 1995). This kind of barrier can also manifest by organizational silence (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Nemeth, 1997), which limits the information flow with individuals who do not express their thoughts, meaning that decisions are made without all the necessary information.

Our field study demonstrated these ideas. Eight of ten change targets who were against this change did not have direct contact with the committee members or any other change agents. The professor who was contacted by the change committee only had

limited communication with the change agents. We think until everyone understands who, what, why, when, and where of the change, they are unwilling to accept the change. Communication is one of the most effective ways to clarify these inquiries. Leaders cannot expect people to change until they have established effective and efficient two-way communication.

Moreover importantly, we found that with poor communication, professors who were potential advocates of this change did not know what they can do or were expected to do, to back up this change. The two professors who would like to see this change happen are just waiting for the upcoming changes and not taking any action to support it.

3.2.4 Lack of involvement

The first known published reference to research on resistance to change in organizations was "Overcoming Resistance to Change" by Coch and French (1948). They claim that "resistance to change is a combination of an individual reaction to frustration with strong group-induced forces".

Through a variety of experiments, Coch and French (1948) basically conclude that groups that were allowed to participate in the design and development of the changes have much lower resistance than those that do not. Coch and French advise managers to hold group meetings to communicate the need for change and to solicit employee involvement in the planning of the change.

During our field research, we found little involvement of change targets into this change. There were few meetings to formally discuss this change so that many professors did not know what was going on. There were few channels, such as website, e-mail, or

on-line forum to exchange the information of this change and to chat about all relevant issues.

Another consideration of lack of involvement we discovered here is that excitement and enthusiasm can be quite contagious, so too can fear, anger, and resentment. People who resist change refuse more forcefully when they see others around them not supporting it enthusiastically and vice versa. This is also shown by our interviews. About half of interviewees agreed that most people they know were against this change and their resistance was reinforced by the resistance of their peers. They also mentioned that they would like to try to teach at Surry at least once if most colleagues would like to do so.

This new change does not come easily to the University, if it comes at all. Different culture, the nature of the new teaching format such as co-hort and E-learning, the dynamics of faculties, and the University itself have conspired against making this prospective expansion difficult, especially if leaders want to maintain or increase morale and productivity while implementing it.

3.3 Contribution of the resistance

Resistance isn't merely inevitable nor does it always impede change. It can benefit the prospective change. If we try to eradicate all resistance to change in an organization, according to Peter de Jager (2001), we are ignoring the legitimate function of resistance: to avoid unnecessary change. In his opinion, "resistance is simply a very effective, very powerful, very useful survival mechanism".

Even more, those who resist plans for change may in fact have different definitions of the problem or beliefs about its seriousness. While they may say aloud that, "This plan won't work", they may actually be thinking, "This plan does not address the real issue".

Resistance could show change managers certain aspects that are not properly considered in the change process (Waddell and Sohal, 1998). The resistance may force reformers to rethink or reevaluate an envisioned change and force them to motivate better and more effectively "sell" a proposed new vision or goal.

This is the part that we think the committee members should pay attention to. In our interview, some professors expressed that the culture issue, the new faculty member's involvement issue and the course design issue were untouched or had gotten less attention by the committee but those were imperative for how to make the change successful. They were concerned with the coherence of the university strategy, the university culture, and the university future. They wanted the university to keep attractive to the elites, the good students and outstanding professors. They didn't want to see any change destroying the university established good image. We believe that these concerns have positive impact on the change. Considering them will optimize the process of the change.

3.4 Types of resistance

3.4.1 Overt and covert resistance

Connor (1993) noted that resistance could be acted out in two extremes, covertly or overtly. Resistance can be covert so that lack of support for change is either concealed or undefined. It can also be overt so that those who resist change express their point of view openly and offer their reasons for disagreement. Although overt resistance leads to debate, and on occasion conflict, it is easier to manage than covert resistance. In cases of overt resistance, managers can see and hear their adversaries. This allows them to work directly with the situation and towards resolving it. On the contrary, managing covert resistance is a serious challenge because it is often not discovered until it is too late. Some people support this change because they do not have control of the situation or they have to protect their own interest.

In our interviews, some professors expressed their disagreement of this change explicitly and refused to accept the change. This is obviously an overt resistance. On the other side, although some professors, especially young professors, would like to accept this change, we revealed later in our discussion that they were actually against this change to some extent. One important reason they took this change is that they were not on tenure positions and did not have enough powers to resist this change.

3.4.2 Rational and Irrational Resistance

De Jager (2001) also classified the resistance to change into rational one and irrational one. Resistance may be based on well-grounded reasoning, or it may be completely illogical. Both rational and irrational resistance can halt the change process.

Specifically, irrational resistance comes from “rare people for whom no amount of evidence, proof, demonstration, or persuasion will suffice to get them to willingly adopt the change. They simply don't want to change”. These people just want to perpetuate current status quo. They have strong tendency to go on with the present ideas although the situation has changed. These people may be shortsighted and cannot look into the future with clarity.

Almost all resistance we uncovered in our interview appeared to be rational resistance. One prominent characteristic of rational resistance is that “it can be subdued with reasonable explanations for proposed changes” (Peter de Jager).

De Jager further pointed out that rational resistance often comes from the feeling of being uninvolved. People tend to believe the change is being forced upon them or their needs are ignored if they've had no involvement with the process.

In most cases, the rational resisters will be willing to adopt the change if they find or are informed that the reasons to change are persuasive or compelling enough. But to convince these resisters, you must involve them in the change.

3.5 Managing resistance

Resistance is a way to say "no" to change. Wisely used, it will be a valuable contribution to the change process. Randomly or irresponsibly employed, it will cause unbearable stress and considerable bad feeling (Connor 1993). What should leaders do to deal with resistance? We recommend the following steps to effectively wrestle with the resistance in the organizational change.

First, change leaders must discover precisely who is resisting and where the resistance comes from. Specific antidote then can be provided to different types of resistance. Moreover, recognizing the source of resistance guides the development of better understanding.

The second step is to embrace resistance. Leaders must avoid any over-reaction to resistance once it is discovered. Actually, resistance provided a great opportunity for leaders to perfect the change project.

Some leaders tried to react forcefully to overcome resistance. They often end it with a failure. “This response does not work because it resists resistance. It is a defensive reaction to a defensive action. It creates two entrenched and resistant positions, not just one, with neither side willing to give way to the other”. “Leaders should encourage group members to give feedback and contribute ideas: both positive and negative. Leaders listen to and, where necessary, guide colleagues to reframe their negative or hostile responses. An open-minded attitude and free debate actually minimize resistance even though comments and reactions to change sound negative and even destructive” (Connor 1993).

3.6 Conclusion

The twists on resistance to change are changing the way we think about organizational change. To successfully implement organizational changes and effectively manage the resistance, leaders must put great efforts to understand the source of the resistance, contribution of the resistance, and the types of the resistance.

CHAPTER 4 REFLECTIONS AND LEARNING ON STUDYING ORGANIZATIONS

The field study consisted of interviews, data analysis, and a written report. We generated an implementation plan, which included a timeline, an assignment of tasks to each group member, and a formalized process for methods of information exchange. In the process of this study, we encountered both internal difficulties (within our project team), and external difficulties (with the client); fortunately, our instructor gave us help to overcome these obstacles. We learned many things from these experiences which will make our performance better in the future.

After our initial interview with the client to establish the project parameters, we made little progress for several weeks. The reason for this was that our project charter took a longer time to complete than we expected. We were very anxious; we did not want to delay the process. We held our first meeting to try to figure out what was going on in our side and to determine what we were doing wrong. This meeting was good because we discovered the interests of each group member, a process that reinforced the trust among us. Each of us talked openly about what we understood the project to be and the role we saw ourselves playing in finishing the project on time.

Although we have known each other for some time, this is the first occasion on which we worked together in a group. None of us had a clear understanding of other group members' perspectives on this project and how they foresaw our group to operate. In the meeting discussed above, we all shared these concerns to each other. For instance,

one group member wanted to apply what we had learned from books and lectures during the course of our MBA program and to test the theories and practice skills. Another just wanted to complete it to graduate. If we had not created an opportunity for members to freely exchange their opinions, we would not have figured out the underlying interests of the members. The cooperation between the members would have been superficial. The team would just simply follow the instruction to do the task, nobody really caring about the performance of the team but just focusing on their personal goals. These behaviours would have hindered our ability to generate a high-quality report. When members understand each other's expectations, they can creatively link their interests toward a common goal of the team which will create a sense of urgency or a personal challenge to them - such as a goal that requires them to do something they've never done before. Such goals will motivate members to put their efforts on the task and to engage in the project. To share underlying interests and build trust among the members is critical for team success.

It was during this time that we received help from our instructor. He called a meeting for us to know where we were and what we were going to do. In that meeting, he helped us clarify the purpose of the project, choose the methods of collecting data, and develop a set of criteria that would be used in the analysis. We felt happy because we knew what and how to continue the project; regrettably, had we had such a meeting earlier we would have saved time and moved faster. This experience showed us it was useful for a team to have external support. We see the external support as a mentor or coach with knowledge, skills, expertise and capability in a certain area. The mentor can provide guidance to the team, offer feedback on the team's performance, facilitate the

team to find out the resolution of the problem by itself, inspire the members by reward or incentive, share the experience as a model to follow, and give new skills and networks to the members to overcome the challenge. The important thing is for the team to find a mentor and to ask for help early. This doesn't mean the team goes to see its mentor as soon as it faces a problem. The team should develop a strategic project plan first. The mentor will provide advice for the team to make sure the plan is effective and in the right direction: whether it will bring high performance to the team or the steps of the plan need to be improved, etc. When this plan is implemented, the team should try to resolve problems by itself by exploring its internal resources, such as its members' skills, knowledge and abilities, to finish tasks. As the team encounters a problem which is time consuming, not possible to make a consensus on within the team, or impossible to overcome, it will seek help from its mentor. The mentor can be an instructor, colleague, internet, friend or expert, etc. The external support is an important factor in the team's success.

Having determined what to do and how to do it, we assigned tasks to each of us: who was to take how many interviews with professors in which area and who would write which part of the report. We also decided to use telephone, e-mail, and the chance when we met in during class, to exchange information and give feedback to each other.

The tasks were assigned based on the competence of the members. We knew our own competence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities and we excelled in. We knew which tasks would complement the different competencies that we had as a team: interpersonal skills, writing proficiencies, listening skills, and analyzing skills. As a result, we didn't need to negotiate for the tasks or make trade offs to balance the

accountability, but took the tasks upon ourselves spontaneously. The member who had specific competence assumed a heavier burden in that certain task. For instance, one member's writing skills were better than others'; he/she would compile all parts created by other members into the final paper. One member had good interpersonal skills; he/she took the responsibility of setting up appointment with interviewees and then facilitated the schedule with other members to do the interview. The team leader took the responsibility to be the timer, making sure every task was completed in time. If someone had a problem, the leader would give their assistance. We had clear roles and accountabilities in the team. We all put efforts in the tasks to finish the project successfully. Without this cooperation, it would have been impossible to complete the project within the time frame we were given.

Communication strengthened our effectiveness as a team as well. Through communication, members can raise any issues, provide constructive suggestions on team work, the implementation and problem solving, and help others get credible sources. For instance, one member believed the interview questions needed to be separated into two parts in terms of his understanding of the purpose of the project. We discussed it in an after class meeting. All of us agreed on his proposal and asked him to create the new questionnaires. When he passed on the new questionnaires to us by e-mail, we returned our feedback on them. As a result, the final version of the questionnaires was completed. Through such kind of communication, we knew others' idea for the interview and paper, breaking down the barriers to process this field study.

Leadership kept our team on the track. In terms of trust, members passed on their options, considerations, complaints, experiences, suggestions and criticisms to the leader.

The leader used this information to clarify what was going on in the team and was able to help the other group members reach the team goal. By increasing other group members' awareness and understanding of problems, encouraging them to take risks, understanding their values in order to harmonize with his/hers, and inspiring them to find their capabilities, the leader was able to influence the group members to do the right thing. The leader also set a personal example to let the members know what and how he/she did the tasks. For instance, at the beginning, members were not sure how to do the interviews and worried about their quality. The leader did the first one and passed on the information to the members, including the e-mails for making the appointments, the draft of the interviews in detail, and the feedback from the interviewee which was to guarantee the content conforming exactly what the interviewee said. This was a model the leader established for members on how to collect data. This kind of leadership helped establish other group members' trust in the correctness of the leader's beliefs and abilities. They believed that the leader was willing to accept their ideas, feelings, and behaviours. They were willing to be influenced by the leader, which is another imperative to ensuring a teams success.

In the process of this field study, we realized that without teamwork, we would have been unable to complete the project; without a formalized system of communication, we would have been unable to solve problems; without external support, we would have been unable to save time; without leadership, we would have been unable to reach our goal. We have all honed our skills in different aspects, such as listening, communication, teamwork, interpersonal skills and leadership. We believe that the improvement of our intra-group relationships was the most crucial factor in making our

team successful. However, there are two issues we have to pay attention to in the future. First, we must not assume that a high level of trust will exist within the group. This implies that the personal values and expectations of others need to be explored - even if you think you know each other very well - as every situation is unique. Second, we should seek external support if necessary, which will make the team more efficient and save time in completing tasks.

APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix A-Eight Factors

- Strategic alignment

Refers to a process in which the organization develops an innovation strategy with cooperate vision, mission, value and goals based on a compelling vision created by the business leader to align the overall company strategies. By this factor, we will clarify whether the change agent: 1) has clear vision; 2) performed a SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities, and treats) analysis, and; 3) took the necessary to align the goals of those affected by the change.

- Business case

A robust case describes what's happening and why concisely and is generated using the inputs from relevant the source document for many other materials. If the business case for change isn't clearly recognized, it's going to be hard or impossible to explain and support the changes. The inputs of case should be from leaders, key staff involved in the planning process, internal documents and other sources. This change component concerns 1) the clear business case and project success measures owned by business leaders, and 2) the stakeholder roles and responsibilities necessary for the project to succeed.

- **Change leadership:**

Identifies a change leadership structure to lead and sustain the project, clearly defines change leadership roles, responsibilities and accountability. We can check based on following roles: 1) effective change leaders should response to the setting and situation of the company; 2) should design organization structure and culture, the strategic prerogative of the business and the resource variables of the business; 3) should connect with strategy management, resource management, organization issues and corporate development.

- **Communication:**

It refers to well-organized, logical plan that use appropriate method to communicate the content of policies and procedures to target people. Develop the communication strategy and implementation plan, follows an appreciative inquiry approach to organizational change. We will clarify 1) scope statement and audience selection; 2) appropriate communication method and context; 3) schedule and timeline for ensuring that apply continually over the life of business process, policy and procedure.

- **Stakeholder perspective:**

The natural propensity for individuals and groups to defend the status quo presents a set of challenges that management must overcome to bring about desired change. In addition, it refers to the myriad of problems that may result if employees are not responsive to workplace issues. Mapping individuals, groups and business units on the continuum provides an informative topography of stakeholder sentiment and

behaviour, and allows those who are resistant to change to be identified and monitored.

- Create commitment:

We need to consider three conditions: 1) the goal, project or activity taps in some item employees could be excited about. That is, people see a benefit for themselves or something they care about and there is not a negative consequence that over shadows the benefit; 2) there is a mutually agreed upon goal or at least one where the other person had a chance to give input about how the goal will be met; 3) there is communication that the person has been listened to.

- Resilient teams:

Identifies a team coaching approach, to increasing team resilience and productivity; reduces team conflict and increases team creativity, trust and performance. Based on the factor, we need to clarify: 1) an understanding of the prevailing patterns that influence how people operate in certain situations; 2) respecting these patterns; 3) conserving assets; 4) liberating latent resources.

- Aligned performance:

Aligns to the company performance management strategy; identifies and creates the competencies and behaviour to ensure project success. Based on the factor, we will clarify: 1) the competencies needed to support the change; 2) training strategies to develop new competencies; 3) the organization structure, reporting relationships and HR processes.

4.2 Appendix B- Interview Questions for Change Committee Members

- 1) Do you think the committee has well informed the faculty of this change? By which way did the committee deliver this information?
- 2) Are there some kinds of communication between you and the change committee?
Do you think the communication is enough?
- 3) Do you think most faculty has a clear vision and goal of this change? If no, Why?
If yes, what are this vision and goal?
- 4) Do you think this change aligned with the whole strategy of Business faculty?
- 5) How many faculty members are willing to teach at Surrey now? Why?
- 6) Are there some kinds of supports that can make people more willing to teach at Surrey? What will you do to attract more professors to Surrey?
- 7) If you cannot get more faculties from Burnaby, what will you do? (Recruiting new members?) If so, will you use a lower recruitment standard?
- 8) Are requirements for hiring new faculty teaching at Surrey Campus same as requirements for Burnaby Campus? If not, why?
- 9) What strategies the business faculty will use to align the performance in Campus, Burnaby and Surrey?
- 10) What is your opinion about the E-learning, the major teaching method at Surry?

11) What do you think about co-hort?

12) What is the advantage/disadvantage to teach at Surrey?

13) What's your expectation for this change? Are you optimistic to it?

14) Do you think the committee members are the best choice?

4.3 Appendix C- Interview Questions for Faculty Members

- 1) Do you know that there will be a change at Surrey campus? Do you think you have got enough information about it?
- 2) By which way did you get this information?
- 3) Are there some kinds of communication between you and the change committee?
- 4) Do you think the communication is enough?
- 5) Do you have clear vision and goal of this change? If no, Why? If yes, what are this vision and goal?
- 6) Do you think this change aligned with the whole strategy of SFU?
- 7) Is there anyone in your department willing to teach at Surrey? Why?
- 8) Are there some kinds of supports that can make people more willing to teach at Surrey? Do you know actually there is kind of change? (More Fund at Surrey for Faculty to do research) Do you think the new faculty recruited at Surrey will be inferior?
- 9) What is your opinion about the E-learning, the major teaching method at Surrey?
- 10) What do you think about co-hort?
- 11) What is the advantage/disadvantage to teach at Surrey?
- 12) What's your expectation for this change? Are you optimistic to it?
- 13) What should be Committee's next step?
- 14) Do you think the committee members are the best choice? Are you satisfied with the performance of the committee? Do you have any suggestion to it?

REFERENCE LIST

- Jansen, Karen J. (2000) The emerging dynamics of change: Resistance, readiness, and momentum. *Human Resource Planning*, 23, 53-59
- Levine, Gene (Sep. 1997) Forging successful change, 39, 164-165.
- O Connor, Carol (1993) Managing resistance to change. *Management Development Review*, 6, 25-30
- De Jager, Peter (2001) Resistance to change: A new view of an old problem. *The Futurist*, 35, 24-28.
- Mercer, Michael (2001) Managing Employees Who Resist or Rebel Change. *Manage*, 52, 16-18.
- Coetsee, L. (1999) "From Resistance to Commitment". *Public Administration Quarterly*, 23, 204-222.
- Pardo del Val, Manuela & Fuentes, Clara Martinez (2003) Resistance to change: A literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision*, 41, 148-157
- Maurer, Rick (2002) When people are ready to act. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 25, 26-28
- B Dent, Eric & Goldberg, Susan Galloway (1999) Challenging "resistance to change". *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 25-43
- Trader-Leigh, Karyn E (2002) Case study: Identifying resistance in managing change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15, 138-157.
- CONNER, DARYL R. (1993) *Managing at the speed of change: How resilient managers succeed and prosper where others fail.* VILLARD BOOKS, 248
- MacKay, Nancy (2004) *Inspire Action Method For Leading Organizational Change.* MacKay Nancy Consulting Services Inc