Self and Identity:
Hidden Factors in Resistance to Organizational Change

Ken Hultman, EdD
Ken Hultman Consulting

Justin Hultman, MA
Arizona State University

Dr. Ken Hultman is an independent coach, trainer, and consultant. He received his EdD in counseling psychology from Rutgers University, with an emphasis in group dynamics, and has over 40 years of experience helping individuals, teams, and organizations overcome barriers to achieving their full potential. He is the author of nine books and numerous scholarly articles. His article, "Evaluating Organizational Values," received the 2005 O.D. Journal article of the year award, and his article, "Organization Development as Identity Change," co-authored with Justin Hultman, received the award in 2015.

Justin Hultman is an independent researcher. He received his bachelor's degree in english from Shippensburg University, and his master's degree in media arts from The Univesity of Arizona. He is passionate about student success and overcoming barriers in Higher Education. He currently is employed as a Student Recruitment Coordiantor Sr. for the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University, and is also an Ed.D. candidate in the field of Educational Leadership at Northern Arizona University.

Abstract

This article proposes that a causal relationship often exists between a person's sense of self and resistance to organizational change, and that many transformation efforts fail because this relationship functions below the level of awareness and, therefore, is often ignored. An overview of self and identity is presented, along with a discussion of resistance to organizational change. We will show how self, identity, and resistance are often related; in addition, we will provide examples and tips to help OD practitioners identify and address underlying issues pertaining to self and identity, so positive change can be accepted and implemented more effectively.

Keywords: self, identity, levels of self, rigid self, adaptable self, self-acceptance and growth, self and resistance, dealing with self and identity issues

Contact Information:

Ken Hultman, EdD
Phone: (228) 327-5375
    Ken Hultman Consulting
    966 Laa La Way
    Diamondhead, MS 39525

Email: ken@kenhultman.com

Justin Hultman, MA
    Arizona State University

Email: justindanielhultman@gmail.com
    https://www.linkedin.com/in/justin-hultman-
    18b8a259/

Did you ever wonder why people resist organizational change even when it would be in their best interest, or even necessary, to avoid negative repercussions for them, a team, or the organization? Some people will argue in support of their opinions so dogmatically, no one can get them to look at alternatives without a futile debate. Just about every OD practitioner has encountered such people, leaving them bewildered in their attempts to facilitate positive individual, team, or organizational change. Schein (1988) believes resistance to change is one of the most ubiquitous of organizational phenomena.

Various definitions of resistance have been offered in the literature. For example, Zaltman and Duncan (1977) define resistance as attempts to maintain the status quo when pressure exists to alter it. Ansoff (1988) indicates resistance is a multifaceted phenomenon, adding delay, cost and instability to the strategic change process. Hultman (1998), defines *resistance* as a state of mind reflecting unwillingness or unreceptiveness to change; *readiness,* in contrast, is a state of mind reflecting willingness or receptiveness to change. Resistance manifests itself by either active or passive opposition, while readiness manifests itself by either active initiation of change or efforts to support it.

Resistance to change has been a perennial

issue since the dawn of humanity, but it has gained increasing attention with advances in psychology, particularly social psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Research on this topic began appearing when employees started resisting advancements in technology. In an early study, Coch & French (1948) concluded that what employees resist is usually not technical change, but social change—the change in their human relationships that accompanies technical change. Consistent with this, Ronken & Lawrence (1952) compared two approaches to introducing technical change. They concluded that the second approach was resisted because employees did not like the way they were treated, and the change was perceived as representing an unacceptable modification in the way they related to others in the organization.

More recently, in a survey of 2,200 executives, managers, and employees, Aguirre, von Post, & Alpern (2013), found that only about half of change initiatives achieved their goals. They offered three primary reasons for failure: fatigue (weariness stemming from seemingly constant change), lack of skill in sustaining the change, and resistance to change. It could be argued that the first two reasons are symptoms of the third. This assertion is supported by other specific survey results:

- Widespread skepticism due to the failure of previous change initiatives.
- Most respondents felt excluded from the change process.
- 44% reported that they did not understand the change.
- 38% said they disagreed with the change.

Over the past few decades, many websites, articles, and books have proposed lists of symptoms, causes, and solutions to resistance, most of which include factors consistent with the above findings (see, for example, Hultman, 2003; Maurer, 2010). To us, these results indicate that, in some way, people's identity was being questioned and they responded by not supporting the change.

In a previous jointly-authored article, we discussed the role of identity as a factor in organizational change (Hultman & Hultman, 2015). We argued that while resistance may surface as specific arguments against proposed change, such as those mentioned above, the *real* issues often relate to unspoken perceived threats to core aspects of one's self and identity. We further asserted that unless these issues can be identified and addressed, resistance is likely to continue or even intensify. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that not all change is good, and there are times when it is healthy and constructive to resist change. OD practitioners are in a unique position to help identify and deal with unhealthy or destructive resistance.

To shed more light on this topic, we will begin by providing a brief overview of self and identity, and then show how these concepts can become causal factors behind resistance.

What Are Self and Identity?

The *self* has a long history in the social science literature, dating back to many seminal thinkers in several areas of psychology and sociology (Allport, 1955; Cooley, 1902; Erikson, 1968; James, 1980; Mead, 1935; Rogers, 1961). More recently, there has been an explosion of interest in the topic from a cognitive-developmental perspective (Leary & Tangney, 2005; Baumeister, 1999). Self and identity were a major focus of OD in the 1960s and 1970s, with the advent of T-groups or sensitivity-training. Carl Rogers described T-groups "as the most significant social invention of the century" (Fehr, 2003, p. 22).

Since that period, however, the focus in organizations has steadily shifted toward an emphasis on short-term profits, doing more work with fewer employees, and "business" consulting, with its goal of increasing financial gain as opposed to building relationships that support organizational success. Despite these trends, self and identity have remained relevant by theory and research on emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1994, 1998; Hughes, Patterson, & Terrell, 2005: Farh, C. C., Seo, M. G., & Tesluk, P. E., 2012), and the widespread growth of appreciative inquiry as an OD intervention (Bushe & Marhsak, 2015; Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Kessler, 2013). Therefore, the relevance of self and identity to long-term organizational viability is sometimes ignored, while at other times championed. This article represents a step toward strengthening the link between these concepts and organizational sustainability.

We will begin by defining terms. One way to place self and identity in context is through systems thinking. Living systems are referred to as *open,* which means they receive information and resources from the external environment, transform them through action and interaction within the system, and return something different or new to the external environment. Organizations are comprised of individuals who interact with others to deliver an output, either a product or service. Individuals have an internal system—within themselves—and they relate to an organizational system to the extent that they share mutual values, beliefs, and objectives. Thus, in one way or another everything pertaining to the self and identity has to do with some type of relationship, and all the relationships are dynamics, constantly impacted by changes both within their internal and the organizational systems.

In terms of the individual, the term *self* can be used as an overarching term that includes everything relating to the questions: "Who am I (my

self-definition), and why am I here (my purpose in life)? It is the lens through which we view the world and our place in it.

Sedikides & Brewer (2001) distinguished three interrelated levels of self: *individual* (personal), *relational* (social), and *collective* (large group). At the core is the personal self, which defines our relationship with ourselves. We are capable of self-reflection, standing outside ourselves and evaluating what we think, say, and do. The personal self extends outward from the center of our being to include the social self, which concerns close relationship, and then even further to include the collective self, which focuses on more extensive entities, such as organizations and group memberships.

Caporeal (2001) explains that the social self focuses on bonds of attachment, while the collective self focuses on more abstract bonds and category memberships. Historically, the social self develops first, as our initial conceptions of who we are stem from family, friends, and early authority figures. As we continue maturing, however, the personal self begins to differentiate from the social self, allowing us to establish our uniqueness as individuals, and continues expanding outward to embrace an increasingly broad range of relationships with institutions, organizations, and even our place in the universe. The social and collective selves

are important, because we compare ourselves to expectations stemming from them, gauging the extent to which our thoughts and actions meet or diverge from these sources of influence.

Identity is more specific, defining the traits and characteristics, social relations, roles, and social group memberships that define who one is (Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012). Each person possesses many identities, determining unique facts, beliefs, and values pertaining to the personal, social, and collective selves. Facts are objective realities that can be proven with evidence, such as demographic information like gender, race, and country of origin, while beliefs are subjective assumptions, conclusions, and predictions. People rely on beliefs to determine what is true and false, right and wrong, and predict what they think will happen in the future. Values are conceptions about what is important in life, based on facts and beliefs. Once established they become powerful influences, serving as criteria for making decisions and setting priorities. People function more effectively when beliefs and values across the three levels of self, and their associated identities interact harmoniously, free from internal conflict.

In addition to facts, beliefs, and values, which are cognitive variables, the self includes one more crucial variable—emotions. People *care* about the various aspects of identity defining their larger

sense of self, and emotions play a key role in how people think and respond to experiences impacting who they are and their purpose in life. You do not have to be around others long before discovering what they consider to be important. Consequently, there is no such thing as a completely rational decision or action, because these are all motivated by what people care about, which is emotional; plus, the beliefs and values behind them, which always contain subjective elements, are vulnerable to misperceptions and distortion. Feedback from others and the outside world not only shape identity, but also impacts it once formed, both positively and negatively. When people perceive that one of their cherished beliefs, values, or behaviors is under attack they can either change or become defensive. The intensity of a negative reaction varies from mild to extreme, depending on its perceived threat to self. When people whose identity is closely tied to membership in a team or organization lose their job, even suicide or violence cannot be ruled out.

Kurt Lewin (1947) had a major impact on the field of change management when he described this as consisting of three phases: unfreezing, change, and refreezing. He argued that resistance is often encountered during the first two stages. This model is useful in describing resistance to individual, team, and organizational change. Relating to the concepts of self and identity, Lewin's work had

a large impact on other theorists. For example, in developing his theory of cognitive dissonance, Leon Festinger (1957) argued that people seek consistency among their beliefs, and that inconsistencies bring about a variety of negative emotions. More recently, Swann (1999) advanced the notion that stable views (consistent self-views) give people a sense of internal coherence, which is essential to defining their existence, organizing their experiences, predicting the future, and planning social interaction. Other widely used terms to describe consistency are congruence and integration, which can be contrasted with incongruence and fragmentation. Of specific relevance to the current article, Higgins (1999) argues that discrepancies between how people view themselves and others produce a wide range of emotions. Specifically, he maintains that discrepancies between what people believe about themselves and what others expect of them can lead to fear that the self is under attack. When this happens, people can either comply with other's expectations, although against their will, or become defensive to protect the self. One obvious way to do this is by resisting change, either actively or passively.

To understand this more fully, it is important to explore the differences between a congruent and incongruent self. According to Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith (2012), people interpret situations in a

manner that is congruent with important aspects of their identities, preferring identity-congruence over incongruence, and strive to interpret contradictions in ways that allow them to maintain identity congruence. Experiments indicate that people go to great lengths to protect identity congruence, ignoring or reinterpreting discrepancies (Markus, 1977; Swann, 1983, 1985).

While these authors use the term *stability* rather than congruence, they maintain that a stable self is not necessarily effective. To support this thesis, they assert that to make sense of themselves and the world, establish self-worth, and select behavior, an effective self should be *dynamic*, allowing for change and growth. While change invariably involves risk, so does refusal to change. Uncertainty is a fact of life; consequently, identities that provide stability but are also open to change are more functional, allowing people to deal with uncertainty, and challenges accompanying different life stages. Nevertheless, people experiencing conflict among their personal, social, and collective selves may resist making important changes,

defending the self dogmatically because they perceive this as necessary to preserve their self-definition.

Figure 1 is an attempt to synthesize the ideas presented above along a continuum extending from a rigid self to a more dynamic, adaptable self. No one has a completely rigid or dynamic self, but ebb and flow along the continuum in response to changes in the external environment, internal changes within themselves, and changes within the organizational system. Even Maslow (1968), who emphasized growth values in movement toward self-actualization, maintained there was a place for stabilizing ("coasting" values), as well as defensive-values. He argued that, while many people have an intrinsic motivation for growth, they also need homeostatic values for peace, rest, and relaxation. He also maintained that defensive-values, which protect against pain, fear, loss, and threat, are a *sine qua non* precondition for growth, but cautioned that they can also inhibit growth. Values for conformity and regimentation, for example, can undermine creativity and innovation.

Figure 1. The Rigid versus the Dynamic, Adaptable Self Continuum

Rigid self

Dynamic, adaptable self, grounded in self-acceptance

While shifts take place along the continuum daily—this is what it means to be adaptable—our contention is that under routine circumstances individuals will tend to maintain a preferred position somewhere between the two poles. We further contend that more adaptable people will show greater openness to new ideas and positive change, while those who tend to be rigid will exhibit more resistant to change.

Other subtler issues exist along the continuum. Facts are subject to distortion. Two people exposed to the same set of facts can arrive at entirely different conclusions and, invariably, most adults hold beliefs with such high confidence they treat them as facts. Beliefs of this kind are less amenable to change because they are simply assumed to be correct; in other words, they assume their beliefs and truth are identical. The same phenomenon can occur with values. People often have a vested interest in their values; they want to believe their values are the best ones or even the only ones. Since values, like the beliefs underpinning them, are subjective variables, however, they cannot be proven right or wrong. The idea that certain values are more important than others is an opinion, not a fact.

The far left of the continuum means that people tend to maintain beliefs and values—especially if they represent core aspects of self and identity—even when clear contradictory evidence exists. They argue on behalf of their views regardless of what anyone else says, as though the essence of who they are is at stake. Their mind is closed to views except their own, leaving others with a sense of futility in raising different perspectives. You can tell when you are talking with a person coming from this position because there is a sense it really does not matter what you say, or an argument would follow if you proposed a different viewpoint. You cannot "reason" with a person in this state of mind, because their opinion is largely driven by emotion, and anything you say is either irrelevant or wrong. In many instances, it appears their goal is not so much to win the argument, but to preserve the self. Convinced that their views are right, such people may perceive their self is fully integrated and consistent, even though it includes contradictions and distortions. This could be a dilemma where people are insensitive to or unable to see multiple perspectives in a situation, representing a limitation of critical thinking skills.

In contrast to stating adamant, dogmatic views, some people with a rigid sense of self reveal very little, concerned what they say might be held against them. Instead of sharing their opinions, responses are calculated and measured. Interaction is often brief and unproductive, revealing little or no useful information.

The flipside is when people do not believe they do anything right. Frequently, they can be overheard chastising themselves with expressions such as, "You idiot," or "What made you think you could do this?" Clinically this is often referred to as the internalized critical parent. This way of thinking has become so ingrained in their sense of self, if you point out a positive contribution, they tend to either minimize it or attribute it to luck. Ironically, this self-criticism represents a way to maintain a consistent sense of self. As children, many of these people were labeled the "black sheep," "the stubborn one," "the complainer," or some other derogatory term. Nevertheless, when it became incorporated into their identity—this is who I am—they behave accordingly. Negative attention is better than none.

At the other end of the continuum, some people are so enthusiastic about a change they fail to thoroughly evaluate the potential pros and cons, or refuse to consider alternatives. Some examples are people who champion change based on a hunch or "gut-feel." This is the gambler's mentality. One of us worked with a supervisor who could not admit a project deadline was unrealistic because he was raised to always think optimistically. His false expectations ended up costing the organization a great deal of time and money. Thus, at both ends of the continuum emotion overrides logic, only for different reasons. The commonality is that the

behavior is so emphatic, the listener is often baffled. A more balanced view would be somewhere in the middle where people are aware of their biases and, while open to change, subject them to rigorous scrutiny and engage in candid discussion with other stakeholders before arriving at a conclusion.

Some common examples of failure to achieve a healthy sense of congruence among the three levels of self, which were discussed earlier, are when people:

- Lack confidence in their decisions.
- Feel inadequate when comparing themselves to others.
- Avoid conflict instead of trying to resolve it.
- Are content to work alone, while distancing themselves from teams and the organization.
- Avoid giving credit, but readily assign blame.
- Conform to team views, even when disagreeing with them.
- Take credit for the work of others.
- Refuse to admit when they are wrong.
- Criticize team or organizational ideas without offering constructive suggestions.

What these examples share is that they prevent dialogue. So the question becomes: what allows for a healthy sense of stability or congruence of self, and yet provides receptiveness to the views of others and change? Helping people develop an

intrinsic sense of worth provides them with a greater sense of inner security, and more willingness to consider change. Many theorists have proposed this view over the decades. For example, William James (1992) defines truth by comparing it to reality. Reality is the state of things as they exist, rather than as they may appear or might be imagined. Reality is not true but simply *is,* and truth is the beliefs we hold *about* reality. He argued that the primary purpose of beliefs is to seek and validate truth, and beliefs are accurate to the extent that they perform this role. While we can never know reality completely, we can come closer to it through successive approximation by correcting, modifying, adjusting, and adding to our beliefs through experience and accurate feedback from others. This is how we can improve the viability of beliefs.

Similarly, Carl Rogers (1961) maintains that self-acceptance is correlated with acceptance of others. Hultman (2012) asserted that intrinsic self-worth is a core condition allowing people to move toward their destiny. Efforts to establish a more unconditional sense of self-worth allow people to maintain a core sense of who they are, to look at themselves more honestly, and to be more open to feedback from others, while grappling with uncertainty, the dynamics of change, and unanticipated developments.

People at either end of the continuum are both difficult to work with, sometimes even impossible, only for different reasons. A large part of the difficulty can often be traced back to self and identity issues below the level of awareness. Coaching and training in emotional intelligence holds considerable promise for helping people develop a more adaptable sense of self and identity, allowing them to increase self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills (Hughes, Patterson, & Terrell, 2005).

To demonstrate how OD can increase organizational effectiveness by focusing on self and identity, two examples will be provided, each in a very different setting—manufacturing and higher education. Following that, we will provide some specific suggestions intended to help OD consultants and other change agents move beyond surface, diversionary tactics, and get at underlying core issues.

Manufacturing example. The CEO of an electric power plant decided that instead of allowing equipment to break down rather then fixing it, they would move to a system of preventative maintenance. Although he and other members of the leadership team were in favor of the change, they met with strong opposition from the maintenance crew. Since this is standard practice in many industries such as the airlines, where

a mechanical failure could be catastrophic, the maintenance crew argued that equipment failures at the power plant were much less serious and could be repaired quickly. They also argued preventative maintenance was costlier than equipment repair, and that spare parts were almost always in stock.

On the surface these arguments seemed logical, but there was a deeper issue. When a piece of equipment failed, the maintenance crew had a long-standing reputation for bringing it back on-line rapidly. Routinely they were praised by operators and supervisors for their efforts. With preventative maintenance, however, the maintenance crew perceived keeping equipment operational would become commonplace and their efforts would be taken for granted. The OD practitioner assigned to this project interviewed the mechanics and realized that many of them felt excluded from the change process, and did not understand the change. This is consistent with the finding of Aguirre, von Post, & Alpern (2013) presented earlier. It also supports an observation made by Head (2000), that resistance is usually caused by the change process (the how) instead of the intervention itself (the what). Indeed, many of the maintenance employees viewed the change as a threat to their pride of workmanship, which the OD practitioner came to realize was important to their identity as company employees.

Meeting with the leadership team, the OD practitioner explained that, to overcome resistance, doing more to explain the benefits of the change and how the maintenance team's efforts would be crucial to achieving them might help overcome their resistance. With the leadership team's support, the OD consultant met with the Director of Maintenance, and coached her in ways to explain the reasons for the change in greater detail, and get the maintenance team more involved in the change process. After much discussion, a system was devised to track the steady decline in equipment failures and power outages, decrease in expenses, and increase in consumer satisfaction. A chart containing this information was displayed prominently in the plant, and the maintenance crew was routinely praised for these results. This made them aware that their efforts would be more significant than simply fixing a piece of equipment because it was essential to overall plant effectiveness and to the provision of dependable electric power to customers. Due to increased communication and involvement, they embraced the change enthusiastically.

Higher education example. The department chairperson of a college voted to deny tenure to a faculty member despite a superlative record, which included excellent teaching ability, research productivity, and service to the community. The department chairperson cited the faculty member's lack of collegiality as rationale for the

decision, suggesting that the tenure applicant's interdisciplinary views conflicted with a firmly entrenched single department ideology (Connell & Savage, 2001; De George, 2003; Bowden, 2009). The faculty member had been vocal in committee meetings and raised issues concerning lack of diversity in the curriculum that were uncomfortable to the chairperson. The chairperson also argued that, while the faculty member's classes were popular with students, they had the potential of influencing future faculty members to stray from the current single disciplinary focus.

This example illustrates the negative impact that intractability can have on a department. On the one hand, the chairperson chose to deny tenure to the faculty member to reaffirm the established structure; on the other hand, the chairperson overlooked not only the sterling credentials of the faculty member, but also a history of popularity with students. Essentially, she was resisting the faculty member's ideas and was also fearful of change. The message being sent by the chairperson was that conformity was valued over change. The chairperson cited collegiality, a subjective judgment, as the reason for denial of tenure, as opposed to objective information in the faculty member's file (Van Den Haag, 1994; Kaplin & Lee, 2014; Tierney, 2014). She had chosen to act as a gatekeeper, defending entrenched norms, attitudes, and views, much of

which she had implemented over the years. This served to preserve the chairperson's identity at the expense of collective best interests.

The higher education leadership team realized the problematic nature of this issue for future growth and brought in an OD consultant for assistance. The consultant, who specialized in working with institutions of higher learning, met with the chairperson, offering research on the success rate of single disciplinary departments, which had shifted to a multidisciplinary approach. The consultant reassured the chairperson that she was not responsible for rigidly maintaining current practices, many of which had laid the groundwork for positive change, and emphasizing that, in the current academic environment, success is best measured by diverse faculty and students who would be interested in joining the department. This approach relieved the chairperson from the self-imposed burden of rigidly maintaining past practices, while preserving her identity. A compromise was reached allowing the faculty member denied tenure to appeal, while simultaneously providing others with the opportunity to preserve their current collegiality and keeping pace with change.

Tips for working with people who are rigid or overly optimistic about change

In this section, we will offer suggestions to OD practitioners who encounter situations working

with people who are always convinced they are right, and also with people who are so convinced a change will succeed, they fail to weigh the pros and cons objectively. Work of this kind requires a high level of emotional intelligence, because some people can become easily offended. Our goal is to assist your efforts to help people attain a healthier and less defensive sense of self and identity, and to lower their resistance to positive organizational change.

Working with rigid people. While judgment calls are always necessary when working with individuals or teams, here are a few examples we have found effective:

- When working with others who appear unwilling to consider other views, avoid asking the question, "Why?" This can increase their level of perceived threat. Instead, you can say something like, "We do not appear to be getting anywhere. Would it be all right if we stepped back from the immediate situation and took a larger perspective? Tell me about yourself and what is important to you?" If you are working with a team, this can be done by asking, "Tell me about the team's purpose and what you are trying to accomplish. Is there anything that gets in the way of that happening?" When people are arguing for a certain position, they often overlook issues or become even more emphatic about their views. Questions such as those proposed above shift the discussion to a problem-solving mode, often generating insights not considered previously.

- When working with very dogmatic people, at times it can be useful to be more direct and say, "We seem to be at an impasse. I have listened to your views, but you have not asked me about mine. Is there a way we can establish a two-way interaction?" Questions like this tend to lower defensiveness, as opposed to creating debates about who is right or wrong. The goal is not to "win," but rather to establish ground rules for a constructive exchange of views.

- Another approach would be to ask, "When you present your view so strongly, what kind of reaction do you get from others?" If the person reveals others offer little support, you can ask, "Can you think of an approach that might be more productive?"

- Point out how their previous efforts have led to the possibility for new initiatives.

- With people who seem reluctant to reveal information or opinions, you might say, "I'm getting the feeling you have more to say about this, but are reluctant to do so.

Your views are important, and I'd like to hear them."

Working with people who are overly optimistic about change. When working with people who only express enthusiasm about proposed change, you might find it useful to respond in a manner such as those listed below:

- "You seem convinced this change is the best choice. Do you see any alternatives?" The purpose of a question such as this is to help people expand their thinking.

- "How do others view this proposed change? If conflicting views exist, are these addressed?"

- "So far you have only mentioned pros concerning the change. Do you see any cons?"

Other examples could be provided, but these serve to illustrate the point. The goal is not to change people's mind but expand their thinking and, without saying so directly, get at possible underlying self and identity issues. Open-ended questions allow you to lower defensiveness and build trust which is effective in stimulating dialogue.

Summary

This article has argued that resistance to organizational change can often be traced back to underlying issues relating to self and identity. Many change initiatives are doomed to fail, unless these issues are brought to the surface and addressed in a constructive manner. An overview of self and identity was provided, along with some background information about resistance. Some examples and suggestions for dealing with self and identity issues were presented. Our objective has been to offer a different way of thinking about the causes of resistance, and strategies for overcoming them.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

References

Aguirre, D., von Post, R., & Alpern, M. (2013). *Culture's role in enabling organizational change.* Retrieved from https://www. strategyand.pw c.com/reports/cultures-role-organizational-change. (This report was originally published by Booz & Company in 2013).

Allport, G. W. (1955). *Becoming.* New haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ansoff, I. (1988). *The new corporate strategy.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bowden, R. G. (2009). The postsecondary professoriate: Problems of tenure, academic freedom, and employment law. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 13*(3), 17.

Baumeister, R. F. (Ed). (1999). *The self in social psychology*. New York: Psychology Press.

Bushe, G.R., & Marhsak, R. M. (2015). *Dialogic organization development: The theory and practice of organizational transformation.* Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Caporeal, L. R. (2001). Parts and wholes: The evolutionary importance of groups. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer, M. B. (Eds.). *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 241-258). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Coch, L. & French J R.P., Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations,* (1)4, p. 512.

Connell, M. A., & Savage, F. G. (2001). The role of collegiality in higher education tenure, promotion, and termination decisions. *Journal of College and University Law, 27*(4), 833-858.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order.* New York: Schochen Books.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

De George, R.T. (2003). Ethics, academic freedom and academic tenure. *Journal of Academic Ethics; 1*(1), 11-25. Doi:10.1023/A:1025421706331

Fehr, S. S. (2003). *Introduction to group therapy: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Binghampton, NY: The Hawthorne Press, Inc.

Farh, C. C., Seo, M. G., & Tesluk, P. E. (2012). Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 97*(4), 890-900.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Goleman, D. (1997). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York:

Bantum Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantum Books.

Head, T. C. (2000). Appreciative inquiry: Debunking the mythology behind resistance to change, *OD Practitioner, 43*(1).

Higgins, E. T. (1999). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The self in social psychology* (pp 150-175). New York: Psychology Press.

Hughes, M., Patterson, L. B., & Terrell, J. B. (2005). *Emotional intelligence in action: Training and coaching activities for leaders and Managers.* San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Hultman, K. E. (1998). *Making change irresistible: Overcoming resistance to change in your organization.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Hultman, K. E. (2003). Managing resistance to change. In H. Bidgoli (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of information systems, Volume 3* (pp. 693-705). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hultman, K. E., & Hultman, J. D. (2015). Organization development as identity change. *Organization Development Journal, 33*(3), 39-54.

James, W. (1890). *Psychology.* New York: World.

James, W. (1992). *Writings 1902-1910.* New York: The Library of America.

Kaplin, W.A., & Lee, B.A. (2014). *The law of higher education* (5th ed). New York, NY: Wiley (Student version).

Kessler, E. H. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Management Theory: The Appreciative Inquiry Model.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Leary, M. R. & Tangney, J. P. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of self and identity.* NY: The Guilford Press.

Leinwand, P., & Mainardi, C. (2016). *Strategy that works: How winning companies close the strategy-to-execution gap.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemas and social processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Psychology, 35,* 63-78.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd Ed.). Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company.

Maurer, R. (2010). *Beyond the wall of resistance: Why 70 % of all change efforts fail—and what to do about it* (Rev. Ed.). Austin, TX: Bard Press.

Mead, G. H. (1935). *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Oyserman, D, Elmore K, & Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and Identity. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney, (Eds.), *Handbook of self and*

identity (2nd Ed, pp. 69-104). New York: The Guilford Press. Retrieved from https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/782/docs/handbook_of_self_and_identity_-_second_edition_-_ch._4_pp._69-104_38_pages.pdf

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ronken, H., & Lawrence, P. R. (1952). *Administering changes: A case study of human relations in a factory.* Boston, MA: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.

Schein, E. (1988), *Organizational psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sedikides, C. & Brewer, M. B. (2001). Individual self, relational self, and collective self: Partners, opponents, or strangers? In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer, M. B. (Eds.). *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 1-4). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Swann, W. B. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 33-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swann, W. B., Jr. (1985). The self as architect of social reality. In B. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 100-125). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Swann, W. B., Jr. (1999). *Resilient identities: Self, relationships, and the construction of social reality.* New York: Basic Books.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Rentfrow, P. J., Guinn, J. S. (2003). Self-verification: The search for coherence. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.). *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 267-283). New York: The Guilford Press.

Tierney, W. G. (2004). Academic freedom and tenure: Between fiction and reality. *The Journal of Higher Education 75*(2), 161-177. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press. Retrieved June 15, 2017, from Project MUSE database.

Van Den Haag, E. (1994). Academic freedom and tenure. *Pace Law Review, 15*(1), 5.

Zaltman, G. and Duncan, R. (1977). *Strategies for planned change.* Toronto: Wiley.

ഇ●ଓ