Schedule for MgS 8130 Summer 2005, Monday-Wednesday 4:45-7:30 224 Aderhold

Send me email at 8130 [at] WHALENs [dot] org

Accessing Assigned Readings in Library Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1; 6/13</th>
<th>Course Introduction; What is Decision Science; Herbert Simon's Normative Problem Solving Model. intelligence -- design -- choice -- implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxonomy of Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assign cognitive style test on Internet

Group Project

Assign cognitive style test on Internet

Individual Take-Home Final Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Apollo 13: &quot;Houston, we have an Opportunity&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intelligence Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Come to class with your type scores group assignment. Overview Of Heuristics and Biases. Real Differences and Random Differences. REVISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Group Behaviors. Jones Box &amp; Label case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printer-Friendly Version
**Design Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion/Group Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>&quot;Creativity in ...&quot; case on eReserves Creativity &amp; Decision Making Ryan Dornbos Case</td>
<td>Harnessing Heuristics: Anchoring, Concreteness Pyramid of ideas Creativity Techniques &quot;Creativity Techniques&quot; - a contradiction? Creativity Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>Creativity and Sleep</td>
<td>Objectives, Alternatives, Consequences Consequence Matrices, Payoff Matrices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choice Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion/Group Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>&quot;Even Swaps&quot; on eReserves Even Swaps</td>
<td>Even-Swap Tradeoffs, Weighted-Sum Tradeoffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion/Group Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>Implementation phase</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Counter-Implementation Resistance to Change: Article Slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>Video: 12 Angry Men Summary of the Course</td>
<td>Delphi: review the results of Round 3 and the requirements for Round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trun in (email) individual Take-Home Final Exam</td>
<td>Turn in: Group writeup on structured dialog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION and COUNTER-IMPLEMENTATION

*Harvey Brightman: Group Problem Solving: An improved managerial approach, 1988*

After your option has been approved, install it. Installation and implementation are not synonymous. Although installation is a critical part of implementation, there is more to implementation. It actually begins during problem solving. Implementation thinking helps you design options that can easily be installed and that accomplish the desired goals without generating any harmful side effects. It helps ensure that the option is enthusiastically adopted by those it is intended to help. Installing the option is important. But setting the stage for the installation is just as critical.

Remember, sometimes a solution creates worse problems. Harmful side effects often occur, especially in implementing complex solutions. Moreover, to be a complete success, you must sell the option to the problem havers. And they must willingly accept ownership. Otherwise the option will always remain the problem-solving team's solution (also known as "their" solution, not "ours")- To summarize, a successful implementation occurs when: An option accomplishes its short-run goals and does not create worse problems. Most important, the problem havers take ownership of the option.

**Why Implementations Fail**

First, and most obvious, are design flaws in the solution. It is either ineffective or the decision goals are in conflict with one another. The option simply cannot meet all the goals. Poor management of the implementation process also produces failures. The option could be effective but the team fails to create a need for the solution or botches the installation. Alternatively, when the decision causes major changes in the organization, political factors become critical. Counter-implementors will try to thwart the implementation effort.

**Design Flaws.** The Model Cities program created by the federal government in 1966 illustrates how design flaws can cripple an option.13 Congress created the program to accomplish the following goals:

1. Help inner city residents with a variety of services.
2. Strengthen the authority of mayors over social program decision making in their cities.
3. Bring efficiency and economy to a whole set of preexisting overlapping programs.
4. Strengthen local neighborhood leaders by encouraging self-sufficiency, including providing training that would lead them to challenge mayors and city officials efficiently.

How could the Model Cities program be successful when goals 2 and 4 clash head-on? It is not possible to strengthen the authority of mayors while teaching neighborhood leaders to successfully negotiate with city officials. The program was flawed from the start.

Another common design flaw is lack of specificity. The team may never fully detail the chosen option. Thus, no one is sure exactly what the option is. You know that lack of specificity has happened when during installation a team member says, "But I thought our solution . . ." Here we have a disaster waiting to happen.

Perhaps the most common mistake is ignoring implementation issues when designing options. The team should design options within the capability of those who will have to install it. Do not assume that the
installers are brilliant or are firmly entrenched in their jobs. Do not wait until the option has been chosen to start thinking about implementation issues. Let it be said one more time: Implementation issues should be a central thread of the decision making process.

**Poor Management Techniques.** Sometimes we even fail with uncontroversial options. The most common reason is ineffective management of the installation process. Many people are involved, but no one is in charge. There are too many Indians and too few chiefs. Furthermore, we have the potential for coordination problems. And these problems are exacerbated when the team has not developed a formal installation game plan that includes routines or procedures.

**Politics of Implementation** The causes of failure increase when the level of conflict is high. And this occurs when others believe that the chosen option will produce major shifts in power or resources. We know that counter-implementors try to deflect the decision goals, divert resources, or waylay an unsuspecting problem-solving team. In short, they play counter-implementation games and use their political clout. We have entered the gamesmanship arena.

**Other Factors.**

- Senior management must truly support the option. Mere lip service will not do. Real support must provide resources and political clout whenever they are needed to overcome installation obstacles.
- Another sure way to kill an option is to expect too much of it. When the beneficiaries of an option have unrealistically high expectations, the option may not deliver and may be scrapped.
- Finally, members of the problem-solving team may not understand the process or dynamics of implementation. You do not just install an option, you need a strategy to guide the entire implementation process?

**Lewin and Schein Model**

Implementation is a perilous journey. However, the Lewin and Schein Model provides a road map for successfully negotiating each step of the implementation:16

**Good Practices in the Unfreezing Stage**

In unfreezing you set the stage for installing your ultimate solution. Unfreezing begins the first day of your problem-solving effort. Now we know that solutions produce change in an organization. While change is inevitable, everyone resists it. Only wet babies like change. We are creatures of habit. Thus, unfreezing is salesmanship. You may need to sell colleagues or senior management on the need for action, your diagnosis, and whatever option you ultimately design.

In the unfreezing stage you create a perceived need to change the status quo. Change can only occur when all agree that it will be beneficial. If the problem havers are not already on your team, invite them to join. They are important stakeholders and have much insight to offer. Encourage them to play an active role in diagnosing the problem, designing "skeletal" solutions, and selecting the final option. You will design more effective solutions when problem solvers and problem havers respect one another.

Also work on building and maintaining networks of supporters throughout the company. They may be able to help you overcome future counter-implementation games. Networking is time-consuming, but it can pay dividends.

Your goal is to create a receptive environment for whatever solution your team ultimately designs. Make it easy on yourself. Begin by designing effective solutions that you can easily implement. Social scientists
Randall Ripley and Grace Franklin argue that the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit designed in late 1978 was so flawed that even a perfect installation could have made no difference. They further argue that some programs are so well designed that even a fumbling bureaucracy cannot derail them. They may not work as smoothly as desired, but the problem havers nevertheless still receive the benefits.

Remember, design solutions that are simple to install. And do not let others complicate your solutions. They may have ulterior motives.

Also, do not assume that your option will sell itself. Your option may encounter opposition when critical stakeholders have not been involved in making the decision, do not trust the problem-solving team, or are likely to lose power or resources. Here, selling important stakeholders and the problem havers is a critical element of the unfreezing stage. Gaining acceptance for the option is as critical as the option itself. For if it is not accepted, it may not be implemented successfully.

Selling an option has additional benefits. The problem havers, or consumers, can give you insight on how best to proceed. Or they can provide your team with additional resources for the installation. Remember, sold consumers are more likely to support the team’s solution.

How should you sell your option? The first principle of salesmanship is sell benefits, not features. The problem havers do not want to know what "bells and whistles" you have designed into a solution, but rather, what benefits your solution will deliver. Do not oversell benefits either. You need to manage their expectations. Unrealistic expectations will kill an option.

Good Practices in the Moving Stage

As you enter this stage, you have already chosen your option; now you must install it. Begin by developing detailed formal plans to guide the installation process. These should decompose the installation into a sequence of steps and procedures. Tailor your plan to your personnel. Don’t build a plan only a Rambo could carry out when Charlie Brown will have to do it. Then develop contingency plans for the most critical problems dredged up from your potential problem analysis. The moving stage concludes when the option has been installed.

Managing the installation is essential to success. It begins with developing an detailed plan. One effective way to create a plan is the Gantt, or time task analysis, Chart. To create a Gantt Chart you:

1. List every task in installing the option. Be specific and do not leave out any tasks.

2. Estimate the total amount of time you have to install your option.

3. Estimate the amount of time needed to complete each task. When must you start and complete each task?

4. Compare the time required to complete the tasks to the total time you have available. If the tasks require more time than you have available, you must (1) eliminate tasks, (2) do several of the tasks simultaneously, (3) obtain additional resources to reduce task time, or (4) ask for more time to install the option.

5. Construct a chart showing the relationship between each task and its time estimate. Plot the tasks on the vertical axis and time on the horizontal axis.

6. Use your Gantt Chart to install your option and track its progress. If you fall behind schedule, you must take steps to get back on track.

Let us construct a Gantt Chart for the Alumni Club option. The team identified five tasks that must be
accomplished within an eight-week period. First, team members must find alumni who will organize the club. The team estimated that this would take about one and one-half weeks and must begin immediately. Next, the team had to find an executive director. This search should begin during the first week and must be completed by the middle of the third week. The completed Gantt Chart is shown in Exhibit 6-9.

Now you can assign installation team members to each of the tasks. You should also determine the resources it will take (time, money, and so forth) to do each task. Obtain those resources and begin the installation.

Use the Gantt Chart to plan, manage, and track an installation. Post the chart in a conspicuous place where all can follow the team's progress. If you fall behind schedule, call a team meeting. Discuss how you can make up for lost time and what resources will be needed to do so.

In developing your plan, keep in mind the following fundamental premises:

- Do not build a plan that assumes installers are highly competent. All are not.
- Do not build a plan that assumes installers are highly entrenched in their jobs. People do transfer or quit jobs.

Now you should develop contingency plans for all critical installation problems (Exhibit 6-8). Use the Nominal Group Technique to develop your countermeasures. Each member, silently and independently, develops a plan for each potential problem. A plan includes the countermeasure and a trigger. A trigger is an indicator that tells you when to enact your contingency plan. That is, what data will you need to see before you are convinced that a potential problem is about to occur? This approach works very well for nonpolitical problems (for example, problems 1 through 4, Exhibit 6-8).

When political problems are likely (see problems 5 and 7, Exhibit 6-8), your implementation problems increase. Consider scenario writing in developing your contingency plans.19 Using the Nominal Group format, ask yourself:

**Question:** What resources are needed to overcome the most probable games?

**Team Analysis:** We will need to develop countermeasures for "piling on" and "keeping the peace." The essential resource is formal authority to keep the human resources group from playing these games. Unfortunately, our team does not have the necessary authority.

**Question:** Who controls the resources, directly or indirectly?

**Team Analysis:** The manager of the human resources group is unlikely to stop the games. In fact, he may well be the "ring-leader." The human resources group reports directly to the vice president for administration.

**Question:** Will the resource owners cooperate, and if not, how will you work around them or buy them off?

**Team Analysis:** At this moment we do not believe that the vice president for administration will intervene if the human resources group plays games. She has more important things to do. How can we get her to intervene on our behalf? Does she owe favors to members of the problem-solving team. Can we speak to her as a colleague and share our concerns?

**Question:** Can you redesign your option to thwart the counter-implementors?

**Team Analysis:** This should be considered. Perhaps we can remove the human resources group from the game. Our initial option had the club reporting to the manager of the human resources group. Perhaps we can have the club report directly to the vice president for administration? Will senior management accept this?
Will the manager of the human resources group accept this?

Question: Can you fix the game? Is there a senior person who can help you overcome obstacles? Why should someone fix the game for you?

Team Analysis: If the vice president for administration does not intervene, who could stop the human resources group from gameplaying? Perhaps the vice president of marketing will intervene. Although he is not involved with the project, he is your mentor. Perhaps he would be willing to play the fixer role. Consider sharing your concerns with him.

Question: Can you build a coalition to fix the game?

Team Analysis: Coalitions are unlikely in this company. The firm is similar to sixteenth-century Italy, a country in name only. Each department rules itself and has not wanted to form alliances in the past. But there is always a first time. Perhaps we should consider it if our other approaches fail. Will the networking we did in the unfreezing stage help us forge a coalition?

Clearly, scenario writing will not be necessary for most installations. Often there is no political infighting. But when there is, consider scenario writing. In answering questions such as those proposed, you will be able to minimize the counter-implimentors' gameplaying. Remember, the game is not over until you have successfully installed your option.

**Good Practices In The Refreezing Stage**

A successful implementation requires refreezing. Evaluate whether the option accomplishes the decision goals. Be prepared to modify it if unanticipated negative consequences occur. Refreezing concludes when the problem havers adopt the option and make it their own. The option now loses its separate identity and becomes a part of the organization's ongoing activities. The option has become part of the routine. It has found a home and now belongs to the problem havers. Management Information Systems' expert Michael Ginzberg tells us that project success is highly related to refreezing success.20 Do not claim success until you have refrozen the option.

First, determine whether the option obtained the desired goals. You should go beyond the obvious and ask:

- Did the problem havers benefit in additional and unexpected ways? Or did others not intended to benefit also benefit?
- Were the problem havers harmed in some unexpected way? Or were others, inside or outside the department, harmed?
- Were the goals obtained on schedule?

Remember a successful option accomplishes its short-run goals, may generate beneficial unintended consequences, but never creates worse problems.

It is essential that the problem havers buy the solution and make it their own. Sometimes this a most difficult task. A temporary task force or problem-solving team cannot continue to manage the option. When the team disbands, who will direct it? We call this bowing out gracefully, and it must be done. But will the problem havers buy what you are selling? Your chances increase if they have been sold on the idea and have been part of a problem-solving team.

Refreezing closes the problem-solving loop. It comes at the end of a long process. But it should have started when you first found out you had a problem. At every problem-solving step, you and your team should have been thinking: "What must we do to ensure that a successful solution will be a permanent part of the
organization's landscape?" When you have refrozen the option, the problem-solving game is over. You've won.
IMPLEMENTATION And Counter-Implementation
Brightman: Group Problem Solving, chapter 6 p. 194-210

Installation versus Implementation
Implementation begins during problem solving
Design options that
  • can easily be installed
  • accomplish the desired goals
  • without generating any harmful side effects.
  • ensure that the option is enthusiastically adopted by those it is intended to help.
You must sell the option to the "problem havers.
  And they must willingly accept ownership

Transition from Decision Making to Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reality Testing</th>
<th>unintended consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>re-evaluate rejected alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem Analysis</th>
<th>Murphy's Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamesmanship &amp; counter-counter-implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rate potential problems: seriousness X probability |

Why Implementations Fail

Organizational Change: The Lewin & Schein Model

Unfreezing -- Moving -- Refreezing
Why Implementations Fail

**Design Flaws:** Vague, contradictory, or infeasible options
   - Model Cities Example; make mayors stronger and weaker

**Unrealistic Expectations**

**Lack of Support from Higher Management**

**Lack of Implementation Strategy**

**Politics of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect goals</th>
<th>Piling On</th>
<th>the Fifth Column</th>
<th>Easy Life</th>
<th>Play Money</th>
<th>We'll Do It Our Way</th>
<th>Not Our Job</th>
<th>Odd Man Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kill an option with kindness  Counter-implementers suggest increasing the option's scope &amp; complexity. More complex projects are more difficult to install.</td>
<td>Counter-implementers join the implementation team as a peacekeeping gesture. Their real goal is to promote chaos, delay, and inertia.</td>
<td>&quot;Let's take this process slowly&quot; &quot;Let's make this project as easy on everyone as possible&quot; Bus the Counter-implementers' real goal is massive delay.</td>
<td>Inflate dollar or man-hour estimates needed to install your option. Can cause delay or outright re-evaluation of the option.</td>
<td>Counter-implementers &quot;support&quot; the option but want to either be in charge or have control of the installation project. Their real goal is massive delay or re-evaluation.</td>
<td>Counter-implementers agree to the option but they believe it is outside the scope of their department. &quot;We would like to help install the option but that is not our job.&quot;</td>
<td>Counter-implementers tell you they support the option but they cannot commit their resources until other groups jump on board. If many groups feel this way the project will die.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lewin & Schein Model of Organizational Change

Unfreezing Stage

- Foster Creative Discontent with the Status Quo
- Establish Trust & Support
- Defuse motives for counter-implementation

Good Practices in the Unfreezing Stage

Unfreezing begins the first day of your problem-solving effort.

While change is inevitable, everyone resists it.

Thus, unfreezing is salesmanship.

Create a perceived need to change the status quo;
Change can only occur when all agree that it will be beneficial.

You will design more effective solutions when problem solvers and problem havers respect one another.

Building and maintain networks of supporters throughout the company.

Design solutions that are simple to install.
And do not let others complicate your solutions. They may have ulterior motives.

Selling an option has additional benefits.
The problem havers, or consumers, can give you insight on how best to proceed.
Or they can provide your team with additional resources for the installation.

How should you sell your option?
The first principle of salesmanship is sell benefits, not features. The problem havers do not want to know what "bells and whistles" you have designed into a solution, but rather, what benefits your solution will deliver.
Do not oversell benefits either. You need to manage their expectations. Unrealistic expectations will kill an option.
**Lewin & Schein Model of Organizational Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving Stage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management Tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gantt Chart, PERT &amp; CPM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contingency Plans** | decision trees  
revise Gantt/PERT/CPM charts over time  
counter-counter-implementation |

**Good Practices in the Moving Stage**

(As you enter this stage, you have already chosen your option)

Formalize detailed step by step plans to guide the installation process.
Develop contingency plans for the most critical problems

- A trigger is an indicator that tells you when to enact your contingency plan. That is, what data will you need to see before you are convinced that a potential problem is about to occur?

Tailor your plan to your personnel.

- Don't build a plan only a Rambo could carry out when Charlie Brown will have to do it.
- Don't build a plan that assumes the same people will stay in the same jobs.

Plan implementation with a [Gantt chart](#) and keep it up to date

**Counter-Counter-Implementation:**

What resources are needed to overcome the most probable games?

Who controls the resources, directly or indirectly?

Will the resource owners cooperate, and if not, how will you work around them or buy them off?

Can you redesign your option to thwart the counter-implementors?

Can you fix the game?
Is there a senior person who can help you overcome obstacles?
Why should someone fix the game for you?

Can you build a coalition to fix the game?
**Lewin & Schein Model of Organizational Change**

### Refreezing Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routinize &amp; Institutionalize the Innovation</th>
<th>Innovation, like treason, n'er doth prospee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sir John Harrington  "Of Treason" - 1618

*Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?*  
*For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.*

**Good Practices In The Refreezing Stage**

A successful implementation requires refreezing.

Refreezing concludes when the problem havers adopt the option and make it their own.

The option now loses its separate identity and becomes a part of the organization's ongoing routine activities.

Never claim success for "your" innovation; it's not a success until it's "our" routine. "bowing out gracefully"

Evaluate whether the option accomplishes the decision goals.

- Did the problem havers benefit in additional and unexpected ways? Or did others not intended to benefit also benefit?
- Were the problem havers harmed in some unexpected way? Or were others, inside or outside the department, harmed?
- Were the goals obtained on schedule?

Be prepared to modify it if unanticipated negative consequences occur.

Refreezing closes the problem-solving loop. It comes at the end of a long process. But it should have started when you first found out you had a problem. At every problem-solving step, you and your team should have been thinking: "What must we do to ensure that a successful solution will be a permanent part of the organization's landscape?" When you have refrozen the option, the problem-solving game is over. You've won.
It seems that this topic just never goes away. I have just returned from New Orleans where I conducted a seminar on overcoming resistance to employee involvement (EI), and was once again surprised (and dismayed) that we are still struggling with moving it forward in our organizations.

Most of the attendees had some role in spreading employee involvement within their organizations, and most were frustrated to say the least. What is it about our workplace today that seems to resist movement to a concept that has proven itself over and over?

As I have working with organizations over the years to create participative work environments, this question has been central to my successes and failures. If one can understand the dynamics of change, both personal and organizational, the probability of success will be greatly enhanced.

What I have learned is that there are three basic elements in creating successful change:

1. The desire to change
2. The ability to change
3. The permission to change (for those in organizations)

1. The Desire to Change

Most humans will not change their beliefs, habits, or behaviors unless they are motivated to do so. Most will not change, even if change is for the better, unless there is some compelling reason. As long as the perceived rewards of staying as we are remain greater than the rewards of changing, we will likely stay as we are. Or, conversely, as long as the perceived risks of changing are greater than the risks for staying the same, we will be unlikely to change.

I was recently given the below cartoon which, to me, symbolizes this concept perfectly in terms of today's changing workplace.

"I trusted him more when he had a whip!"
The supervisor or, symbolically, the slave master, is attempting to change (humanize) his management style with his "Slave of the Month" program. Meanwhile, one slave says to the other, "I trusted him more when he had a whip!"

Not only does the slave master have difficulty changing, but the slaves are also feeling some discomfort, even when the change is beneficial to them! Our desire to hold on to things that are familiar and, hence, comfortable is strong.

**Resource Tip:** Resistance to change can be lessened by using an instrument such as *Mastering the Change Curve.*

Of the three elements required for change, my bias is that desire is most important. Little happens if there is no real motivation to change. And strong motivation frequently makes up for shortcomings in the other two. A central question, then, is how do we create this desire to change?

**Awareness**
First we must create awareness of the need to change. What are the compelling reasons to move away from the familiar and comfortable and move to something different and perhaps uncomfortable?

In today's competitive world economy, more and more people are becoming aware of the need for improving the way or organizations work. However, if we really want to turn up the heat on change, we must discuss internally the specific challenges facing our organization.

Who is our competition? What are they doing? What new products and services are they adding? Is the market for our product or service expanding or contracting? What are our costs and revenues per employee versus our competition's? Will our products be subject to new environmental controls? What will rapidly expanding telecommunications technology mean to us and our existing work processes? Can we reduce our overhead expenses to match those considered best in our industry? Could we really become "paperless?" How could we reduce our basic work process by 10 steps this month? How could we improve our turnaround time by 90%?

It is my opinion that the more profitable an organization is, the more creative it must be in creating the appropriate challenge. One organization I worked with wanted to increase the rate of implementation of employee involvement, which for several years had been painfully slow. The company was old, well established in its market, and experiencing continued earnings growth. What, I asked myself, would provide some motivation for these people to move forward?

By chance, I came across an article discussing one of their strongest competitors. The article related performance data of the competitor showing, for example, that its revenues per employee were twice that of my client! I shared this information with the management team and they were shocked by the numbers. They could now see the potential threat posed by a competitor with such strong financial performance.

In this case, the risk of inaction became a greater motivator than the discomfort of changing to a participative style of management.

**Strategies to Develop Awareness**
From a practical point of view, how can this type of information and resulting dialogue be generated?

1. Develop a proactive organization newsletter that discusses issues relevant to its future.
2. Initiate management dialogue sessions with other managers, supervisors, and employees.
3. Conduct **training sessions** that deal with the need to change.
4. Use case studies that demonstrate what happens when organizations don't respond to changes in their industry or environment: GM, Sears, IBM, Xerox (early 80's), and others.
5. Conduct book study sessions at the work group level using, for example, books that show compelling reasons for change.\(^1\)
6. Ask people (perhaps in a small group format) "What would happen if we don't change?"
7. Bring in examples of competitor's products and discuss the implications.
8. Put up a master bulletin board in a central area and invite employees to post articles on the industry, competitors, challenges, and so forth.
9. Conduct a Future Search Conference, *(see section entitled Large Scale Involvement in the Facilitation section of our bookstore)* to seriously discuss the future of the organization.
10. Encourage senior managers to "wander" frequently throughout the organization asking appropriate questions regarding the need to change.
11. Change reward systems to align with those behaviors the organization wants to expand. For example,
performance evaluations should reward a participative style for leaders at all levels and active involvement in organization improvement for all employees.

Again, the purpose of these strategies is to create some discomfort or dissatisfaction with the status quo—a realization that to stay as we are is more of a threat than to move forward with new concepts.

The above strategies make one major assumption, however, and that is that management is not already destroying employee motivation and allegiance with destructive dictates and mandates. For example, those organizations prone to laying off employees at the first sign of financial weakness will find it difficult, if not impossible, to implement and sustain any form of participative management. A layoff as a first alternative to cost reduction contradicts the notion of participative management. Employees will find it hard to commit fully to the organization and its mission, goals, and ideals.

2. The Ability to Change

If the motivation for change exists, then people will need some assistance developing the skills to change. Ignorant of the dynamics of human behavior, we assume that once people understand the need for change, they will miraculously move in that direction.

However, what holds us back is our ingrained beliefs and resulting behaviors. For example, I may want to become a participative manager but all my previous training has conditioned me to be controlling and directive and, clearly, the decision maker. And down deep inside, I might really have doubts about this employee involvement stuff. To change my beliefs and ultimately my behaviors significantly, I will need some help.

Strategies to Develop Ability

1. Join the Association for Quality and Participation and tap into a valuable network of people going through the same change.
2. Get on mail lists for other organizations providing support services dealing with change in today's workplace.
3. Define a clear vision of the new work environment. In specific terms, what does employee involvement, empowerment, and self-direction mean in our organization?

Example: Employee Involvement Vision

- All employees engaged daily in improving work processes and solving problems
- 50 ideas per year per employee for improving the work and the workplace
- Managers and supervisors encouraging and supporting new ideas on a daily basis
- Work teams meeting on a weekly basis to expand and enhance process improvement innovations

Example: Empowerment and Self-Direction Vision (partial list for example only)

- Supervisor trains group members, delegates daily work group skills, and focuses on longer/wider-range value-added work
- The work group sets and measures its own standards of performance
- The work group determines its own training needs
- The work group deals with its customers
- The work group sets and monitors its own budget
- The work group operates without daily direct supervision
- Peer evaluations are used to improve individual performance
- The work group interviews and selects/hires new group members

The vision serves as a clear picture of what the organization will look like in the future.

4. Attend training on the new skills required by managers, supervisors, and front-line employees.
5. Publicize "success" stories as they occur in the organization. This helps people see what the organization wants of them.
6. Attend specialty seminars, conferences, symposiums, (see Upcoming Events) and so forth that discuss the new work concepts.
7. Visit other organizations that are further along in the process and learn from them.
8. Invite guest speakers in from other organizations to relate what they have learned about change and the new work concepts.
9. Contact video services and search for videos that discuss or model involvement, empowerment, team, and quality concepts.

**Resource Tip:** The changing roles of supervisors and front-line employees in the new system is demonstrated in the video *A Team Leader's Day*.

10. Conduct structured dialogues where managers, supervisors, union representatives, or employees can discuss safely their fears and concerns with the new concepts. Why might they hold back? ...and what has to happen for them to move forward? Small group formats work best.

11. Strive to simplify the entire improvement (quality) process. A bureaucratic process will cave in under its own weight.

**Resource Tip:** Simplification of process improvement and quick-change concepts is demonstrated in the video *The Winner's Circle*.

12. Conduct a management session on understanding the organization’s beliefs. Do the beliefs support the changes necessary for progress, or will they hold the organization in its current system?

Because our prior training and conditioning is such a significant barrier to our ability to change, we need to take some very proactive steps (such as the strategies listed above). Our learned behavior is like a spring that pulls us back to a comfortable position whenever we stretch a little too far. Breaking free of that spring is difficult, but possible, if we take conscious actions that eventually replace the old behaviors with new ones.

### 3. The Permission to Change

Finally there is the issue of permission. When a change is personal, we only have to give ourselves permission to change. But when the change is in an organizational context, permission must be granted by those in power.

I may have the desire to change, and I may have the knowledge and ability to change. But if I work in an environment that doesn't enable me to change, very little will happen. Desire and ability are there, but permission is not.

I am told frequently by seminar participants that they are constrained by those above them and they don't know what to do. Here are some suggestions:

1. I could do nothing and wait for my organization to get serious about improvement and involvement concepts.
2. I could learn more about the new workplace concepts and begin to discuss them with others, particularly those above me.
3. I could lobby my bosses to take seriously these concepts of involvement and improvement to secure a future for our organization.
4. I could invite my bosses to a seminar, AQP local chapter meeting, conference, or other session.
5. I could ask for permission to experiment with the concepts.
6. I could send my bosses copies of the book *Walk the Talk*. (Depending on my comfort level with this idea, I may want to give them anonymously.)
7. I could send articles regarding our industry and its competition to my bosses, to entice them to look further into change.
8. I could secretly put my bosses on the mail lists of organizations advocating change.
9. I could begin making changes (without permission) within the confines of my workspace and see what happens. A front-line supervisor that wants to experiment with team and improvement concepts might begin by quietly involving his or her people in improving their work processes. Documenting any improvements would then validate the concepts. (Makes use of the important principle: It is easier to ask for forgiveness than permission.)
10. I could send a letter to the CEO encouraging senior management to look seriously at improvement and involvement concepts. (Requires a high level of confidence and risk taking.)
11. I could ask to make a presentation to the senior management team and attempt to influence their thinking about the new workplace concepts. (Also requires a high level of confidence and risk taking.)
12. I could assemble a group of others in the organization who also feel strongly about the need to improve our work and operate within this group to promote change.

The point of this list is to show that if you work in an organization that does not yet support the new workplace concepts, all is not lost. There is probably something on this list that would fit your personal comfort level. Too
many of us throw up our hands and say "What can I do?" rather than "Here's what I can do."

The question of permission is a very personal one that we must answer for ourselves.

In this article I have tried to address the ongoing concern of how to overcome resistance to employee involvement, empowerment, self-direction, and improvement concepts. This is an issue we all struggle with, and I wish there were a simple answer. What I have learned is that no one strategy will work for everyone. The reasons we resist change are very personal and unique, so to change the thinking of many people in an organization will probably require a variety of approaches.

1. A good resource for identifying such books: Theodore Kinni, The Business Reader, P.O. Box 3627, Williamsburg, VA 23187. Phone (757) 258-4746 Email: bizbooks@gte.net

2. See Supervisors in Transition

3. U.S. Department of Labor, American Productivity and Quality Center, Center for the Study of Work Teams

4. Contact the Association for Quality and Participation at 513-381-1959 for a list of such companies.

Additional Resources:

Seminars:

- Embracing Change
- Overcoming Resistance to Employee Involvement, Teams, and Collaboration (call 610-358-1961 for more information)

Books:

- Caught in the Middle: A Leadership Guide for Partnership in the Workplace
- Beyond the Wall of Resistance: Unconventional Strategies That Build Support for Change

Products

- Mastering the Change Curve - A 1-2 hour program to help individuals, teams, and organizations understand, accept, and move through the experience of change.
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Overcoming Resistance to Employee Involvement

By Peter B. Grazier

Three basic elements in creating successful change:
1. The desire to change
2. The ability to change
3. The permission to change (for those in organizations)
1. The Desire to Change
As long as the perceived rewards of staying as we are remain greater than the rewards of changing, we will likely stay as we are.

Or, conversely, as long as the perceived risks of changing are less than the risks for staying the same, we will be unlikely to change.
Awareness of the Need To Change

Who is our competition?
What are they doing?
What new products and services are they adding?
Is the market for our product or service expanding or contracting?
What are our costs and revenues per employee versus our competition's?
Will our products be subject to new environmental controls?
What will new telecommunications technology mean to us and our work?
Can we reduce our overhead expenses to match those considered best in our industry?
Could we really become "paperless?"
How could we reduce our basic work process by 10 steps this month?
How could we improve turnaround time by 90%?
Strategies to Develop Awareness
1. organization newsletter that discusses issues relevant to its future.
2. management dialogue sessions with managers, supervisors, employees.
3. Conduct training sessions that deal with the need to change.
4. Use case studies that demonstrate what happens when organizations don't respond to changes:
5. work group book study sessions, books that show reasons for change.
6. Ask (perhaps in small group) "What would happen if we don't change?"
7. Bring in examples of competitor's products and discuss the implications.
8. invite employees to post articles on bulletin board about the industry, competitors, challenges, and so forth.
9. Conduct a Future Search Conference (what the author sells)
10. Encourage top managers to "wander" throughout the organization asking appropriate questions regarding the need to change.
11. Change reward systems to align with those behaviors the organization wants to expand. For example, performance evaluations should reward a participative style for leaders at all levels and active involvement in organization improvement for all employees.
The purpose of these strategies is to create some discomfort or dissatisfaction with the status quo. A realization that to stay as we are is more of a threat than to move forward with new concepts.

The above strategies assume that management is not already destroying employee motivation and allegiance with destructive dictates and mandates. For example, those organizations prone to laying off employees at the first sign of financial weakness will find it difficult, if not impossible, to implement and sustain any form of participative management. Employees will find it hard to commit fully to the organization and its mission, goals, and ideals.
2. The Ability to Change

If the motivation for change exists, then people will need some assistance developing the skills to change. Ignorant of the dynamics of human behavior, we assume that once people understand the need for change, they will miraculously move in that direction.

However, what holds us back is our ingrained beliefs and resulting behaviors. For example, I may want to become a participative manager but all my previous training has conditioned me to be controlling and directive and, clearly, the decision maker. And down deep inside, I might really have doubts about this employee involvement stuff. To change my beliefs and ultimately my behaviors significantly, I will need some help.
Strategies to Develop Ability

1. Join the Association for Quality and Participation.
2. Get on mail lists for dealing with change in today's workplace.
3. Define a clear vision of the new work environment.
4. Attend training on the new skills required by managers & employees.
5. Publicize "success" stories as they occur in the organization.
6. Attend specialty seminars, conferences, symposiums.
7. Visit other organizations that are further along in the process.
9. Videos on model involvement, empowerment, team, quality concepts.
10. Structured dialogues: managers, supervisors, union representatives, employees safely discuss fears & concerns with the new concepts.
11. Simplify the entire improvement (quality) process, reduce bureaucracy
12. Management session on understanding the organization's beliefs.
More about "Define clear vision of the new work environment."

Example: Employee Involvement Vision
* All employees engaged daily in improving work processes & solving problems
* 50 ideas per year per employee for improving the work and the workplace
* Managers & supervisors encouraging & supporting new ideas on daily basis
* Weekly work team meetings to expand & enhance process improvement innovations

Example: Empowerment and Self-Direction Vision
* Supervisor trains group members, delegates daily work group skills, and focuses on longer/wider-range value-added work
* Work group sets and measures its own standards of performance
* Work group determines its own training needs
* Work group deals with its customers
* Work group sets and monitors its own budget
* Work group operates without daily direct supervision
* Peer evaluations are used to improve individual performance
* Work group interviews and selects/hires new group members
3. The Permission to Change

1. just wait for my organization to get serious about improvement and involvement concepts.
2. learn about the new workplace concepts, discuss them with others, particularly bosses
3. lobby bosses to take seriously involvement & improvement.
4. invite bosses to a seminar, AQP local chapter meeting, conference, etc
5. ask permission to experiment with the concepts.
6. buy bosses copies of the book Walk the Talk. (anonymously?)
7. send articles regarding our industry and its competition to my bosses,
8. secretly put bosses on the mail lists of organizations advocating change.
9. make changes (without permission). Document any improvements.
10. send letter to CEO encouraging senior management to look seriously at improvement and involvement concepts.
11. ask to make presentation to senior management team to influence their thinking about new workplace concepts.
12. assemble coworkers who feel strongly about the need to improve our work,
(It's easier to ask for forgiveness than permission.)

The point of this list is to show that if you work in an organization that does not yet support the new workplace concepts, all is not lost. There is probably something on this list that would fit your personal comfort level. Too many of us throw up our hands and say "What can I do?" rather than "Here's what I can do."
### Characters in 12 Angry Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Identifying Characteristics</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
<th>Decision Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Martin Balsam</td>
<td>Foreman of Jury Tie w/wide stripes</td>
<td>ESFJ Guardian</td>
<td>consensus-seeking leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John Feidler</td>
<td>High pitched voice gives away coughdrops</td>
<td>INFP Idealist Healer</td>
<td>avoid conflict by being serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lee Cobb</td>
<td>Horizontal striped tie, loud mouth</td>
<td>ESFJ Guardian Supervisor</td>
<td>availability heuristic (personal anecdotes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E. G. Marshall</td>
<td>Coat, solid tie, wire glasses, brainy</td>
<td>ISTJ Guardian Inspector</td>
<td>confirmation bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jack Klugman</td>
<td>Loose tie, comes from slum</td>
<td>ISFJ Guardian Protector</td>
<td>selective perception HEURISTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Edward Binns</td>
<td>no tie, painter Defends the old man</td>
<td>INFJ Idealist Counselor</td>
<td>focuses on motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jack Warden</td>
<td>Hat, no tie has baseball tickets</td>
<td>ESFP Artisan Performer</td>
<td>representativeness bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Henry Fonda</td>
<td>The hero; he does everything right</td>
<td>normative model; needs no heuristics, has no bias equally good at introversion, extraversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, perceiving, and judging!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ed Bagley</td>
<td>Polka dot tie, loud mouthed bigot</td>
<td>ENFP Idealist Champion</td>
<td>selective perception BIAS &quot;A kid like that&quot; -- &quot;I'm sick &amp; tired of facts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. George Voscovec</td>
<td>Immigrant with mustache</td>
<td>ISFJ Guardian Protector</td>
<td>rational argument model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Robert Webber</td>
<td>Doodler; glasses with thick frames</td>
<td>ESFP Artisan Performer</td>
<td>avoid conflict by NOT being serious; avoids responsibility for what he says</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seating Chart: 1 foreman

12 doodler 2 high voice
11 immigrant 3 loudmouth
10 bigot 4 brainy
9 old man 5 slum guy
8 the hero 6. painter
7 baseball
# Summary of the Course

## Intelligence Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Styles: How we acquire and process information</td>
<td>Kiersey Temperament Sprter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristics and Biases</td>
<td>Kepner-Tregoe Diagnostic Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages and Disadvantages of Heterogeneous Groups</td>
<td>Techniques for Creative Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Diagnosis: what Is &amp; what Is Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupthink and related dangers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Design Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Alternatives &amp; Skeletal Alternatives</td>
<td>Nominal Group Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity Techniques</td>
<td>Forced Analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Interaction</td>
<td>(Brainstorming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence matrices and Payoff Matrices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Choice Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Choice</td>
<td>Even-Swap Tradeoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vroom &amp; Yetton Theory of Leadership</td>
<td>Weighted-Sum Tradeoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnessing Greed &amp; Fear</td>
<td>Dollar Value of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delphi Technique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Implementation Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation &amp; Counter-Implementation</td>
<td>Gantt Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to Change: Levin &amp; Schein model of Organizational Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Project on the Rogue Division

Begin each of the following on a new sheet of paper, even if there's just one line on the previous page. Do not use a report cover.

1. Compare and contrast what the table comparing decision processes has to say about interacting groups ("discussion groups") with your personal experience with an interacting group in the Objectives phase of the Rogue Division problem.

2. Compare and contrast what the table comparing decision processes has to say about nominal group processes with your personal experience with a nominal group in the Alternatives phase of the Rogue Division problem.

3. Compare and contrast what the table comparing decision processes has to say about Delphi group processes with your personal experience with a Delphi group in the Consequences phase of the Rogue Division problem.

Note that writing a "compare and contrast" essay is NOT the same as writing one essay summarizing what the web resource saya and writing a disconnected essay summarizing your personal experiences. Write some paragraphs about how the website and the experience are similar, and some paragraphs on how they are different, plus a concluding paragraph. I already know what interacting, nominal, and Delphi group processes are; so don't bore me with a rehash. I want to know how the specific details of the theory jive with your own specific experience.

I will assign heterogeneous teams on the basis of cognitive style. If you miss class for ANY reason at all on a day there is a group exercise, you leave your original team and move to an "expansion team," which is required to get together on their own to do the exercise they missed, and remain together as a new group thereafter. I may merge expansion teams created after two sessions, keep them separate, or even merge an expansion team into one of the original teams that has lost too many members. If this sounds complicated, you can avoid the complication by coming to class for each group exercise!

If you miss an exercise and do not make it up, you cannot get an A no matter how good your written work is.
Suppose that a heterogeneous group of four people, with one member from each of the following four temperaments

- **NT Rational**
- **NF Idealist**
- **SP Artisan**
- **SJ Guardian**

will work together on one problem, going through each of Simon's four stages of problem solving: **Intelligence, Design, Choice, Implementation** with a different member serving as group leader in each of the four phases.

The NT member will lead the group in the Intelligence phase,

the SP member will lead the group in the Design phase,

the NF member will lead the group in the Choice phase, and

the SJ member will lead the group in the Implementation phase.

Answer the following questions, **VERY CLEARLY LABELING** the answer to each question. Begin your answer to each question at the top of a new page even if there's only one line written on the previous page. Turn in your answers with a single staple in the upper left corner. Do not use a report cover or paper clip. (4 points for following each and every one of these instructions. No partial credit for following just some of them).

1. Discuss what **SPECIFIC** aspects of each of each of the four phases dovetail with **SPECIFIC** characteristics of the corresponding cognitive styles to make the assignments of members to leadership in phases a good one. (Alternatively, you may chose a different assignment of members to phases and discuss what **SPECIFIC** aspects of each of each of the four phases dovetail with **SPECIFIC** characteristics of the corresponding cognitive styles to make your assignments of members to leadership in phases a better one than the one I gave.)

   Warning: the strengths of a particular cognitive style are only relevant insofar as they match the demands of the corresponding phase better than those of some other phase. It's not an answer to the question to show that a cognitive style is a good leader or a good problem solver; you need to show that those persons belong in leadership in one phase rather than another phase. (16 points, 4 for each combination of phase and cognitive style.)

2. Discuss two **specific** cognitive biases from the list on this link that the NT leader's **specific** temperament might suffer from in dealing with the **specific** needs of the intelligence phase. (10 points) You must tie in specific characteristics of the leader with specific characteristics of the phase to justify your choice of which cognitive biases are most problematic. (10 points)

3. Discuss how the **specific** temperaments of the other three group members can help to overcome those two **specific** potential cognitive biases of that the NT leader's **specific** temperament in dealing with the **specific** needs of the intelligence phase. (10 points)

4. Discuss two **specific** cognitive biases from the list on this link that the SP leader's **specific** temperament might suffer from in dealing with the **specific** needs of the design phase specifically. You must tie in specific characteristics of the leader with specific characteristics of the phase to justify your choice of which cognitive biases are most problematic. (10 points)

5. Discuss how the **specific** temperaments of the other three group members can help to overcome those two **specific** potential cognitive biases of that the SP leader's **specific** temperament in dealing with the **specific** needs of the design phase specifically. (10 points)

6. Discuss what **specific** cognitive biases from the list on this link that the NF leader's **specific** temperament
might suffer from that are problematic in dealing with the specific needs of the choice phase. You must tie in specific characteristics of the leader with specific characteristics of the phase to justify your choice of which cognitive biases are most problematic. (10 points)

7. Discuss how the specific temperaments of the other three group members can help to overcome those two specific potential cognitive biases of that the NF leader's specific temperament in dealing with the specific needs of the choice phase. (10 points)

8. Discuss what specific cognitive biases from the list on this link that the SJ leader's specific temperament might suffer from that are problematic in dealing with the specific needs of the implementation phase. You must tie in specific characteristics of the leader with specific characteristics of the phase to justify your choice of which cognitive biases are most problematic. (10 points)

9. Discuss how the specific temperaments of the other three group members can help to overcome those two specific potential cognitive biases of that the SJ leader's specific temperament in dealing with the specific needs of the implementation phase. (10 points)

Work individually. Do not copy from another person's essay.
Do not allow another person to copy from your essay.
Do not work together on a common rough draft that you both copy from.
Do not claim that you did not read or understand these instructions