DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 642 EA 004 250

AUTHOR Duncan, Robert B.
TITLE Criteria for Type of Change-Agent in Changing Educational Organizations.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 72
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (57th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; *Administrator Role; *Change Agents; *Educational Change; Educational Research; Individual Characteristics; Objectives; Organization; *Organizational Change; Speeches; *Task Analysis; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses (1) the tasks of the change agent, (2) the different dimensions of choice the administrator has in specifying the change agent role, and (3) the optimally specified role. A change agent must establish a relationship with a client system, diagnose the client system, select the correct helping role, determine change objectives, deal with resistance to change, and maintain the changes. Within each of these tasks, the administrator can choose a change agent from inside or from outside his organization, can select a single-person change agent or a team, and can decide whether the change agent is similar to members of the client system in attributes or different with respect to certain traits. The optimum change agent role employs the team concept, uses both internal and external personnel, and utilizes agents with greater similarity to other members. (RA)

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Graduate School of Management
Evanston, Illinois

Annual Meeting

of the

American Educational Research Association

Symposium
26.3

CHANGE PROCESSES IN EDUCATION:
SOME FUNCTIONAL AND STRUCTURAL IMPLICATIONS

Chicago, Illinois
April 7, 1972

# Criteria for Type of Change-Agent in Changing Educational Organizations

by

Robert B. Duncan
Department of Organization Behavior
Graduate School of Management

## Introduction

An initial consideration in designing a program for educational change is the specification of the type of change agent to be utilized. Although there has been some discussion in the literature on the change-agent role (See Lippitt, Watson and Westley, 1958; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971), there has been little discussion on the kinds of choices the administrator faces in specifying the change-agent role. Although the issues raised in this discussion should hold true for most organizational settings, specific reference will be made to the characteristics of educational systems.

This paper will thus discuss (1) the tasks of the change-agent; (2) the different dimensions of choice the administrator has in specifying the change-agent role; (3) the optimally specified change-agent role.

## Tasks of the Change Agent

Before we can focus on the different dimensions of choice that the administrator has in specifying the change-agent role, it is necessary to present our definition of the change-agent and then to state the various tasks that the change-agent may carry out. Change has been defined as the process by which alteration occurs in the structure of a social system (Rogers, 1963). Utilizing this definition of change, a change agent is defined as follows: a change agent is an individual whose task is to alter the structure and functioning of a social system. In this discussion, we will be elaborating upon Lippitt et als' (1958: 91-126) discussion on the change agent's role.

Establishing a Relationship with Client System

One of the first tasks that the change-agent faces is to establish a relationship with the change target or client system. In establishing this relationship, there are several things the change-agent must do: First, the client system has to acknowledge him and view him as legitimate in the change-agent role. The main issue here is simply -- does the change target or client system perceive him as a competent individual whose task is to help them alter in some fashion the structure and functioning of their organization? Thus, the change-agent is faced with the task of "proving himself" and demonstrating that he has some abilities and competences.

Secondly, in establishing a relationship with the client system, the change agent shares his expectations about the change process, and he must also find out what the client system expects in terms of some change. This sharing of expectations is important for several reasons; (1) By sharing his expectations about the change process with the client system, the client system gets a better idea about what the change agent feels he may be able to help the client system accomplish and also the change agent's method of operation. Understanding the change agent's methods is important, so that the client is aware of the kinds of demands (access to people, information, etc.) the change-agent might make; (2) By finding out the expectations of the client system, the change-agent is better able to correct any unrealistic expectations on the part of the client system regarding change that could lead to a feeling of failure and frustration when these expectations were not met during the change process.

Thirdly, in establishing a relationship, adequate sanction must be given to the change-agent. What is the basis for power for the change agent? Does the change-agent have some formal base of power from the client system, or does he have just the expertise or legitimate power base to operate from? The power base is important for the change-agent as it is the means by which he must influence members of the client system.

Diagnosis

A second major task the change-agent must perform is the diagnosis of the client system, in order that he can better understand the issues surrounding the change the client system is contemplating. It is at this point that the change-agent faces the problem of being locked into the client's perception of the change situation. In interacting with the contact person in the client system, such as a school superintendent, the change-agent will get one perspective on the change issue. It is necessary that the change-agent also independently collects some data in the system to ascertain from a representative sample of organizational members their perception of at least the following issues; (1) the change issue, (2) the need for change in the system, (3) the openness to change in the system, (4) the resources available for change, (5) the commitment of the members and powers that be to making the changes and working through the difficulties that are likely to arise as the change is implemented. This will give the change-agent much more systematic and complete data to plan and carry out his other tasks as a change-agent.

In performing this diagnostic phase, there are a variety of methods by which data can be collected. The change-agent can just observe organizational members performing their roles, he can interview a variety of participants, and he can collect much more comprehensive data by using questionnaires such as Duncan's (1971) climate for change questionnaire. This instrument surveys organizational members' perception of (1) the need for change; (2) the openness to change; (3) the potential for change in the system.

## Selecting the Correct Helping Role

Once the diagnosis has been completed, the change-agent is ready to make his first major intervention by feeding back the results of the diagnosis. The feedback of the diagnosis can be an unfreezing mechanism (Schein et al, 1968) for the system to open it up to considering some changes. It, thus, is at this point that the change-agent has to decide what type of helping role he is going to perform. There are a variety of different types of helping roles the change-agent can fill (Lippitt et al, 1958); (1) He can play the expert role where he provides direct solutions to the client system; (2) He can play a catalyst role where he becomes an advocate of the change and puts pressure on the system to make these changes; (3) He can play more the role of the process consultant (Schein, 1969:9) where he works with the client system to help them interpret the feedback from the diagnosis and better learn to perceive, understand and act upon process events (work flow, interpersonal relations, intergroup relations) which occur in the client's environment.

## Determining Change Objectives

Once the feedback of the diagnosis has taken place and the client system with the change-agent has decided what kind of helping role he will play, the specific objectives of the change program can be determined. The specific issues here are; What is the nature and scope of the change program going to be? Who are the people that are going to be affected by the change? What exactly is the change program trying to change -- attitudes, values, beliefs or behavior? Whom are the leverage points (Lippitt et al, 1958:100) i.e., the persons or subgroups that change-agent should work directly with if he is to have some impact on the system?

Dealing with Resistance to Change

Another important component of the change-agent role is to continue to help the client system unfreeze, so that it does become open to change. Thus, dealing with resistance to change is a task the change-agent must accomplish here. There are several things that can be done here; (1) Find out what the sources of resistance are; (2) try and reduce these sources of resistance rather than putting more pressure on the system to change. Resistance can be reduced by the change-agent by; (1) involving members of the client system in the determination of the change objects; (2) finding out client members' perception of the anticipated changes in order to see if there are any misunderstandings about the change program; (3) trying to anticipate sources of resistance on the part of the client system and thus address these before the client system can mobilize them; (4) pointing out the long run benefits of the change to the system and how they outweigh any immediate problems (See Watson, 1966). Here the change-agent is pointing out the relative advantage of the change (i.e., getting the client to perceive the change as a better way of operating than they now are) and compatibility of the change with the client system (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971:167).

Maintenance of the Changes

A final task that the change-agent is faced with is how to maintain or refreeze the change into the ongoing structure and

and function of the client system. It is at this point in the cycle that many change attempts falter. A change or innovation is introduced into a system and perhaps makes some immediate impact, but then in a short time the change has been washed out and has disappeared. The maintenance of change task then is important from two perspectives; First, from the perspective of the client system, it is important if there is some concern for obtaining long tern change; secondly, from the perspective of the change-agent, this maintenance issue is important as it can help him decide when to terminate or leave his change-agent role.

In trying to enhance the maintenance of change in a system, there are several strategies open to the change-agent. First, and perhaps the best strategy, is to attempt to institutionalize the change process. The institutionalization of change as Duncan and Radnor (1972) have discussed it is the development of a set of shared, learned norms among members in the system that define the new change or innovation, let's say the open class room concept, as a legitimate aspect of carrying out one's role as a teacher. This institutionalization process focuses on both the individual as well as the structure of the client system. It focuses on the individual in that it emphasizes the legitimacy of the new change and creates the expectation among organizational members that this change (i.e., the open classroom approach) is part of one's job definition and that one should expect to carry this activity out in his role. This institutionalization process also focuses on the structure of the organization in that it creates a set of role expectations on the part of organizational members that supports change. Thus, this institutionalization operates on the individual to change his values, attitudes, and behavior to create change and then supports and reinforces this change by other organizational members where role expectations are congruent with the change.

Secondly, the change-agent can remain in the client system and provide some support to system members and provide help to them as they work through some of the difficulties they may experience as they implement the change. For example, if a school had adopted the open classroom concept of teaching, the change could remain in the client system for some specific time period and meet at the client's request to discuss adoption problems when they arose.

In any event, the change-agent is always faced with a difficult choice in deciding when to terminate as a change-agent with the client system. There is always the potential problem of the change fading out when the change-agent is not around to provide some support and expertise in dealing with problems.

We have now very briefly discussed some of the tasks the change-agent must perform. It should be emphasized that although these different tasks of the change-agent have been discussed sequentially, they do, in fact, overlap and complement each other.

For those who are interested in a more complete discussion of various aspects of the change-agent's role, see Chris Argyris (1971) Intervention: Theory and Practice, Neil Davey (1971) The External Consultant's Role in Organizational Change, Ronald Lippitt et al (1958) The Dynamics of Planned Change, Everett Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, (1971) Communication of Innovations and Edgar Schein (1969) Process Consultation.

## DIMENSIONS OF CHOICE IN SPECIFYING THE CHANGE-AGENT ROLE

In this section, we will focus on some of the dimensions the educational administrator can choose from in specifying the change-agent role. In other words, when the administrator is deciding on a change-agent,what are some of the dimensions he should consider?

In this short discussion, we will focus on three dimensions; (1) Whether the change agent is an actual member of the client system (i.e. internal) or whether he is same one from outside the client system (i.e. external) that has been called into the client system; (2) Whether the change-agent is a single person or a team of change-agents are used; (3) Whether the change-agent as Rogers and Bhowmik (1971) have indicated is similar to members of the client system in attributes (homophilous) or is different with respect to certain traits (heterophilous). Is the change-agent perceived by the client system as being representative of them or more in an elitist role?

Our procedure here will be to take each of the six tasks of the change-agent and for each one discuss the relative advantage that each aspect of these three dimensions (i.e., internal vs. external change-agent) has on the particular task. This process is summarized in Table I which relates the different dimensions to the change-agent tasks and identifies by a "+" or a "-" the advantage - disadvantage aspect of a dimension. "N/D" means that on that particular change-agent task no distinct advantage can be given to one of the other aspects of the dimension.

ESTABLISHING A RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CLIENT SYSTEM

Internal vs. External Change-Agent

A continuing choice dilemma for the administrator is whether to select a change-agent from within the target school system or select an external change-agent. The external change-agent may have the advantage in both being acknowledged and in sharing expectations. The external change-agent is "being called in" and thus comes in as an outside expert with certain skills to be made available to the client system. On the other hand, the internal change-agent is a member of the client system who is temporarily occupying the change-agent role. It is somewhat more difficult for him to establish himself as the expert given his other roles

TABLE I: Analysis of Change-Agent Dimensions of Specification and Change-Agent Tasks

| Tasks of The Change-Agent | Change-Agent Dimensions: Internal Change-Agent | vs. External Change-Agent | Single Change-Agent | vs. Change-Agent Team | Homophilous Change-Agent | vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Establishment of a Relationship | | | | | | |
| A) Acknowledgement viewed as legitimate | - | + | - | + | - | + |
| B) Sharing of expectations | | | | | | |
| 1) Change-agent view and methods of operation | - | + | N/D | N/D? | - | + |
| 2) Client system expectations | - | + | N/D | N/D | - | + |
| C) Sanction power base of change-agent | - | + | - | + | N/D | N/D |
| II. Diagnosis | | | | | | |
| A) Understanding what problem change issue is | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| B) Independent data collection | | | | | | |
| 1) Change issue | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| 2) Need for change | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| 3) Openness to change | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| 4) Resources available to change | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| 5) Commitment to change | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| C) Methods that can be used in diagnosis | | | | | | |
| 1) Observation | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| 2) Interview | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| 3) Collect questionnaire data | N/D | N/D | - | + | N/D | N/D |
| III. Select Correct Helping Role | | | | | | |
| A) Feedback of diagnosis | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| B) Playing different helping roles | | | | | | |
| 1) Expert | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| 2) Catalyst role | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| 3) Process consultant | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| IV. Determining Change Objectives | | | | | | |
| A) Nature, scope, involvement | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| V. Dealing with Resistance | | | | | | |
| A) Identifying sources | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| B) Understanding clients' perception | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| C) Anticipate sources of resistance | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| D) Identify long run benefits | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| VI. Maintenance of Change | | | | | | |
| A) Institutionalizing change | N/D | N/D | - | + | + | - |
| B) Internal support | + | - | - | + | + | - |

in the system (Scurrah et al, 1971). Although the external change-agent is seen as an outsider, it is still likely that he will be in a better position to establish himself as he is likely to be seen as more objective and thus more professional.

In the sharing of expectations with the client system, the external change-agent is again given the advantage. He is seen as being more objective and professional, and thus his motives for involvement as a change-agent are less open to suspicion by the client system. The internal change-agent on the other hand is an insider and may be seen as having more of a stake in the change, so his objectivity and motives can be questioned. Also, because the external change-agent is seen as more objective, members of the client system are likely to be more open in sharing their expectations concerning the change program.

With respect to the sanction or power base of the change-agent, it would appear that again the external change-agent has the advantage. There are several different bases of power such as reward, coercive, expert, referrent, or legitimate as French and Raven (1959) have defined. It would appear that even if the change-agent, either internal or external, had some formal power (reward and coercive) that the external change-agent could also more likely develop some additional power base by being seen as an expert and, as pointed out above, more legitimate than the internal change-agent. Thus, it appears that the external change-agent would have a broader base of influence over the client system.

Single vs. Change-Agent Team

The change-agent team is likely to have the advantage in being seen as legitimate. Because there are several change-agents, the client system is more likely to see them as bringing more skills and expertise to bare on the change issue than a single change-agent could. In the sharing of expectations, no relative advantage is seen between the single vs. change-agent team. The only potential problem might be for the change-agent team. It is important that the change-agent team be sure they are consistent among themselves concerning the expectations they communicate to the client system. If there were some inconsistencies in expectations communicated, these could cause some ambiguity among client system members as to just what the change-agents were trying to accomplish.

With respect to the power base of the change-agent, it would appear that the change-agent team would have the advantage. Because of the broader skills that they could bring to the client system, it would be possible for them to develop a broader power base to include expert and legitimate power. This would be in addition to any formal power they might have.

Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

As Rogers and Bhowmik (1971) have indicated, homophily-heterophily is concerned with the relationship between source and receiver in a communication exchange. They have indicated that when communicators share common meanings, attitudes, beliefs, etc. (they are homophilous),communication is likely to be more effective (Rogers and Bhowmik (1971: 529). In heterophilous relationships, the interaction is likely to cause some message distortion, some restriction of communication channels, etc. (See p. 529). These findings provide the administrator with a dilemma in that often the change-agent is seen as somewhat different than the client system which can lead to a heterophilous type of relationship.

With respect to acknowledgement and being seen as legitimate in the change-agent role, it may be that the heterophilous change-agent has the advantage. This is likely if he is perceived as different, because he is seen as being an expert in the particular area in which the organization is considering some changes. It may be that the change-agent can be most influential here if he is perceived as heterophilous in the sense of being an expert while at the same time he is seen as sharing many of same attitudes, values and beliefs of the client system.

The heterophilous change-agent might be more successful in communicating his views to the client if he is seen as an expert.

Again, he is likely to be seen as more legitimate in this role than just "another member" of the client system. This same argument holds in expliining why the heterophilous change agent might get a more open sharing of the client's expectations regarding the change.

With respect to sanction or power base, there does not appear to be a clear advantage for either the homophilous or heterophilous change-agent. Given that both of them would have some formal base of power from the client system, there would be some trade offs on the other bases of power. For example, the heterophilous change-agent could establish some power if he was perceived as being an expert. On the other hand, the homophilous change-agent could establish some referent power as client system members would perhaps be better able to identify with him given their perception of their similarity to him.

DIAGNOSIS

Internal vs. External Change-Agent

In looking at this dimension under diagnosis in Table I, there appears to be no overall advantage for either the internal or external change-agent in understanding the change issue that the client system has identified. The external change-agent has more objectivity in looking at the organization and can take a more flexible approach to understanding the change issue. On the other hand, the internal change-agent, because he is a member of the client system, is likely to be more involved in the change issue and thus may be more biased in his perceptions. However, being a member of the client system might initially provide the internal change-agent with more information concerning the change issue.

In terms of independently collecting data in the client system, again there are trade offs between the internal and external agent. In collecting data about the change issue, the perception of client members of the need for change in the system, openness to change, and commitment to change, the external change-agent may have the advantage. Because he is not a member of the system, he is likely to be seen as more objective and as not having any vested interest in the change. Thus, client system members might feel safer to confide in him. With respect to identifying resources available for change, both have some advantages. The internal change-agent knows the system better and so possibly, at least initially, has a more thorough understanding of the resources available. However, the external change-agent, because of his expertise, might be able to help the client system develop more resources for change. For example, an external consultant may be able to do some team building sessions with the client system to help them improve their interpersonal relationships which could then help them interact more effectively (Beckhard, 1969).

In utilizing different data collection methods during the diagnosis, there are again trade-offs between the internal and external change-agent. With respect to observation of the day to day activities of the client system, the internal change-agent would have the advantage. He is a member of the system and would be less conspicuous than an outsider trying to observe. In using interviews of client system members, the external change-agent, if perceived as an expert, would have the advantage. Perceived as an expert, he would more likely be seen as more objective than the internal change-agent and respondents would have the tendency to be more open with him. In utilizing questionnaire data collection, neither change-agent here is seen as having a particular advantage.

Single vs. Change-Agent Team

In all aspects of the diagnostic function, the change-agent team is seen as having a distinct advantage over the single change-agent. The change-agent team simply is likely to have more skills available and through a division of labor can more comprehensively carry out the varoous tasks under the diagnostic function.

Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

This dimension focuses on the relationship between the change-agent and the client system concerning how similar (homophilous) the client system perceives the change-agent to be on attitudes, beliefs, etc., with them. As Rogers and Bhowmik (1971) indicate, the more homophilous the relationship the more effective the communication between the parties. Thus, it appears that in the diagnostic stage where communication between the client system and the change-agent is critical, a more homophilous change-agent is going to have the advantage. He is going to be able to communicate much more effectively with the client system, so his diagnosis is potentially going to be more accurate. The conclusion thus is that the more similar the change-agent can be perceived by the client system in terms of attitudes, values, beliefs, and appearance, the more effective will be his interaction with the client system. Even if the change-agent is seen as an expert which may make him heterophilous in one sense, he should be similar along this other dimension. He should empathize with the client system which will make him more homophilous at least social-psychologically (Rogers and Bhowmik, 1971:535).

SELECTING THE CORRECT HELPING ROLE

Internal vs. External Change-Agent

There are two tasks here, (1) feeding back the diagnosis to the client system, (2) selecting the actual helping role. In feeding back the diagnosis, the external change-agent seems to have the advantage. He is not a member of the client system, so again he is likely to be perceived as objective and as having less of a motive for biasing the feedback. A bias could be ascribed to an internal change-agent who might be identified with certain factions in the client system.

In terms of filling any of the different roles of expert, catalyst or process consultant, neither internal or external change-agent has a clear advantage. The external change-agent who is called into the organization is going to have an easier time playing the role of the expert. He has usually had specialized training and is more clearly perceived as an expert. On the other hand, the internal change-agent is, in a sense, just another member of the system. Thus, it is going to be more difficult for him to establish himself as the expert.

In filling the role of the catalyst or advocate for change, there doesn't seem to be a clear advantage to either the internal or external agent. The external agent is seen as the expert, and he can use this power base in trying to win support. On the other hand, the internal change-agent is an on going member of the system, so he can play the advocate role indefinitely.

In filling the process consultant role, it appears that the external change-agent has the advantage. His potential of being seen as objective and neutral will facilitate his ability to help the client to perceive, understand and act upon process events (interpersonal relations, communications, intergroup relations) which occur in the client system (Schein, 1969:9).

Single vs. Change-Agent Team

Once again as indicated in Table I, the change-agent team, because of the greater resources and potential for division of labor, is seen as being more effective for feeding back the diagnosis and in selecting the correct helping role. For example, the clear advantage of the change-agent team might rest in its ability to have different members play the expert, catalyst and process consultant roles. This approach would be much more comprehensive than what a single-agent could perform in occupying just one of the change-agent roles.

Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

In feeding back the diagnosis, the more homophilous change-agent might have the advantage as he can communicate more effectively with the client system. There would be, at least initially, more openness to the more homophilous change-agent.

In playing the different helping roles, the advantages again seem to favor the more homophilous change-agent. In playing the expert role, catalyst role, or process consultant role which creates some heterophily, the more the change-agent can be similar in other attitudes, values, beliefs, appearance, the better the communication between him and the client system. Playing any of these roles may create some heterophily, but as long as the change-agent is similar on these other dimensions and empathizes with the client system, the more the change-agent will be perceived as homophilous.

## DETERMINING CHANGE OBJECTIVES

### Internal vs. External Change-Agent

In determining the nature and scope of the change program, we are concerned with such things as: Who is going to be affected by the change program? Who are the influential people in the client system that the change-agent should focus on in his influence attempts? Both the internal and external change-agent have advantages here. The internal change-agent has some clear advantages in that he knows the system well and should be in a position to know the key influential people in the client system who might be the initial change targets. These individuals could then be used as allies by the change-agent. On the other hand, the external change-agent with special training and prior experience and potentially a more objective view of the client system may be in a better position to determine the nature and scope of the change within the client system.

### Single vs. Change-Agent Team

Again, the change-agent team with its potential greater resources and division of labor should be more efficient than the single change-agent in determining the scope and objectives of the change program.

Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

The homophilous change-agent is seen as being more effective in determining the scope, nature and involvement in the change program. This is based on the more effective communication flow this type of change-agent is predicted as having with the client system. The homophilous change-agent is simply likely to get more accurate and valid data from the client system.

## DEALING WITH RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

### Internal vs. External Change-Agent

The internal change-agent might have some advantages in dealing with resistance. He is a member of the client system. so he is in a potentially better position to identify those people or groups who might be resisters. Also, because he at least shares some values and norms in common with system members, he is in a better position to understand how clients may perceive the change. As Watson (1966) has indicated, resistance can often be reduced if the change-agent can anticipate sources of resistance or deal with misunderstandings about the change issue when they arise. The internal change-agent by virtue of his membership in the system is potentially in a better psition to do this.

In identifying the long run benefits of the change to the system, neither the internal or external agent has a clear advantage. The internal change-agent has initially more in depth knowledge about the client and should be able to point out ways that the change can be useful to the organization. On the other hand, the external change-agent can bring his experience from other systems to bare and thus point out long run benefits that client system members may never have thought about.

Single vs. Change-Agent Team

From a resource standpoint, the change-agent team is again seen as being more effective.

Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

From Table I it can again be seen that the homophilous change-agent is seen as potentially being more effective in dealing resistance. This is due to the fact that the homophilous change-agent can more effectively communicate with the client system.

MAINTENANCE OF CHANGE

Internal vs. External Change-Agent

In trying to institutionalize the change which is the development of a set of shared learned norms supporting the change, neither the internal or external change-agent has the advantage. The external change-agent can provide the expertise that helped the system initially make the change, but then an internal change-agent is required to help generate support internally to the system. Minimum involvement is required by members of the client system if institutionalization is desired. It is only in this manner that mutually reinforcing role expectations supporting the change can be developed.

In trying to just maintain internal support for the change, the internal change agent is an ongoing member of the system rather than a temporary member as the external change-agent and thus has a clear advantage in providing continuing support and reinforcement for change to the client system.

## Single vs. Change-Agent Team

Again the change-agent team, due to its potential resources, is seen as having a clear advantage over the single change-agent.

## Homophilous vs. Heterophilous Change-Agent

In maintaining change, the homophilous change-agent is seen as having a clear advantage. Because of his similarity to client system members, his communication with them is improved. Also, because he is perceived as being similar to client system members and thus communicates more effectively, he is better able to persuade them to change and then maintain it (Rogers and Bhowmik, 1971:534). Also, the perceived similarity of the change-agent facilitates identification of client system members with him and his views. This can facilitate not only the change process (Schein et al, 1968), but also the refreezing process as the homophilous change-agent is likely to be seen as more supportive and a more credible source of reinforcement for the change itself.

## OPTIMALLY SPECIFIED CHANGE-AGENT ROLE

Having discussed the various dimensions along which the change-agent role can be specified, what conclusions can the administrator make? In reviewing Table I, it is clear that no dimension has a clear advantage in performing the six tasks of the change-agent.

However, from the above disucssion, it appears that we could specify the ideal change-agent as follows:

1) From Table I it can be recalled that the change-agent team had,in general,a clear advantage over the single change-agent. This was due to the fact that the team simply had the potential for having more resources and a better division of labor.

2) The composition of this team should consist of:

   A) An internal and external change-agent. The external change-agent brings a certain degree of objectivity and broader perspective to the client system. An internal change-agent can compliment this with his understanding of the system. The internal change-agent is also, by virtue of being in the system, in a better position to help maintain the changes that take place.

B) In general, the more homophilous the change-agent the more effective he will be. The more homophilous change-agent can communicate more effectively with the client system and is thus likely to have a broader base of power, i.e., referent, legitimate, than a heterophilous change-agent. Even if the change-agent is an expert, which might make him initally heterophilous, if he can empathize with the client system, he will be seen as less heterophilous and more homophilous.

## References

C. Argyris (1971) Intervention Theory and Method, (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley)

R. Beckhard (1969) Organizational Development: Strategies and Models (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley)

N. Davey (1971) The External Consultant's Role in Organizational Change (East Lansing: Bureau of Research, Graduate School of Business, Michigan State University)

R. Duncan (1971) "Climate for Change Instrument" unpublished paper, Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

______ and M. Radnor (1972) "A Strategy for Institutionalizing Change Interventions in Organizations: An Action Model" Working Paper, Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

J. French and B. Raven (1959) "Bases of Social Power" in D. Cartwright's Studies in Social Power (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

R. Lippitt, J. Watson, B. Westley, (1958) The Dynamics of Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World)

E. Rogers (1969) Moderization Among Peasants (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)

______ and F. Shoemaker (1971) Communication of Innovations (New York: Free Press)

E. Schein, W. Bennis, F. Steele, D. Berlew, (1968) Interpersonal Dynmmics (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press)

______ (1969) Process Consultation (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley)

M. Scurrah, M. Shani, C. Zipfel (1971) "Influence of Internal and External Change Agents in a Simulated Educational Organization" Administrative Science Quarterly Vol. 16, pp. 113-122

G. Watson (1966) "Resistance to Change" in Goodwin Watson (ed) Concepts for Social Change, Cooperative Project for Educational Development Series, Vol. I (Washington, D.C., National Training Laboratories)