

Next Stage 2 課題文

We did some research recently where we went out and asked companies about change. We interviewed 5,000 people. We asked them "When people are forced with change, what are their responses?" We found that there are three responses. I think you'll find the results interesting as you look at your own organization. Please compare our results with your own expectations for responses to change within your own organization. In today's economy, restructuring, reengineering, and downsizing are common changes employees must face.

Proactive behavior is one type of response we noted. Proactive people are curious, willing to hear and learn about changes. They may even agree with and promote change. Often, they are energized by it. In your opinion, in your organization, what percentage of people would respond in this manner? We found in our research of 5000 managers from many corporations that only five to fifteen percent of people fell into this category.

Reactive behavior is another response to change we observed during our research. These people were automatically against any change. Their attitude was cynical and/or dismal. Their behavior was tired and careless. "We've tried this before", is a common negative reaction. These people often say nothing in meetings. But outside, over coffee, or in the evening over a beer, they will talk about how they disagree with how things are going. Our results showed that reactive people often act as "soft saboteurs". They are against change, but do not speak up. We found in our research that approximately five to fifteen percent of people in a given organization fit into the Reactive category.

The third category is Inactive. We found that seventy to ninety percent of the workforce fits into the "wait and see" category. So, you've got a large amount of people who are waiting to see what happens before they make any decision. They often think, "Maybe this too shall pass", or "I won't have to change", or "I won't have to do anything".

Given those percentages, we asked people how they would bring about change in their organization. Who would they spend their time with, as a leader, as a manager? What type of person are you going to spend your time and money on? Someone who is Proactive, Reactive or Inactive? What we found is that when changes happened, the dollars and resources were spent on a Proactive person. They are the so-called "thought leaders" in the organization. There is only so much time and so much energy to be spent. Therefore, the time and money need to be invested in the thought leaders. These are the people who can influence the rest of your organization.

Who are the thought leaders in your department? Are you a thought leader in your organization? After downsizing and reengineering, the energy and choices of people who do the work will make or break the organization. People have to care why, before they will put energy into what and how. The thought leaders will be needed to deal with change. To coin a phrase, it will take "courageous conversation". Courageous conversations are open dialogues amongst the leaders in an organization. If today's leaders don't understand that they are working for the people who report to them, they do not understand the change process. Our job is empowering other thought leaders in the organization. Influence, not authority, drives change. The thought leaders, called the fifteen percentiles, drive change. Who are the thought leaders in your organization? Are you one of them?

We have found that job security is an oxymoron. In other words, having a job and having security can no longer fit in the same sentence. Independent or full-time employees know what they have to offer, what their talents are and who needs those talents. They know the customers both inside the organization and outside the organization. I believe that is the only job security there is today. Innovating from within, knowing what you offer and knowing who needs it clearly is job security.

Outsourcing is an ongoing issue today. The services of human resource development and human resource education and training are being provided by outside organizations. People who are not customer-driven and customer-oriented are being replaced. The old game is the replication of economy with a ladder of success and a retirement model. We stayed at the same organization until retirement, and were then guaranteed an annual income. The secure jobs of the past era have been eliminated. Many of them were eliminated by the computer. For example, my father was a banker. He worked for the same bank for 38 years. He got on the ship, he stayed on the ship and then he got off the ship at the end. What would his advice be for me today; to do the same thing? I don't think so.