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ABSTRACT

Overtime, some jobs become routine and less challenging, resulting in the demotivation of the job-holders. Effort should be made to make work more reading or satisfying by adding more meaningful tasks to a worker’s job. Such an act aims to spur employee self esteem and feeling of self fulfilment, hence long-term satisfaction’ and performance are upheld. This calls for the constant reviewing of the jobs’ content.
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Introduction

While job analysis focuses on organisational expectations of jobs; job design concerns the satisfaction of the job-holder’s needs. The design of job should reflect both technological and human considerations. It should facilitate the achievement of the organizational objectives and the performance of the work for which the job was established to accomplish. At the same time, the design should recognize capacities and needs of those who are to perform it. The most common job design strategies in current use are job enlargement, job rotation and job enrichment.

Job Design

Job design has been defined by Davis (1992) as the specification of the content, methods and relationship of jobs in order to satisfy technological and organizational requirements as well as the social and personal requirements of the job holder. Job design has two aims:-

a. To satisfy the requirements of the organization for productivity, operational efficiency and quality of product or service;

b. To satisfy the needs of the individual for interest challenge and accomplishment.

Clearly, these aims are interrelated and the overall objective of the job design is to integrate the needs of the individual with those of the organization.
The reason for using job design techniques is based on the premise that effective performance and genuine satisfaction in work, follow mainly from intrinsic content of the job. This is related to the fundamental concepts that people are motivated when they are provided with the means to achieve their goals. Work provides means to earn money, which as extrinsic reward satisfies basic need and is instrumental in providing ways of satisfying higher-level needs. But work also provides intrinsic rewards, which are under direct control of the worker himself.

**Criteria for Job Design**

The influence of scientific management on modern work practices has been enormous. One of its major legacies is that work has been designed to fit the technology available, rather than to meet the needs and aspirations of the people concerned. Thus the most important criteria for the job design have been as follows:-

- maximise the degree of specialising;
- minimise the time required to do the job;
- minimise the level of skill required;
- minimise learning time/ training time;
- maximise the use of the machines;
- minimise the degree of flexibility in the performance of the job.

Despite the theoretical arguments in favour of simplicity of industrial jobs, it is clear that even Britain and many other industrial nations have experienced far fewer benefits than expected (Bounds, York, Adams and Ranney, 1994 p.459). The principal reason seems to
be the needs of the machines. This unwillingness to cooperate with what has been
described as the “engineering approach to job design” has manifested itself in high labour
turnover, absenteeism, lateness, poor attention to quality etc.

The pressure on the organization to reverse the trend towards work simplification, has
come from the following three main sources:

• high manufacturing costs due to low productivity;
• demands for increased control over the pace and method of working by employees
  themselves;
• pressure applied by researchers and academics working in the field of social psychology
  that studies have demonstrated that employees at all levels seek some degree of job
  satisfaction at work,

**Boredom at work**

If we are to be able to redesign jobs to adapt technology to meet the motivational needs
of employees, then it is important to know what employees find demotivating about their
work. Some useful evidence has been provided by Guest and others (1978) in a study of
boredom amongst three contrasting groups of employees: insurance workers, civil
servants and manufacturing workers. The following factors were found to make a
significant contribution to people’s views about boredom:-

• constraints in the job — having to carry out certain tasks which management has
  seen as essential, but which employees have found uninteresting e.g. form-filling,
  figure work etc;
meaningless tasks- tasks which have to be done regardless of whether they have been thought to be a waste of time by the employees;

lack of interest and challenge — clerical workers have found undemanding tasks such as filing and form filing very boring;

repetition-repetitive tasks have been seen as the major source of boredom for workers.

never-ending nature of the job- the public sector staff have said that boredom has risen from lack of any sense of completion of the task; although however, much work will have been achieved during the day, there is always more to come.

Boredom and lack of interest at work are not just caused by factors in the work itself. Two of the following also play an important role:

- individual differences;
- compensatory activities.

Whilst some generalization can be made about people’s perception of boredom, researchers have found that individual viewpoints vary considerably. Differences in the physical, mental and emotional make-up of individuals, lead to differing levels ‘of need, differing abilities and differing responses to stress. The extent to which individuals can offset boring factors in their work, depends partly on what compensatory activities are available. These may be of work or non-work kind such as having a different task to handle a tea break (non-work).
Sell (1983) states that the following characteristics are crucial if a job is to satisfy human needs:-

- There should be some degree of autonomy over the way tasks are to be achieved.
- Individuals should be responsible for their own work and for resources they use (e.g. equipment).
- An element of variety should be present in the job, so as to permit variations in task, pace and method, for example. Work cycles should be longer and repetition should be reduced to a minimum.
- There should be some arrangements for providing employees with feedback on their performance.
- The job should enable the completion of a complete item, wherever practicable.
- Some degree of social contact should be available to the jobholder.
- Learning opportunities should be built into the job so as to provide an element of learning as well as the opportunity to extent a person’s repertoire of knowledge and skills.
- Every job should have some goals to aim for.

Under job design the main approaches to achieving increased job satisfaction at work are:

- job rotation;
- job enlargement;
- autonomous work groups;
- job enrichment.
Turner and Lawrence (1985) identified the following five techniques of job design:

- Job rotation, which comprises the movement of employees from one task to another to reduce monotony by increasing variety.

- Job enlargement, which means combining previously, fragmented tasks into one job, again to increase the variety and meaning to repetitive work.

- Job enrichment, which goes beyond job enlargement to add greater autonomy and responsibility to a job and is based on the job characteristics approach. Job enrichment aims to maximize the interest and challenge of work by providing the employee with a job that has satisfying characteristics. Job enrichment is not just increasing the number of variety of tasks; nor is it the provision of opportunities for job rotation. It is claimed by advocates of job enrichment that these approaches may relieve boredom.

- Autonomous work groups, which means creating self-regulating groups who work largely, without direct supervision. The philosophy on which this technique is based is a logical extension of job enrichment but is strongly influenced by socio-technical systems theory.

- High performance work design, which concentrates on setting up working groups in environments where high levels of performance are required. Of these five techniques, it is generally recognized that although job rotation and job enlargement have their uses in developing skills and relieving monotony, they do not go to the root of the requirements for intrinsic motivation and for meeting the various motivating characteristics of jobs as described above (Armstrong 1992).
These are best satisfied by using, as appropriate, job enrichment, autonomous work groups, or high performance work design.

The idea behind the concept “job design” is built on the two factor theory formulated by Siggins (1992). A deeper involvement at work is attained through making the work itself, rather than working conditions, more attractive. The tasks are usually changed according to principles laid down by expert consultants and formulated by senior management. Some of the studies are experimental and very sophisticated for instance, in the sense that one of the workers knows that any experiment is being carried out. The enriched tasks are compared with the tasks in control groups.

**Socio-Technical Theory**

The concept “job enrichment” seems to have lost some of the attractiveness from the late 1960s. Some of the principles of job enrichment and job enlargement have become included in the socio-technical theory. Siggins (1992) summarises the essential elements in the socio-technical theory. Briefly socio-technical theory rests on the two premises. The first is that in any purposive organization in which many are required to perform activities, the desired output is achieved through the actions of a social, as well as technological system. These systems are so inter-locked that the achievement of the output becomes a function of their final joint operations.

The second premise is that every socio-technical system is embedded in an environment influenced by culture, its values and a set of generally acceptable practices. The environment permits certain roles for organizations, groups and individuals in them. To
understand a work system or organization, one must understand the environmental forces that are operating in it”.

Socio-technical analysis provides a basis for determining appropriate boundaries of systems containing men, machines, materials and information. It considers the operation of such systems within the framework of an environment that is itself made an overt and specific object of study. It concerns itself with spontaneous re-organization or adaptation with control of system variance, with growth and self-regulation.

One main aspect emphasized, at least in the recent Scandinavian application of socio-technical theory, is the influence of the worker on the development of the organisation. This contrasts strongly with some of the job enrichment studies where the changes have been carried out by senior management and researchers for experimental purposes, concealing some of the purposes of the changes from the workers.

The results of the studies on the job enrichment in the socio-technical tradition have often been similar. One reason for the apparently small differences in the results in the two approaches may be that carrying out changes slowly with worker participation, in spite of the intention, have often led to only a few workers taking a more active part in the change process.

A recent evaluation of 57 field experiments from 1959 to 1974, has been undertaken, covering four different theoretical and change approaches: socio-technical, (focusing on
the group worker influence in the change process), job enrichment (or job restructuring, focusing on the individual job with influence on the change processes), participative management (increasing autonomy by changing supervisory behaviour) and organizational change focusing on structural and formal changes. From the 57 field experiments, it has been concluded that: consistency of the finding from the innovative work experiments suggests that the studies have been relatively effective in producing positive outcome on job satisfaction, withdrawal and productivity.

Examination of the action levers across all of the change orientation suggests, however, that increases in autonomy, task variety and feedback are important factors in producing positive results.

However, although the different change strategies have proved valuable in terms of job satisfaction and autonomy, it is felt that there is a basic consistence in the job enrichment approach in the sense that autonomy is increased by changes not influenced by the workers. This change strategy probably limits the chances of getting beneficial spill over from the increased general political participation. Elden (1993) argues for the socio-technical approach as a means for influencing participation not only at work but also in society in general.

Redesigning jobs is not easy. Changes in one part of a job hierarchy, are bound to bring about changes elsewhere. Change may be welcome in one group, but not in another. This is likely to cause tension between groups. Individuals may initially welcome change but
then feel less enthusiastic if related job conditions (pay, re-training etc) do not meet their needs. Once expectations are raised, there is no going back. Supervisor may feel particularly threatened by any form of job redesign, but will expect to benefit ultimately. However, when work can be redesigned effectively, the rewards are two fold. For individuals, there is the opportunity to achieve lower costs, better quality and improved productivity through a more effective match between the needs of people and the requirements of technology.
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ABSTRACT

Trade unions and later workers’ committees have vigorously bargained with employer organisations for a say on matters that concern their lives at workplaces. This move met with severe resistance from the management who have been fearing to lose their managerial prerogative, which for years, has made employees passive recipients of instructions. The demand for a say in decision-making has now won the day in that trade unions / workers committees and group work are now encouraged to be in place in every organisation hence the existence of democracy/participatory management at
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Introduction

Degrees of democracy at workplace range from participatory management where worker’s views are heard and considered in decision-making, to systems, of worker control, where a structure is created in which workers’ authority and responsibility are institutionalized (Herrick and Maccoby, 1975 p66). The principle of democracy, like that of individuation, is opposed to making the worker a passive object or part of a machine. Wherever feasible, workers should manage themselves: authoritarian and hierarchical control should be replaced by co-operative and self-managed groups.

The concept of democracy also includes the right to citizenship, including free speech within the workplace as well as outside. It requires activeness and responsibility on the part of all participants (Davis and Cherens 1975). In its fully developed form, democracy in the workplace means that workers also take responsibility for what is produced, how money is invested and for the social consequences of production.

Why Democracy! Participatory Management has become Popular

While these arrangements may be appealing, they do not completely explain why the concept of participation has become popular in recent years. There are numerous other explanations. Recent technological and economic developments have considerably strengthened the organizational case for participation especially in developed economies (Heller, Pusic, Strauss and Wilpert, 1998 p 11). As mass production technique has spread to low-wage countries, high-wage countries find it much harder to compete in the manufacture of standardised goods. Their comparative advantage rests increasingly on
their capacities to adjust rapidly to technological and market changes in their ability to produce high-quality, high-value added, specialised high-tech products and services.

As this requires a flexible, better trained and highly skilled workforce. These qualities are especially important in technologies where initiative is required and shirking difficult to detect. Under these circumstances there is an advantage in having employees who are willing and able (motivated and trained) to make decisions on their own. Further, teamwork and rapid communication are required. Thus, participation may be the key to maintaining a competitive edge.

Rapid technological change, plus increased competition, requires what Germans call “flexibility” (Thelen, 1991) and changes in what Americans call “work rules” and the British call “custom and practice”. Especially given the possibility of union and employee position, such changes are typically more easily accommodated when made participative than when introduced autocratically. Another factor contributing to the spread of participation is the growth of the service work. By contrast with manufacturing, service employees’ attitudes are an essential part of the product they provide. A cheerful waiter or concerned nurse provides a totally different product from one who is surly. To the extent that participation improves attitudes, it also improves the quality of the service provided. Further, new organizational forms such as contingent employment, telecommunicating and networks (Miles and Snow 1981), all have some impact on both the desirability and feasibility of participation, though more study is needed.
Forms of participation

There are various forms of participation and some of them are direct participation, representative participation, and employee ownership and producers co-operatives. For purposes of this chapter only direct and, representative participation are to be dealt with.

a. Direct Participation

Direct participation schemes often attempt to empower employees. They constitute a reaction against Taylorism. Their popularity is derived from their frequent association with Japanese management.

Among the most common forms of direct participation are problem-solving groups such as quality circles, task forces and cross-functional teams.

Quality Circles

Quality circles are another method of employee involvement. Quality circle is a group of employees from the same work unit who volunteer to meet regularly to solve productivity and quality problems, or to improve the existing level of product quality in their work area. A circle will typically meet between four to six hours each month, usually on company time. Recommendations for improvement are made to management, which must approve any changes.

Quality circles are parallel structures, separate and distinct from the organization’s regular ongoing activities. Because of this, quality circles can often be initiated with a
minimum disruption to the normally functioning organisation and without posing a threat to its overall authority structure. However, circles may encounter resistance from certain functions, in the company such as staff specialists who may feel threatened that suggested improvements reflect poorly on their own performance. Resistance to quality circles often comes from middle management (Lawler and Mohman 1987). Despite, some difficulties, in one survey, 66% of the responding companies still made some use of quality circles, although typically, only a limited number of employees were involved (Lawler, Mohrman, and Ledford, 1992).

Japanese companies still invest in quality circles and Japanese quality control experts routinely recommend circles as part of a total quality system (Ishikawa, 1985). Almost three-quarters of the firms with over 1,000 employees had circles (Japan, Ministry of Labour, 1973, 1977). Quality circles have spread to both the non-manufacturing operations of Japanese manufacturing companies and to service-sector firms, including restaurants and nightclubs.

Although participation is voluntary, management strongly encourages it for everyone to want to participate and help to constantly seek improvement. Problems addressed by the circles can fall under the categories of safety, cost reduction, productivity, work ability and quality.
Task Forces and Cross-Functional Teams

Task forces are mechanisms for addressing problems and making decisions that have multi-functional implications, i.e., the solution or result must meet different sets of constraints.

Further, the expertise for solving the problem resides somewhere in the organisation other than the top. Task forces are very useful mechanisms for the solving of the cross-functional issues of systems and sub—systems.

To be effective, a task force must be characterized by the following:

- Members must be, knowledgeable representatives of their functional organisation’s needs.
- Members must be in a position to speak with authority on behalf of their functional organisations.
- Members must have the skills necessary for making decisions on the basis of information and expertise and must not be preoccupied with questions of formal authority.
- Generally, task force activity should be a substantial job obligation for only a few members, while the majority remains more focused.
- On their home department obligations, albeit maintaining a meaningful commitment to the task force.
- Assignment to a task force must be viewed as a sign of being a highly valued employee, with participation being a recognised and rewardable activity.
To succeed, members of the task force must be committed to solve the issue in a manner that works for everybody with a stake in the decision. Unfortunately, in many companies, people come to task forces with the mindset of simply protecting their functional department’s interests. The result is gridlock. Further, being assigned to a task force must be seen as a sign of the value of a person’s potential contribution. This in contrast to the “who can I spare” mentality, many managers have when assigning people to participate. In today’s business environment, many task forces involve participants from various levels of the organisation. The necessary expertise from various functions is often found at different levels of the organisation.’ Members must respect each other for the expertise and contributions, not for the formal rank.

Senior executives who accept ownership for systems and middle managers who focus on their component sub-system rather than on functional turf, are important elements in creating a culture that supports task involvement. These task teams are functioning within a climate that supports their cross-functional objectives.

All are formalized means of taking advantage of employee ideas or what economists call their “inside knowledge”. But they differ in the extent to which groups actually exert influence.

b. Representative Participation

Representative participation in which committees of employees’ representatives meet with management, takes many forms. Participation may occur at the plant,
divisional or company levels. There may even be representative of the company board of directors. Participation may deal with narrow topics, such as safety, or broad ones, such as overall organisational investment policy.

Employees may be merely able to make recommendations or may have the right to block management action until agreement has been reached (Heller, Pusic, Strauss and Wilipert, 1998:27). Sometimes, they may have limited power to make decisions on their own. Here, the paper considers only three types of representative participation: consultative committees, works councils and employee representation on boards of directors.

**Consultative Committees**

Joint consultative committees are perhaps the most common form of representative participation in English speaking countries. These meet periodically with management for discussion, but have no power to make decisions. As of 1990, consultative committees existed in a majority of large UK establishments. Half of these committees included union representatives, yet slightly less than half met as frequently as monthly, (Miliward et al 1992). Among the topics discussed most frequently at these meetings are production, pay and employment. Consultative Committees (Whitley Councils 1992) have a long history in the British Public Sector, though in recent years their role has diminished.
Works Councils

The main differences between Works Councils and Consultative Committees are that the former have generally more power than the latter and have jurisdiction over a broader range of issues. However, the differences among countries are great. This is especially true with regard to the topics with which Works Councils deal. In some countries their jurisdiction includes what might be called collective bargaining issues, such as wages, hours, redundancy, work rules and grievances. In other countries their functions are confined to less adversarial issues, such as safety. Works Councils are required by law in most Continental Western, European countries and even in Zimbabwe for middle and large size companies. E.U. legislation mandates that by the end of the century, firms with 1 000 or more employees must set-up Works Councils whose functions are consultation and information (Fucini and Fucini, 1990).

Many councils owe their existence primarily to legal backing; rarely do they enjoy much more power than the law requires. Portuguese law, for example, mandates that councils be kept informed of technological changes but not that they be consulted. Consequently Portuguese councils have little direct input into workplace governance but receive a great deal, of information (Gill and Krieger, 1992). German works councils by contrast, have considerable power to block proposed management activities which lack their consent. In German, works councils have the right of co-determination with regard to broad range of topics. Similarly, large Australian plants are required to have elected health and safety representatives who may, in some circumstances unilaterally order the cessation of work,
(James 1992 p165). Elsewhere, works councils monitor complaints, with the governmental regulations relating to safety, health and the like.

**Representation on Company Boards**

Most large, companies in Australia, German, Netherlands, Norway and Zimbabwe are largely required to include employee or union representatives on their boards of directors. Similarly there are union / employee directors in small number of British and US firms (Chell, 1993). In France a works council representative is entitled to attend board meeting but does not vote. Elsewhere employee representatives are in a minority.

Overall, Heller, Pusic Strauss and Wilper (1998), say that democratising organisational life through participative arrangement depends on more contingencies than much of the current literature leads people to believe. None of the obstacles highlighted is insurmountable. It is possible to overcome resistance to change, cosy feelings of dependency, in, authenticity, neo-classical economic pessimism, lack of trust and adequate competence training. Technological development and social needs are capable of being integrated. Formal and informal measures of influence-sharing, incorporating appropriate measures of conflict management, must be seen as complimentary rather than antagonistic sub-system of a framework that recognises that the decision - making process in organisations must be sanctioned and agile and will remain, hierarchical while recognizing the, legitimate interest of employees as stakeholders.
Management, may become increasingly independent on employees’ knowledge, commitment and ability to exercise discretion. Only then will participation’s relative advantages become apparent and participation more widespread. Will this happen? At the moment the myths surrounding participation are stronger than reality. In future, there may be more equally balanced.
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ABSTRACT

Organisations have, for a long time, acknowledged their responsibility towards the community and the environment in which they operate. Responsibility does not end with the production of goods or the rendering of service of a high quality as required by the community, but extend into the social field. In the Middle Ages, Popes gave generously of their personal fortunes. Social responsibility is a social norm. This norm holds that any social institution, including the smallest family unit and the largest corporation, responsible, for the behaviour of its members may be held accountable for their misdeeds. It is implicitly stated that an organisation’s responsibility extends far beyond the internal maintenance of its human resources to outside the work environment as well.

Key Words: social norm, labour accountability, fringe benefits, incentives, retention of labour.
Introduction

The social responsibility of an organisation is becoming even more important today. It would also appear that organisations are expected to be involved in real social problems of the community to show that they do not only want to use the community for personal gain, but that they want to give something back to the community to ensure better dispensation for both parties (Pincus, 1992). Today, however, organisations pursue multiple goals with emphasis on social awareness, social care and social commitment. Social responsibility is at present so important that the sources of an organisation may depend to a large extent on the social commitment.

The Involvement of Organisations in Social Responsibility: Arguments for and Against Social Responsibility

Why does an organisation become involved in social responsibility programmes? Roy Pascoe (1998) says that social responsibility is just as important to an organisation for the achievement of good profitability. In addition to this, he says that they are several reasons why an organisation should show its social responsibility namely:

- **Relationship with employees**

  A good relationship, with employees is established if an organisation supports the education, culture and welfare organisation serving these employees. By supporting the organisation that serves its employees, an organisation may ensure improved employee morale because their living standards are raised and this may result in increased productivity. The promotion of these relationships is inherent
in human resources management process, such as equal employment opportunity programmes, health and safety programmes and the provision of incentives and fringe benefits.

• **Relationship with the community**

Skinner and Von Essen (1995 p 2258) state that an organisation cannot build a relationship with the community on the basis of promises and propaganda. A good relationship with the community is the product of responsibility, policy and conduct on the part of an organisation. Raymond Ackerman (1997) Chairman” Pick n’ Pay states that if we help the community, it will respond by helping us”.

• Relationship with consumers, commerce and shareholders

By making contributions to social causes, an organisation fosters good relationships with consumers, commerce and shareholders. Pincus (1192 p 31), reports as follows, “Pick n’ Pay” which won the Food Marketing Institute International Hall of Fame Award for Social Responsibility in 1984, was founded on consumerism and a strong base of social responsibility”. He says that, after all, consumers, commerce and shareholders are the groups who provide the financial resources that enable organisations to become involved in social responsibility programmes.

• **Public Image**

Companies seem to enhance their public image to get increased sales, better employees, access to financing and other benefits. Because, the public considers
social goals important, business can create a favourable public image by pursuing social goals.

- **Better Environment**
  Business environment can help solve difficult social problems, helping create a better quality of life and a more desirable community in which to attract and keep skilled employees.

- **Possession of Resources**
  Business firms have the financial resources, technical expertise and managerial talent to support public and charitable projects that need assistance.

- **Superiority of Prevention over Cures**
  Social problems must be addressed one at a time. Business should act before these problems become serious and costly to correct, taking managers’ energies away from accomplishing their goals of producing goods and services.

- **Dilution of purpose**
  The pursuit of social goals dilutes business’s primary purpose i.e. economic productivity. Society may suffer if both economic and social goals are poorly accomplished.

- **Costs**
  Many socially responsible actions do not cover their costs. Someone has to pay those costs. Business must absorb the costs or pass them on to the consumers through higher prices.
• **Too Much power**

Business is already one of the most powerful sectors of our society. If it pursues social goals, it will have even more power. Society has given business enough power.

• **Lack of Accountability**

Political representatives pursue social goals and are held accountable for their actions. Such is not the case with business leaders. There are no direct lines of social accountability from the business sector to the public.

**Importance of Social Responsibility**

Cronje et al (1990 p 389) maintains that the social responsibility of business is increasingly coming to the fore. Nowadays, the public expects an organisation to become closely involved in the real social problems of the community within which it operates. One of the tasks of management is to initiate programmes to bring the corporate sense of social responsibility to the attention for the external public. Management should also keep a watchful eye on any activities that might be construed by external groups as irresponsible, giving rise to resentment.
Figure 1.0

Social Responsibility

Social Responsibility

Social Obligation
Robbins and Coulter (1999 p 146) state that it is a business firm’s obligation (beyond that required by law and economics) to pursue long-term goals that are good for the society. Figure 1.0 above spells out the business’s social involvement. A business fulfills its social obligation when it needs economic and legal responsibilities. Following an approach of social obligation, a firm pursues social goals only to the extent that they contribute to its economic goals. Social responsibility adds an ethical imperativeness to do those things that make society better and not to do those that could make it worse. A socially responsible organisation goes beyond what it must do by law or chooses to do any thing because it makes economic sense to doing what it can to help improve society because that is the right or ethical thing to do. Social responsibility requires business to determine what is right or wrong and to make ethical decisions and engage ethical business activities. A socially responsible organisation does what is right because it has an obligation to act that way. A company that meets pollution control standards established by the government or does not discriminate against employees over the age of forty in promotion decisions, is meeting its social obligation. When it provides on site child-care facilities for employees, it is being socially responsible.

The conclusion to be drawn is that long-term profitability cannot be attained if an organisation does not act in a socially responsible way. Social responsibility is not confined solely to matters affecting the external environment. The internal environment and the well-being of workers and their working conditions are no less important. Cronje et al (1992) are of the opinion that the support of such services by an organisation, fosters good moral and allows for higher standard of living for its staff which can also lead to
higher productivity. When it becomes known that an organisation has the welfare of its employees at heart, this creates a spirit of good will and commitment and the, organisation then does not need to scrape the labour market barrel to get and keep good workers.
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MANAGING CHANGE
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ABSTRACT

If it were not for change i.e any alterations in people, structure or technology, manager’s job would be relatively easy (Robbins and Coutler, 1999:p.380). Planning would be simple because tomorrow would be no different from today. The issue of effective organisational design would also be solved because environment would be free from uncertainty and there would be no need to adapt. Similarly, decision-making would be dramatically streamlined because the outcome of each alternative could be predicted with almost certain accuracy. It would, indeed simplify the manager’s, if for example; competitors did not introduce new goods and services, if customers did not demand new and improved products, if governmental regulations were never modified or if employees’ needs never changed. However, this is not the case. Change is an organisational reality. Handling change is an integral part of every manager’s job as external and internal forces keep on impinging on the job.

Key Words: modification, adaptation, communication, pro-activeness.
Introduction

External forces come from various sources. In recent years, the marketplace has affected organisations through the occurrences of severe competition. Companies constantly adapt to changing consumer desires as they develop new products and improve marketing strategies. Governmental laws and regulations are frequent impetus for change. For example, any national health reform legislation enacted will undoubtedly bring changes in human resources management policies.

Technology also creates the need for change. Assembly line technology in industries is undergoing dramatic changes as organisations replace human labour with robots. The fluctuations in labour markets, force managers to change. For instance, the demand for health care technicians and specialists has made it necessary for companies that need those kinds of employees to change their human resources management activities to attract and retain skilled employees in the areas of greatest need.

Economic changes also affect companies. For instance, recessionary pressure forces companies to become more cost-efficient. Even in robust economy, uncertainties and foreign trade create conditions that may force companies to change.

In addition to external forces referred to above, internal forces also stimulate the need for change. These internal forces originate primarily from the internal operations of the organisation or from the impact of external changes. A redefinition or modification of an organisation’s strategy often introduces a host of changes. In addition, an organisation’s
work force is rarely static. Its ‘composition changes in terms of age, education, sex e.t.c.
In a stable organisation with an increasing number of older executives for instance, there might be a need to restructure jobs in order to retain younger managers who occupy lower ranks. Employee attitudes such as increased job dissatisfaction may lead to increased absenteeism, more voluntary resignations and even collective job actions. Such incidences often lead to changes in management policies and practices.

**Stable Environment, Versus Turbulent Environment in Change Management**

Lewin, quoted in Robbin & Coulter (1999) uses two metaphors (calm waters and white—water rapids) as attempts to manage changes. Calm waters metaphor states that successful change requires unfreezing the status quo, changing to a new state and refreezing to make the change only work in stable environments that most organisations faced from the 1950s to 1970s. Researchers agreed that this clam water metaphor is obsolete as a way to describe the kind of seas that managers are accepting that the stability and predictability of the calm water metaphor do not exist in the turbulent environments in which they operate today. Today’s managers never get out of the rapid waters as they often face constant change, bordering on chaos. These managers are being forced to play a game they have never played before, and the game is governed by rules that are created as the game occurs and progresses.
Change Management

Burnes, (1996:p322) views organisational change as the product of three interdependent organisation processes exhibited diagrammatically below:

- The choice process- which is concerned with the nature, scope and focus of organisational decision-making.
- The trajectory process- which relates to an organisation’s past and future direction and is seen as the outcome of its vision, purpose and future objectives.
- The change process- which covers approaches to mechanisms for achieving outcomes of change.
Fig 1.2: Change Management Model by Burnes (1996)
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These processes are interdependent because, as Fig 1.2 shows the change process it self is an integral part of the trajectory process and this in-turn is a vital part of the choice.

Within each of these processes, there is a group of elements or forces, which interact, clash and influence each other in subtle and complex ways. It is the interaction of elements or forces, which prevents decision-making and change management from being a rational-mechanical process and ensures that they are based on subjective and imperfect judgment. Each of the three processes will now be described not only to show their complexity and interdependence but also to provide a guide to putting the Choice Management- Change Management models into practice. For this latter reason, the description of the change process in particular will dwell on the steps necessary to accomplish change successfully.

The Choice Process

The choice process comprises three elements: organisational context, focus of choice and organisational trajectory.

Organisational Context

One of the standard prescriptions for successful organisations is that they should know their own strengths and weaknesses, their customers’ needs and the nature of the environments in which they operate. However. It has been noted that many organisations appear only to begin collecting this sort of information when they are in trouble (Burnes, 1996).
Gathering this sought of information as well as discussing it and agreeing on how to interpret it, will require the participation of a wide range of people and functions. This develops a sense of teamwork, cooperation and natural understanding among those concerned. Also by working in this fashion, organisations can promote openness and reduce political behaviour and conflict. Some organisations find that owing to the context in which they operate, teamwork, cooperation and openness are very difficult to achieve without first changing those factors which hinder or prevent these. Perhaps the prime consideration in this respect is the prevalent style of management. Managers are really the only group who initiate change and will rarely voluntarily adopt changes, which adversely affect them. It follows that, faced with a mismatch between their organisation and its environment, some mangers will seek to achieve re-alignment by influencing the environment rather than pursuing an internal upheaval which may involve changes in management style and personnel.

**Focus of Choice**

At one point in time, organisations appear to focus their intention on only a narrow range of short, medium and long term issues. Some of these will relate to the organisation’s performance, while others may be more concerned with building or developing particular competencies or technologies. In some cases, the issues maybe of passing interest only, in other cases, they may be fundamentally to the organisations survival. Certainly, in most instances, organisations will in one way or another focus on aligning themselves with or even influencing or changing the constraints under which they operate (Kay, 1993; Senger, 1993).
**Organisational Trajectory**

An organisation’s trajectory or direction is shaped by its past action and future objectives and strategies. As such, it provides a guide or framework within which to judge the acceptability, relevance or urgency of issues, concerns and proposed actions. The trajectory process encompasses the determination of and interplay between, an organisation’s vision, strategies and its approach to changes. In some respects the concept of trajectory comprises both an organisation’s memory of past events and its intent, in terms of future one. For some organisations, the trajectory will be clean and unambiguous. In others, the interpretation of past events and proposals for the future actions will be the subject of dispute and uncertainty.

Each of the three (3) elements of the choice process is complex in itself but they also interact with each other in an intricate and unpredictable fashion. An organisation’s trajectory can influence both the focus of its decision-making and the context within which the, organisation operate. Likewise, the context provides a framework within, which a trajectory is developed. Similarly, the focus of choice will influence which aspect of the organisation’s context, its trajectory will be directed towards not only in the short-term but also the medium and long-terms.

**The Trajectory Process**

Like the choice process, the trajectory process comprises three (3) elements, namely, vision, strategy and change.
Vision

It is noted that, not all companies have visions and not all visions find, favour with the managers and employees who have to implement them. However, the concepts of organisations driving themselves forward by creating an ambitious vision where they wish to be in the long-term, had become increasingly influential over the last decade (Cummings and Husse, 1989, Johnson and Scholes 1993: Senger 1993). The process of developing the organisation’s vision attempts to overcome some problems by encouraging senior managers to think freely without considering present resource constraints about where they would like to take the organisation in the long-term.

The creation of the Vision is an iterative process whereby an initial vision is created and, the gap between this and the present circumstances is identified. The organisation then considers its strategic, options to bridge the gap and in so doing refines the vision itself. The refining process serves partly to ensure that the vision is discussed widely within the organisation and gain employee’s commitment to its objectives, thus using, the vision as a motivating and guiding, force for the organisation. The organisational vision is at times termed a “beacon” that shines from far away the hillside at night that guides travellers to their destination. The beacon prevents travellers from being lost. The vision as described by Burnes (1996:327) should, like, the beacon, shine clearly for everyone in the organisation, to see, so that they can all know where they are heading. Visions are implemented and brought to life through the development of strategy.
Strategy

Strategy is defined as a coherent or consistent stream of actions, which an organisation takes to move towards its vision. This stream of actions can be centrally planned and driven; they can be delegated and distributed throughout the organisation, and they can be either conscious actions, in pursuit of the vision or unconscious or emergent ones resulting from the past patterns of decisions or resource allocations or current responses to problems and opportunities. In reality, organisations tend to pursue a mixture of these. These strategies are put together in one strategic plan which is usually, formally reviewed annually, but is frequently reviewed informally and when major and unexpected events occur. Because strategies are not ends in themselves, but means to an end, they are by necessity both flexible and pragmatic. There will be constructed and pursued only to the extent that they facilitate the pursuit of the vision (Burnes, 1996).

Change

Just like organisation’s trajectory is an important element of the choice process, the same applies to change. On the other hand, visions and strategies shape and direct change. They indicate what needs to change demand, where. They also create the conditions and climate within which change takes place. Because vision and strategies only become reality through the actions of the organisation, it is these changes and these actions, which shape vision and strategies.

Whatever form change takes, however, there are three (3) people —related activities that need to be undertaken:-
• creating a willingness to change;
• involving people.

Creating Willingness to Change

Even where change, is purely of technical form, there has to be willingness among those concerned to change, to want to be involved. For this to occur, organisations ought to cultivate a conducive climate where change is accepted as the norm. Companies therefore, need to create readiness for change among their employees and adopt an approach, which is aware of the possibility and case of resistance and deals with these at an early stage.

In order to achieve this, there are four steps a company can take:

• make people aware of the pressures for change. The company should inform employees on a regular basis of its plans for the future, market pressures it faces and the performance of its key competitor. Through this approach, company employees will come to accept that change is not only inevitable but is being undertaken to safeguard rather than to threaten their future.

• give regular feedback on the performance of individual processes and area of activity within the organisation. This allows an organisation to draw attention to any discrepancy between actual performance and desired present and future performance.

• publicise successful change. In order to create a positive attitude towards change, companies should publicise the projects, which are seen as models of how to undertake change. However, those projects not performing as expected should not
be ignored but should be examined, explained and lessons learnt. Staff should be encouraged to expect and set credible and positive outcomes for change programmes.

- understand people’s fears and concerns. Companies need to recognise the real and legitimate fears of employees as change does at first create uncertainty and that individuals and groups may resist if they fear the consequences. It follows that those championing change need to pay special attention to the potential for resistance, both in terms of the adverse consequences it brings and the underlying problems it may indicate (Burnes, 1996).

People are not just important because they are often the objects of change, but also because they are the ones who have to carry it out. In a real sense, they are the glue, which holds it together. They can influence the choice of objective and the way change is planned. In turn, objectives and planning can also affect their willingness to accept or become involved in some, if not all, aspects. Further, Burnes (1996) says that Change, Management model, potentially, at least, resolves the dispute between the proponents of planned and emergent approaches to strategy development and change. In addition, however, it raises fundamental questions about what managers can do in terms of running and shaping the organisations. Many writers have made a case for visionary leadership being the key to an organisation’s success.
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