

Navigating Organizational Change: Reflections, Analysis, and Insights

Posted on September 11, 2024

Introduction

Organizational transformation is a fundamental and unavoidable element of any dynamic workplace. Embracing change is crucial for firms to maintain competitiveness and attain their goals and objectives. In this reflection, I will apply the theories and concepts discussed in Module 1 to my experience as a department supervisor at Unilever. This experience occurred in the context of a planned structural change. The structural change did entail restructuring departments and reporting lines to enhance efficiency and achieve the long-term goals set by the company. Departments were combined, responsibilities were reallocated, and new lines of authority were set up. Through this reflection, I aim to illuminate the intricacy of this shift, assess the leaders' behaviour during the change execution, and judge how well the experience was in line with established transformation administration theories. Additionally, I will discuss the implications of this evaluation for future transformation administration practices.

Task one: Experience and Reflection

The selected structural change focused on reconfiguring the organizational hierarchy and reporting lines. Despite the inherent benefits of change, it is important to acknowledge the accompanying intricacies that arise when established procedures are modified and address employee apprehensions about job security and career advancement. Upon contemplation of the structural transformation at Unilever, I have discerned many intricacies. Resistance is a significant challenge in organizational change, mostly due to employees' familiarity and adherence to the established hierarchical structure. The employees' resistance was evident through multiple manifestations, including scepticism, elevated turnover rates, absenteeism, and decreased production levels.

Additionally, the structural change did lead to cultural shifts as Unilever had to adopt a more collaborative and agile organizational structure, thus leaving the traditional top-down approach. The structural change did not only the reconfiguration of the formal processes but also the transformation of deeply ingrained employee values and behaviours; hence, it did pose a great challenge as it entailed dismantling established power dynamics and fostering open communication within the organization (Armenakis and Harris, 2009, p.135). Leveraging the employees for the transformative pivot necessitated careful consideration and focused initiatives to involve, enable and inform personnel, acknowledging that this kind of cultural modification is a multifaceted expedition that

influences every angle of the institution.

Moreover, the structural change did contribute to skills gaps. As the company reshaped its organization, workers faced the need to take on fresh duties and gather the needed talents. Hence, a careful look at the skills missing and courses shaped for each was key, underlining their vital part in the change work succeeding.

Reflections on Leadership Behavior

Throughout the process of adapting to structural changes within the company, leaders showed various behaviours that drastically influenced the result of the change. For instance, some leaders were able to paint a clear and compelling picture of the benefits of future changes (Hayes, 2002). Their skill in clearly stating the vision effectively helped align employees with the fresh heading. Thus, this lucidity acted as a beacon amidst the ambiguity of change, nurturing the workers' sense of intent and course.

Furthermore, an alternate assembly of leaders differentiated themselves by earnestly participating with workers. They acknowledged the magnitude of incorporating the labour force in the alteration method, actively requesting remarks, and combining employee viewpoints into decision-making. This tactic proved indispensable in decreasing dissent and improving overall backing. Employees felt appreciated and authorized, adding a more positive reception of the variation.

Certain department leaders displayed thoughtful talk as a trademark and routinely revealed shift information. Thus, this allowed them to tackle workers' worries upfront and provide consistent reports. Their dedication to frank discussions-built confidence and reduced guesses, which frequently obstruct efforts to transform. Concise and steady communication was key in keeping staff knowledgeable and inspired throughout the transition.

While many within the group supported the alterations, there were obvious disagreements among the leaders. Some were hesitant to readily accept the modifications, showing a reluctance that passed mixed messages to workers. This wavering and disconnection with the switches undermined their believability and hampered their capacity to beneficially impact others (Seijts and Gandz, 2018, p.243). The inconsistency in managerial conduct produced ambiguity and added to zones of opposition within the company.

Task Two: Analysis

In reviewing the intended organizational shift, it is clear that there was harmony with particular alteration administration theories, particularly Lewin's change model (Burnes, 2020, p. 41). The company effectively acknowledged the necessity for modification, and they adhered to the model's phases of liquefying the present circumstance, executing the alteration, and, after that, solidifying the

new circumstance (Yukl, 2012, p. 2012). This harmony demonstrates an articulate comprehension of the change procedure and a capable initiation of it.

While disagreements surfaced with other frameworks, including Kotter's Eight Phase Change Procedure, during the change endeavour, Kotter's model stresses producing a sense of necessity and forming a guiding alliance, both problematic transition parts (Kang et al., 2022, p. 280). Insufficient messaging regarding the pressing nature of the change and the lack of a united leadership team brought about reluctance and hampered the progress of the change. This difference highlights the significance of dealing with these specific facets when managing change.

The leaders who participated in managing the shift and connected with workers consistently updated them on the transformation's objectives and advancement and comprehended worries about how it influenced employees to be more prosperous, guiding the modification (Kang et al., 2022, p. 282). In comparison, the leaders who did not exhibit these behaviours confronted bigger troubles initiating the shift. Hence, this underscores how significant administration plays in powering fruitful modifications, underlining the necessity for cultivating administrators and preparing them for change control practices.

Conclusion

Leadership is pivotal in managing change and ensuring behaviours align with desired alterations. Additionally, I've gained deeper insight into handling resistance and communication during organizational shifts. In approaching future change guiding, I will highlight transformational leadership skill development to rouse and motivate teams through change efforts. The consistent and transparent dialogue will be prioritized, concerns addressed, and personnel involved in decisions. Furthermore, I will strive to exemplify the change I wish to establish, presenting a compelling model for others to emulate. Armed with this personal familiarity, I intend to approach change administration with a more inclusive and fruitful strategy, ultimately facilitating smoother transitions and enhanced outcomes within companies.

Bibliography

- Armenakis, A.A. and Harris, S.G., 2009. Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of change management*, 9(2), pp.127-142
- Burnes, B., 2020. The origins of Lewin's three-step model of change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(1), pp.32-59.
- Hayes, J., 2002. *The theory and practice of change management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Kang, S.P., Chen, Y., Svihla, V., Gallup, A., Ferris, K. and Datye, A.K., 2022. Guiding change in higher

education: An emergent, iterative application of Kotter's change model. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(2), pp.270-289.

Seijts, G.H. and Gandz, J., 2018. Transformational change and leader character. *Business Horizons*, 61(2), pp.239-249.

Yukl, G., 2012. Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management perspectives*, 26(4), pp.66-85.