Human Relations

The Change Agent: A Taxonomy in Relation to the Change Process

Richard N. Ottaway

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

$SAGE

On behalf of:

The Tavistock Institute

Additional services and information for *Human Relations* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://hum.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://hum.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations http://hum.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/36/4/361

The Change Agent: A Taxonomy
in Relation to the Change Process

Richard N. Ottaway[1]

Graduate School of Management, Rutgers University

The article begins with a historical review of the term change agent from its origin in Lippit, Watson, and Westley to current usage in behavioral science literature. More detailed descriptions are provided for research that has been conducted on change agents. Lewin's three-phase paradigm of social change is used to construct a taxonomy of ten categories of change agents involved. Activities and characteristics are proposed for each category, citing recent research efforts to substantiate them.

INTRODUCTION

This article provides a review of definitions of change agents and presents a taxonomy of change agents in relation to the change process as conceptualized by Lewin (1952). The review begins with the historical development of the definition from its origins at the National Training Laboratories to its present usage among behavioral scientists. Also presented is a summary of the current research on change agents. The article then presents the taxonomy along with a description of its development, the principles governing it, and its intended uses. In conclusion, some future directions for research are indicated.

[1]Request for reprints should be sent to Dr. R. N. Ottaway, Visiting Associate Professor, Organization Management, Rutgers State University of New Jersey, Graduate School of Management, 92 New Street, New Jersey 07102.

REVIEW OF DEFINITIONS

Historical Development

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) are generally credited with offering the first definition of the change agent in what is probably the first book on change agents:

> the planned change that originates in a decision to make a deliberate effort to improve the system and to obtain the help of an outside agent in making this improvement. We call this outside agent a change agent.* (Footnote: *The term was adopted by the National Training Laboratory staff in 1947 to facilitate discussions among heterogeneous groups of professional helpers. It is a term which has since proved very useful.) (1958, p. 10)

> We call all of these helpers, no matter what kind of system they normally work with, change agents . . . . We shall call the specific system — person, or group that is being helped — the client system. (1958, p. 12)

This first book on change agents, a scant 20 years ago, is dedicated to "Kurt Lewin and our colleagues at the National Training Laboratories." Lippitt was one of the three (Bradford and Lewin being the other two) who set up the first training conference in 1946, the Connecticut Workshop Project, which grew into the National Training Laboratories (Cohen & Smith, 1976). Lewin is credited by many (Benne, 1976; Hall & Lindzey 1978; Foster, 1972; De Board, 1978) with the basic concept of bringing together scientific inquiry and democratic methods and giving birth to such terms as change agent, action research, and group dynamics. Possibly due to his early background in Nazi Germany, combined with his moral philosophy, Lewin felt that democracy could only survive with more participation, and that would require change. Change in turn required change agents to be trained for that purpose.

Bennis is an early and important conceptualizer of change agents. As early as 1964 he defined change agents as "professionals, men who, for the most part, have been trained and hold doctorates in the behavioral sciences" (1964, p. 306). He saw them as a heterogenous group including researchers, trainers, consultants, counsellors, teachers, and in some cases, the line managers. He saw them operating from a common set of assumptions: the centrality of work in the culture, working for organizational effectiveness, focusing on interpersonal or group relationships, not as interested in changing the arrangements of personnel as they are the relationships, attitudes, perceptions, and values at work among the existing personnel.

Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1969) continue in the Lippitt et al. tradition (which I call this historical development) with concepts such as planned change,

relationship between theory and practice, the variety of social systems to which planned change is applicable, and change agents. They add to the Lippitt et al. concept by saying that the change agent can be either from the outside or the inside of the organization. They see the "principal tools of planned change: consulting, training, and applied research" (1969, p. 8).

Beckhard's definition of change agents seems to reach the generic level: "'Change agent' refers to those people, either inside or outside the organization, who are providing technical, specialist or consulting assistance in the management of a change effort" (1969, p. 101). This definition is comprehensive, nearly value-free, and yet focused on change of social behavior. Nothing new appears to have been added to the definition of change agents since Beckhard.

In this brief historical sketch, the change agent is seen as helping a client system to change, from either the inside or outside, and in either a proactively initiated or reactively initiated relationship. The current application of this definition will be reviewed in the following section.

Review of Current Change Agent Definitions

Most writers of change literature offer a definition of change agents when presenting their findings or descriptions of training, consultancy, or applied research. This section will review a sample of these definitions from the literature. Dale says, "By 'change agent' I mean those who seek to help others (singly or in organizations) with their *processes* of problem-solving and change, without themselves becoming involved in its content" (1974, p. 102, his italics). Dale's change agents are focusing on the process rather than the task.

Another definition which fits into this tradition is that of Hall and Williams (1973, p. 2): "Let us define as change agents those individuals in our society who have the role of bringing about constructive change in either other individuals or social organizations and institutions."

For a contrasting example, Pearl explores the role of the psychological consultant as change agent, "Psychologists are in the business of producing change . . . . The change the psychologist advocates regardless of the situation is almost always a change in the individuals to fit the larger society. He is paid to make the individual fit and that is what he tries his damnedest to do—and that is the major weakness of psychology and all other social sciences" (1974, pp. 292-293). Or, for a one-liner, Reddin says: "For the past several years I have worked with several companies as a change agent. Change agents have been called consultants in behavioral clothing" (1971, p. ix). Both of these definitions appear to focus on a task.

Lundberg follows the Lippitt et al. traditional definition of the change agent with an emphasis on the breadth of the definition: "While everyone in

the very loosest sense is an agent of change, I refer here to those people who usually have an allegiance to a behavioral science discipline, and who assist and implement the planned change resulting from social interventions in a variety of situations" (1974, p. 69). In this paper he is discussing the change agent image of self and the incongruities resulting.

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) offer specialized definitions for a particular group of change agents. They focus on the change agent in the area of diffusion of information and innovation, particularly in developing nations. They say "A change agent is a professional who influences innovation decisions in a direction deemed desirable by a change agency" (1971, p. 35). They see themselves working in the Lippitt et al. tradition, but they value the internal/external argument less than others: "We maintain that he is set off from his clients by nature of his professional status (that is, employment by a change agency), rather than whether he lives in or out (or considers himself a member) of a particular system" (1971, p. 227). Their work will be discussed in greater detail later.

Another researcher to be mentioned here and also discussed in more detail later is Tichy. He defines the change agent he researched as a social change agent: "The change agents in our study are individuals whose primary role is to deliberately intervene into social systems in order to facilitate or bring about social change" (1975, p. 772).

Argyris introduces some new language into the definition when he says: "This book represents the writer's first attempt to construct a theoretical framework for consulting, which I should like to call *intervention*" (1970, p. viii). He calls the change agent an interventionist, which means primarily a consultant or researcher, because, he says, "In recent years the focus has been so strongly upon change that interventionists have usually been called 'change agents'" (1970, p. 20).

Zaltman and Duncan (1977) base their definition on that of Rogers and Shoemaker: "In this book we take a broad view of the change agent role to include some change in that system whether it is sanctioned or not. Specifically, a change agent is any individual or group operating to change the status quo in a system such that the individual or individuals involved must relearn how to perform their role(s)" (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p. 17). Change agents are often referred to as "actors in the change processes" (Zoltman & Duncan, 1977, p. 183). They seem to omit as change agent activity the teaching, facilitating, or assisting the changes in this relearning process. However, they conclude that change agents are more likely to be effective if they (i) stimulate the user's problem-solving processes; (ii) match up processes with client needs; (iii) foster collaboration with client; (iv) link client with resources of change; (v) are receptive to new ideas; and (vi) are flexible with this relationship (1977, pp. 188-189). These points appear to be in the Lippitt et al. tradition. Zaltman and Duncan depart from Lippitt et

al. on the topic of the change agents' self-consciousness. They allow for unaware agents of change: "unwitting change agents, that is, persons who initiate change without a particular intention to do so, or even without awareness of their instrumentality as agents of change" (1977, p. 187).

Havelock and Havelock (1973) have defined the change agent by role in the change processes:

> Regardless of his formal job title and his position, there are four primary ways in which a person can act as a change agent. He can be:
> 1. A CATALYST
> 2. A SOLUTION GIVER
> 3. A PROCESS HELPER
> 4. A RESOURCE LINKER. (p. 60)

The first change agent in the process, the Catalyst, prods people to change. People do not normally want change. These agents have more questions than answers. "By making their dissatisfaction known and by upsetting the 'status quo', they energize the problem-solving process; they get things started" (1973, p. 61). But once the process starts, other roles are required. "Many people who want to bring about change have definite ideas about what the change should be; they have solutions and they would like to have others adopt those solutions" (1973, p. 62). These are called Solution Givers. The third type of change agent they call the Process Helper. "Because clients are not experts on the 'how to' change, they can be helped greatly" (1973, p. 63). The fourth type of change agent is the Resource Linker: "A very special and underrated change role is that of the linker,' i.e., the person who brings people together, who helps clients find and make the best use of resources inside and outside their own system" (1973, p. 62). These are not the only types of change agents possible and they think they are not mutually exclusive. Havelock and Havelock indicate a shift away from some of the main tenets of the Lippitt et al. tradition. For instance, Lewin is not referenced in the book at all. Another example is the favor shown for the centrality of the change agent in the change process rather than enabling the client to act. The purpose of a training program "aims at making trainees into *masters of the change process*" (1973, p. 70; their italics). This emphasis of the change agent being in charge and having skills to offer on an expert level runs throughout their book.

There are efforts to define change agents as being in a formal role. While exploring the change agent implications of this role, Bennis and Schein (1969) report an anecdote of "The Undercover Change Agent" who attempted to conduct an unauthorized T Group which resulted in him being fired and only technical training being allowed in the future. Weir and Mills (1973) discuss the supervisor as an agent of change, stating that if the supervisor is poorly assessed of a planned change in his organization he may be very resistant. They feel that if he is informed and brought into the process, he can be an agent for change. Kraak (1969) makes

the point that managers in developing countries can be effective change agents if they are trained for it.

Barnes (1964) does not overtly define change agents, but in the process of discussing approaches to organizational change he helps identify some activities in which various types of change agents might engage. He uses Leavitt's (1965) four interacting variables of organizational change: Task, People, Technology, and Structure. He says, "Leavitt also notes that the People, Technology, and Structural approaches represent potential strategies for organizational change. Each attracts specialists who develop expertise in changing the strategic variable and then use this change strategy as their lever for improving organizational Task performance. The People specialists tend to focus on personnel placement, management development programs, job counselling, and human relationships within organizations. Technology specialists approach change as production engineers, computer experts, or systems designers. Structural specialists work on organization planning, work-flow procedures, and staff-line configurations amongst other things." (Barnes, 1964, p. 60).

A similar indirect naming of change agents is undertaken by Harrison (1970) when discussing intervention strategies at various psychological depths of emotional involvement. He names operations analysis, performance evaluation, process analysis, interpersonal skills, and personal awareness in order of greater emotional involvement required of the client. Harrison suggests that the greater the depth of the intervention, the more the success of that intervention relies on the competance of the change agent.

By implication, Chin and Benne classify change agents into three categories when they list the persons associated with "Strategies of Deliberate Changing" (1969, pp. 58-59). The first group are Rational-Empirical change agents who operate from views of the enlightenment and classical liberalism. The second group are Normative-Reeducative who operate from views of therapists, trainers, and situation changers. The third group are Power-Coercive who push for change through power and coercion. They depict the strategies in a linear way which might be seen as implying historical development of change strategies in the tradition. Their definition might also be used to depict how change takes place in a particular situation from the Lewin Paradigm. This would begin with the Power-Coercive strategy (unfreezing); followed by Normative-Reeducative (change, move); and end with the Rational-Empirical (refreeze). In short, someone pushes for change, new behaviors are taught to others, and later it is recorded and studied in the rational mode.

Most books on organizational development will identify the change agent as essential. French and Bell say, "The notion of the use of a change agent, or catalyst, as one of the distinguishing characteristics of OD has a purpose in our definition (1978, p. 16). Huse (1975) follows the Bennis

(1969) definition of OD which relies heavily on the role of the change agent. Duncan thinks that "a change agent is any individual or group that initiates and/or facilitates change" (1978, p. 362). He then classifies them under four broad categories: external pressure group, internal pressure group, organizational development consultant, internal change agent or consultant.

In addition to the main efforts in the behavioral sciences to define change agents, work in education and social work are interesting. Gross, Giaquinta, and Bernstein (1971) make a comprehensive study of a case where most of the usual factors thought to be required for success of organizational change were present, yet the innovation was not successful. Their case was an effort to implement a new definition of the teacher's role, which they call the catalytic model. The hypothesis of their study is that failure to implement the innovation is an often neglected potential cause of failure: "Innovations introduced into schools are only *possible* for change; to achieve their intended effects, they must be implemented." They offer a critical review of much of the group dynamics and organization development literature. For our purposes their conclusion is significant: "In summary, our review of the literature reveals that the use of change agents and participation are generally believed to be strategic variables with respect to the successful initiation of change proposals, and that it is assumed that a strategy of initiation involving a change agent and subordinate participation typically leads to the successful implementation of innovations" (1971, p. 29).

In the field of social work, a model is provided by Pincus and Minahan (1973). They say:

> Social work is concerned with the interactions between people and their social environment which effect the ability of people to accomplish their life tasks, alleviate distress, and realize their aspirations and values. The purpose of social work therefore is to (1) enhance the problem-solving and coping capacities of people, (2) link people with systems that provide them with resources, services and opportunities, (3) promote the effective and humane operation of these systems, and (4) contribute to the development and improvement of social policy.

They call this planned change, referring to Lippitt et al. (1958) as the source.

Some authors have focused on the consultant in the organizational change process. Blake and Mouton (1976) have examined the consulting function in depth. They say, "Often, evocative words are used to describe those who engage in consulting activities—psychiatrist, priest, counselor, trainer, helper, social worker, teacher, nun, pastor, expert, confidant, colleague, and so on. Some of these terms imply health; others imply pathology. Some suggest strength; others connote weakness. . . . For the purpose of our discussion, the person who is intervening is called consultant." (p. 7).

Lippitt (1959) is also interested in the consultant and sees him/her as a professional helper using the same words to define this as Blake and Mouton did. Lippitt sees the consultant as an outsider, "i.e., is not a part of any hierarchical power system in which the client is located." He means outsider in a psychological sense, which means that the consultant could be a member of the personnel department.

Steele (1975) says, "When I refer to consulting, consultant, or consultation in this book, I intend the emphasis to be on a particular process, not on a strict occupational role. By the consulting process, I mean any form of *providing help* on the content, process, or structure of a task or series of tasks, where the consultant *is not actually responsible for doing the task itself* but is helping those who are" (1975, pp. 2-3). His focus is on process consultation aimed at improvement through the application of behavioral sciences.

Management consulting often has a clear notion of change. Kuhr, in a guidebook for the International Labor Office, says, "Change is the 'raison d'etre' of management consulting" (1980, p. 27). He adopts the definition of management consulting of the British Institute of Management Consultants:

> The service provided by an independent and qualified person or persons in identifying and investigating problems concerned with policy, organization, procedures, and methods; recommending appropriate action and helping to implement these recommendations. (1980, p. 7)

To bring about change with this traditional approach of advice giving, the change agent has "Not only to give the right advice, but to give it in the right way at the right time— this is a basic skill of a consultant" (1980, p. 8).

This brief review of some of the literature indicates the variety of definitions and settings in which the term change agent is currently used. The following section reviews some empirically based definitions.

Research on Change Agents

The most extensive change agent studies have been conducted by Jones (1969), E. Rogers (1969, 1971), and Tichy (1974, 1975, 1976); while Slocum (1978) and Ganesh (1979) also work empirically.

Jones

One of the earliest empirical studies of the change agent is Jones' (1969) study. He defined the change agent in the Lippitt et al. tradition: "An

agent (helper, doer, mover) employed by the client system to assist in achieving improved performance. The agent of change is a professional that is equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to improve the organizational performance of the client system (1969, p. 192). He and his students analyzed the contents of 200 cases of organizational change from journals, monographs, and books. "The objective was to isolate, define, and classify the significant elements in change and to learn how these elements could be operationalized by professional change agents" (1969, p. 8).

He names three types of actors involved in change in two categories:

1. *Primary Actors.* These are essential to any change process and present throughout it. They are the client system and a change agent. Their activities are the fundamental aspects of planned organizational change:

(a) Identify and clarify the goals of change for the client system. They found that about 75% of the cases showed the change agent as the predominate actor in goal-setting, while 3% were set by clients, and 23% were mutually set.

(b) Develop useful strategies and tactics to help client systems solve their own problems.

(c) Establish and maintain appropriate working relationships between parties engaged in the change.

2. *Secondary Actors.* These are so named because they are not found in all change situations. They are the change catalyst and the pacemaker. The catalyst is analogous to the catalyst in chemical reactions: "A change catalyst is any agent that causes, speeds up, or slows down change (catalysis) in an organizational system" (1969, p. 46). The catalyst undergoes no modifications in his character, may not be a professional, but his behavior is "helpful, constructive, sensitive, rational and dynamic paternalism" (1969, p. 48). Usually this actor is a key person in the client system who does not himself change but gives the required consent for it to proceed by giving recommendations and support, or by participating in bureaucratic decisions.

The pacemaker is involved in the regulation and control of the planned organizational change. The term is analogous to the electronic pacemaker for heart patients: "By definition, a pacemaker is an exogenous homeostatic agent. His usefulness to an organizational system is his capacity to energize or carry out a vital equilibrium function with an external supply of power" (1960, p. 60). He works more for the guarantee of survival of the change by working for the right equilibrium in the client system. This definition is based on conjecture and lacks cases to indicate the nature of his activities.

Rogers

Everett Rogers has conducted some of the most extensive research on change agents. He and Shoemaker used about 1200 empirical reports and about 300 nonempirical reports (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p. 387) to support their generalizations. Basically, they see the actors in the change process being the change agent working for an agency, the opinion leader who the change agent works with closely, and the adopter who is influenced by the opinion leader.

Zaltman and Duncan (1978) note the difference between Rogers and the Lippitt et al. tradition as centering on the focus of control and collaboration: "Rogers' definition tends to put the change agent outside the client system, representing some third party attempting to communicate something to the client system" (p. 17). The invitation of the client system is not emphasized. Yet, Rogers and Shoemaker feel that change agent success is positively related to client orientation, rather than to change agency orientation (1971, p. 380). They see this, and the generalization that change agent's success is positively related to his empathy with clients, as restating a basic proposition about communication (1971, p. 237).

Rogers and Shoemaker collect and report characteristics and activities of change agents, which help define them. For example, they report a number of studies on change agent contact which show that change agent contact is positively related to higher social status among clients, to greater social participation among clients, and to higher education and literacy among clients (1971, p. 380).

The opinion leader is an important actor in the Rogers and Shoemaker work: "We define opinion leadership as the degree to which an individual is able to influence informally other individuals' attitudes or overt behavior in a desired way with relative frequency" (1971, p. 199). In their model the opinion leader is a link between the change agent from the agency and the adopter. Whereas this is different from the Lippitt et al. model with its emphasis on invitation, collaboration, and the facilitation of a self-learning process, it may be argued that even the Lippitt et al. type change agents often use some aspects of the Rogers model.

Most of the Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) work is devoted to the adopter type of change agent—32 generalizations based on 3,435 references out of the 4,184 reported in the entire book. They find that individuals adopt an innovation at various times. They place adopters in five categories on a normal distribution curve over time.

The first to adopt are the *innovators* which are characterized by their venturesomeness. An innovator is quick to try new ideas and "he desires the hazardous, the rash, the daring, and the risky" (1971, p. 182). Innovators are followed by the *early adopters* who are more integrated into the social

system where the change agent is working, and therefore are characterized as respectable. As the innovation begins to be accepted by the system, the *early majority* pick it up. They might be seen as deliberate. An equally large group, but a bit slower to adopt, are the *late majority* with their skeptical eyes on the movement of their peers. Last to adopt are the *laggards* who are "suspicious of innovations, innovators, and change agents" (1971, p. 185). One might ask if a sixth category of about the same size as the innovators would not fill out the curve and be more representative of social systems? They might be named resisters.

Tichy

Noel Tichy (1974, 1975) is another researcher who has focused some of his work on the change agent. He first collected data on a sample of 133 which included "a wide variety of change agents (consultants, organizers, agitators, interveners, catalysts, etc.)." From his data he defined four types of change agents.

1. *The Outside-Pressure (OP) Type* "who are social-action militants and consumer advocates seeking to change systems from the outside and employing pressure through tactics such as mass demonstrations and violence" (1974, p. 168).

2. *The Organization-Development (OD) Type* "who view organizations critically from the inside and attempt to improve the system's problem-solving capabilities through applied behavioral science techniques" (1974, p. 168).

3. *The People-Change-Technology (PCT) Type* "who work to improve individual functioning in organizations, using techniques such as behavior modification and need-achievement development (1974, p. 168).

4. *The Analysis-for-the-Top (AFT) Type* "whose main concern is to consult with business and government units to improve efficiency and output and employ various analytic procedures to develop expert advice" (1974, p. 168).

Slocum's study of 152 change agents follows on Tichy's (1975) work on diagnosis. He addressed the question "Do change agents with similar cognitive styles use similar intervention strategies to achieve organizational change? (1978, p. 199). Basically, Slocum's findings supported those of Tichy and Nisberg (1974), which concluded that OD change agents have a strong bias in their diagnostic work.

Last in this summary is a report from India. Ganesh (1978) studied organizational consultants' style and its influence on their interventions. He observed: "Quite in contrast to the vast literature about the concept and methods of OD, the literature on people who are involved in OD work is very meagre" (1978, p. 3). His research was conducted by interviewing 11

well-known American OD consultants (including such people as Beckhard, Schein, etc.) and 10 outstanding Indian OD consultants. He categorized the consultants into two categories, derived from Leavitt (1965): people approach or task and structure approach. He found that about half of the sample was in each category.

Summary

In summary, the 35 reports of defining and research on change agents, seem to have several points in common.

1. The change agent is seen as a person or group engaging in a particular set of activities. These activities have a behavioral science orientation.

2. The focus of most research seems to be on the activities, such as strategy, diagnosis, entry, or technology used.

3. The Lewin change paradigm seems to prevail.

4. The definition of the change agent by Lippitt et al. appears to be the tradition being followed with a wide variety of examples, from those with doctorates in behavioral science (Bennis, 1964) to activists in the Students for Democratic Society (Tichy, 1974).

5. Most of the studies seem to agree with Lippitt et al. that the change agent should be in an invited collaborative situation while some advocate an initiated proactive position in relation to the client system.

6. Most definitions are focused on the change agents during the change period of the process. Except for Roger and Shoemaker, there is a lack of emphasis on the refreezing period.

7. Noteably lacking is a comprehensive definition of change agents encompassing all three phases of Lewin's change paradigm with a focus on their order of appearance, their tasks, and their characteristics.

The proposed taxonomy which follows attempts to fill out the definition of change agents to meet those deficiencies.

A TAXONOMY OF CHANGE AGENTS

This section presents a taxonomy of change agents as an exercise in defining the term change agents more fully. From the Latin *de* and *finire* (to limit) comes our word define. The exercise of defining is done in order to reduce the options of a term from the discretion of the user to a limited use. At the present time the term change agent is nearly unrestricted. If one calls oneself a change agent, who is to deny it? Or, if one person calls another person a change agent, everyone can deny it.

The definitions used by the writers discussed earlier usually refer to one particular group of people acting during the change phase, to use Lewin's phrase. This taxonomy divides change agents in 10 groups, spread over all three phases in Lewin's change paradigm. The emphasis is on finding a role for everyone in sequence of social change.

I intend for the taxonomy to serve two purposes. First, research of change agents may be facilitated if a comprehensive definition is available. Secondly, I hope that the taxonomy helps change agents better understand their own behavior. My assumption is that if a person has a concept of how change takes place, and has available a variety of names for the change agents required, their tasks described, and the sequence in which they appear laid out, he or she will be better able to decide what change is possible in a given situation and where he or she is best suited to work in a particular change process.

What is a Taxonomy?

The word taxonomy is from the Greek *taxis,* which means to arrange or to put into an order, and *anoma,* which means to name. Therefore, a taxonomy is a naming and arranging in an order an aspect of reality. The taxonomist views reality and arranges it conceptually according to some order based on a set of principles, and names the categories he has created. The taxidermist, for an example of another word from the same root, arranges the skin of animals to fit our view of their lifelike reality.

One of the most important taxonomists was Carl Linne, the Swiss naturalist who published his *Systema Naturae* in 1735. This begins the classification system of the plant and animal kingdoms which still prevails today. He saw this as a system of arrangement based on the stamens and pistels of plant flowers. Eventually, the taxonomy ended with the categories we know today (phylum, class, order, family, genus, species, and variety) using the principles of evolution, or descent from common ancestor, and common characteristics.

Madge (1965) sees the taxonomy as useful in establishing definitions in the social sciences. He says that definitions precede research: "Before we can measure or count, we have to choose a definition of the thing that we are concerned with" (1965, p. 32). He views the taxonomy in the quantitative tradition. He thinks of the taxonomist examining very large samples to find a variation from a norm, "Taxonomy in its contemporary form is thus seen to be a highly sophisticated, quantitative version of the long-established principle of definition by minute description" (1965, p. 33).

Leach, discussing taxonomies in anthropology (1975, p. 9), notes that the taxonomy in biology uses evolution and hierarchy as the principles of

ordering. But in a taxonomy of cultural behaviors, his interest, he finds analogy useful as well. For instance, the classification of social classes in England carries with it an implied rank ordering. He points out that folk taxonomies often uses the concept of one category descending from the previous one to convey both their differences and relatedness.

Bloom, Krathwohl, and Masia (1964) have developed a taxonomy of educational objectives. They call their categories cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. They first developed their taxonomy from their own experience of teaching teachers and observing how people learn. Next they attempted to order and name this data according to a set of principles. They say, "A true taxonomy is a set of classifications which are ordered and arranged on the basis of a single principle or on the basis of a consistent set of principles" (1964, p. 9). Later they refined their named order by presenting it to large audiences of those named in the taxonomy for varification and refinement.

In summary, this taxonomy has categories based on the principle of the sequence of appearance and tasks performed. It is used for defining as a preparation for better research, but not in the quantitative sense that Madge suggests. The analogy concept of Leach is useful, but the analogy here is the chronological sequencing of the categories with no ranking of value implied in the change process. As for differences and relatedness, the succeeding category can only contribute its task to the process after the preceding category has accomplished its task. The method for developing the taxonomy is modeled after the work of Bloom et al. and adopts their concept of ordering the taxonomy on a principle or consistent set of principles.

Development of the Taxonomy

This taxonomy of change agents was born in my experiences. It began when I began trying to sort out what kind of a change agent I was in the civil rights movement in the United States. In 1961 I became the first chairman of a community biracial committee which worked for racial harmony. Eventually this committee was able to persuade the white owners of restaurants, movie theaters, lunch counters, and hotels to desegregate voluntarily prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and without public demonstrations or court orders.

On August 28, 1963 I participated in the March on Washington during which Martin Luther King, Jr. gave his famous "I have a dream. . ." speech. I found that I got an unexpected reaction when I told some community leaders about being in Washington. I felt a distrust and confusion in some of the leaders, black and white. I felt that I had stepped into another role, another expectation, another image. This was the seed of a taxonomy of change agents in roles and expectations. Later, when

I was Executive Director of the Human Enterprises Institute at Wake Forest University, I had to select change agents to work in towns, schools, and factories that were trying to change their social behavior. In the early 1970s I formulated a "two-phase model of change," It contained two types of change agents: change generators and change implementors. They worked in the two phases of change. They each had their roles to play. Both types were necessary. They had different characteristics. *But,* one person could not work in both roles at the same time. We at the Institute were clearly implementors (Ottaway, 1976a).

During the summer of 1975 I learned of Bloom's taxonomy. Suddenly it made sense of my problem dating back to the March on Washington. I felt a sense of release experimenting with naming the various agents involved in my past experiences. Ordering and naming the jumble of persons, tasks, concepts, and characteristics helped me to make sense of them.

The first version of the taxonomy written in August, 1975, had nine categories in three groups (Generators, International Implementors, and Unintentional Implementors). It was mimeographed and distributed for further discussions before publication (Ottaway & Cooper, 1976).

During the following academic year the taxonomy was presented to several hundred students, client groups, and colleagues. They indicated their problems with it. Some words were found to be clumsy and confusing. Some groups, such as managers, did not see themselves represented. Third World audiences felt that it was culturally bound. For example, they felt that the taxonomy was best suited for highly rationalized, bureaucratic settings rather than prerationalized or revolutionary settings.

In April, 1976, I rewrote the taxonomy calling the third group Adopters rather than Unintentional Implementors. I added a tenth category for the person who is not committed to being an overt change agent, but who is in sympathy with, and often the key ally to, the implementor working with the organization or community, naming them Prototypic Adopters (Ottaway, 1982). The third refinement was not in the content of the taxonomy but the beginning of questioning its universality. I stated the most applicable setting for the change agents involved and described other settings for which is less well suited. (Ottaway, 1976b)

The taxonomy remained essentially the same until quite recently, when I received some very helpful suggestions. As a result of their comments, I have reassessed the universality of the taxonomy. Also, I have tried to simplify the names of the various taxa. In this paper, new names appear for several change agents. In summary, the taxonomy is:

1. Change Generators
   (a) Key Change Agents
   (b) Demonstrators
   (c) Patrons
   (d) Defenders

2. Change Implementors
   (e) External Implementors
   (f) External/Internal Implementors
   (g) Internal Implementors
3. Change Adopters
   (h) Early Adopters
   (i) Maintainers
   (j) Users

Principles Governing the Taxonomy

Under the topic of principles governing the taxonomy, four subjects will be discussed: a definition of change; the most appropriate setting for the taxonomy; assumptions behind the taxonomy; and finally the terms used in the taxonomy and the meaning intended by them.

Definition of Change

What is meant by change in this taxonomy? The entire taxonomy with its ten categories of actors in three major groupings appearing in chronological order is a definition of change. But, a more manageable definition may be Kahn's definition in the context of OD: "To change an organization means changing the pattern of recurring behavior" (1974, p. 496). Substituting the words social behavior for organization gives the definition more breadth to include individuals, groups, organizations, community, and society, and makes it more representative of the change being depicted in the taxonomy.

Shepard says, "Cultures are maintained through the operation of self-validating processes. Changing a culture requires interventions that invalidate old processes and conditions that facilitate the creation of new self-validating processes" (1970, p. 259). The word culture is more comprehensive than patterns of behavior and better captures the change meant here.

Changing social behavior means changing the normative social behavior of individuals, groups, organizations, communities, or society. Homans (1950) defines norms as "The code of behavior which implicitly or explicitly, consciously or unconsciously, the group adopts as just, proper or ideal." This seems similar to the Berger and Luckmann (1964) concept of everyday "common sense reality," and fits Lewin's concept of custom or habit (1952).

The change agents in this taxonomy are contributing to the process of the change of everyday, normal way of doing things, whether or not they are aware of it. The change agents in this taxonomy are acting in a process, to paraphrase Homans' language, to change the code of behavior which a group adopts as just, proper, or ideal, whether the group acts implicitly or explicitly, consciously, or unconsciously. It is assumed that everyone is acting in some aspect or aspects of their life to have around them the kind of everyday normative behavior they want, no matter how slight their contribution, or their awareness of it, is.

Lewin's field theory is useful in depicting culture. He calls patterns of recurring behavior "custom" or "social habit" (1952, p. 224). Such habits are contained in a field of forces—psychological forces. These forces, some pushing for change and others restraining against change, held in tension in a "quasi-stationary equilibrium," are what we call reality in a social system. He also feels that we like to keep this reality in a balance so we institutionalize and justify it with a value system. I picture this as a dynamic collage which each of us tries to make comfortable for ourselves by pushing for what we want and resisting what we do not want. All forces are of equal value to the field, but one may not be aware of them all.

The task of change agents is to change this quasi-stationary equilibrium in three steps: unfreezing, moving, and refreezing (Lewin, 1952, p. 228). The taxonomy fits the classic paradigm with Generators as unfreezers, Implementors as movers, and Adopters as refreezers. All three steps are required and a total emphasis on one without the others produces an unblanced social system which is seen to be psychologically "unhealthy."

The Most Appropriate Setting for the Taxonomy

There are several settings where change seems to be most obvious. A short discussion of them might further illuminate the taxonomy. One such setting is the revolution. As I mentioned earlier, until recently I have discounted the possibility of the taxonomy being useful in understanding revolutions. The reason for this is that revolution is change by force which means that the new behaviors remain while the force is in effect. But in spite of that, there are some striking similarities between the classic study of revolution by Brinton (1965) and the taxonomy. He is searching for uniformities among four revolutions: English, French, American, and Russian. In the end, he finds a few uniformities. But for our purposes, the main contribution he makes is establishing that revolutions have beginning, intervening, and end stages, and naming the actors involved. He starts with the old regime which begins to have "prodromal" signs, that is,

complaints which might be diagnosed as prerevolutionary if one knew how to do this. From these unattended inefficiencies and neglects, the revolution begins with moderates attacking the old regime. These moderates get into power when two things happen: the intellectuals transfer their allegiance from criticizing the existing order to depiciting a new order required to save the day; and the leaders of the old regime lose confidence in their ability to rule and in their beliefs about the regime. But the moderates are not able to hold onto the change process when the revolution is in full swing. They are soon ousted by the extremists who institute a reign of terror but get the system going again. The last stage is when the "thermidors" tire of the extreme pressures, rhetoric, and lack of routine. The thermidors scapegoat the extremists and institute rituals and tyrant rule which stabilize the social system. This signifies the end of the revolution: "The equilibrium has been restored and the revolution is over" (1965, p. 259). It is over until the new rulers become the old regime with prodromal signs and so on.

The study of revolution, such as Brinton's, does open the possibility of the taxonomy being useful in naming the actors and their sequence of tasks in forced change. With that in mind, the taxonomy may be universal in its application.

A setting where the application of this taxonomy is more easily seen as appropriate is technological innovation. There is an argument that technology has a determinism—"according to this view, inventions occur in large numbers by a random process analogous to gene mutation in biological evolution. . . . Eventually, everyone who is in competition with the users of the new technology has to follow suit or cease to survive" (Langrish, 1977, p. 26). In either case determinism may be a larger part of technological innovation and therefore reduces the need for a complex change process.

The most appropriate setting for this taxonomy is the democratic setting. This has voluntarism at its strongest and therefore a more complex change process is required. Resistance is not only possible, but is seen as equally valuable as change. The value of resistance is that it contributes to stability (Watson, 1969, p. 488).

For example, students from the developing countries often find the taxonomy overly serious and unnecessary. They feel that when they return home, their newly earned expert opinion will bring about voluntary social change. One might hypothesize that the less formal, unrationalized developing organization is more susceptible to allowing forces into its field for the same reason that stability is valued in organizations. Therefore, the ten types of change agents are most appropriate for the more stable, rationalized, predictable democratic social system.

Assumptions Behind the Taxonomy

I have identified seven assumptions on which the taxonomy is based.

1. Everyone is a change agent. Change as a phenomenon is a normal part of everyone's life. Since we are in the field of forces which holds reality in a quasistationary equilibrium, we make change happen. Change does not occur because someone alien to our life is always stirring up trouble. We are vaguely aware of most of the change processes we contribute to and on are vaguely aware of most of the change processes we contribute to and on rare occasions we have a definite, conscious role. A person is involved in a variety of change processes at any one time. For example, one might be a User in terms of which school the children attend, a Maintainer at work and the new shop regulations, a Defender in the local pub about the rights of women, and a Patron by giving to the legal defense fund of a mate being unjustly dismissed from work.

2. The change agents at the beginning of the change process are well defined, clearly focused in their activity, least in number, and least benefit from the change. The change agents near the end of the process are most diffuse, least clearly focused, most in number, and most benefiting from the change.

The assumption behind this principle is that there is a pattern, or form, which change seems to take, which is not an accident nor is it a deterministic force unaffected by individuals. The early actors in the change process stand out because of their clear focus. But near the end of the process the awareness of agentry is dimmed and the users are analogous to the general population.

It appears that pioneers, or Change Generators, often have available to them the benefits which they are striving to obtain for everyone. For example, I think of education for American Negroes while Martin Luther King had an excellent education. Also, the suffragettes were often women who had access to political power by virtue of their station in life. They were seeking it another route, the voting box, for all women. Ralph Nader does not even own an automobile.

3. All change agents (10 categories) are required in every change process. The principle at work here is that the total change process can be broken down into identifiable, differentiated functions. Barnes discusses the phenomenon of change as a process, "Starting with one complex of dynamic equilibria, the organization shifts to others during and after changes. This transition from one set of equilibria to another suggests that there may also be some identifiable phase of change which makes up the whole process" (1964, p. 64).

The second implication here is that unless all change agents have contributed, the new state of norms does not come into existence. The activity of the change agents may vary in length of time and visibility. But (with few exceptions) they are all required, albeit in particular cases some of them have short, nearly invisible roles. It is often possible to diagnose why a change process failed by identifying the change agents omitted.

The Maintainers and Users are the least aware of their role as change agents, but they are in the strongest position to prevent change from taking place. All earlier change agents aim their activity to get them to adopt. Often, the entire list of change agents has been active and successful at accomplishing their task, yet no change takes place because it has not been adopted by the User. The best known case may be "The Great Experiment," prohibition in America from 1920 to 1933. It would appear that users favored prohibition with 33 of the 48 states already dry at the time of passing the 18th Amendment to the Constitution. Yet, in 1930 the police (maintainers of the new behavior) discovered 282,122 illegal stills (Murphy 1978, p. 136). In 1932, Roosevelt had a strong repeal plank in his election platform. He won and Congress immediately passed the 21st Amendment repealing the 18th. The Users had said "yes" to Reality A, drinking alcohol.

4. The required change agents are listed in chronological order. The change process begin with Change Generators, is taken up by Change Implementors, and lastly adopted by members of the organization as well as its users. Implementors cannot work until there is a felt need for change. The felt need is not present unless the Change Generators have completed their work. The principle here is that change does not just happen. If it were not for Change Generators, the system would move to a deadly, entropic equilibrium. They are required, much like Weber's charismatic leader is, in order to introduce any change into the increasingly dull bureaucracy.

Change often fails to take place because the change agents are confused about what is currently required. For instance, Change Implementors often try to implement change before there is a felt need to change.

5. All change agents are equal value with their importance relative only to the circumstances. Many change agents have questioned whether their activity makes a difference. The tendency is for the latter change agents to feel less and less important. But in principle they are of no less importance. For example, if there were no women voters, the work of the suffragettes would have been in vain. If there were no desegregated classrooms the work of Martin Luther King would have failed. The consumer buying the safety equipped car completed the process begun by Ralph Nader. The same can be said for all change processes.

6. A change agent can function in only one category in a change process. The most dysfunctional result of not applying this principle is that the

change agent may be discredited. The greatest risk is present when the change agent moves from Generator, particularly demonstrator, to Implementor. When there is movement from one category to another, it is usually over a long period of time.

It is also possible that an individual tests out his feelings about being a change agent in a later category in the process. If he finds that his needs are not satisfied, he may move to a more risky role. There can be an element of radicalization in the lives of change agents. The assumption here is that if one tries to implement change and is frustrated, or has the characteristics of Generators attributed to him, he may move to earlier functions until he finds the place that meets his needs. The same can be said for Generators who move out of this taxonomy into the revolutionary setting.

7. Common values are shared by all the change agents in a particular change process. All categories from the Key Change Agent to the User share the common value implicit in the change process. If one participates in the common value implicit in that change process. If one participates in the change process as a change agent, one is in agreement with the common value implied in the change process. It appears that the later in the change process the change agent acts, the more difficult it is to discern the value implied in the activity. The value issue is most important in a voluntary change setting. Since a person in this setting cannot say that he is behaving in a particular way because he is forced to, he has to be behaving as he elects to. Electing behaviors immediately brings in the value issue.

The Taxonomy

Change Generators

Key Change Agents. The Key Change Agent is the first, or primary, converter of an issue into a felt need. His method, style, and values dominate the change process.

To select the right issue at the right time, convert it into a felt need in the right target population using the right style, method, and value system, and dominate the ensuing process requires a gifted person. I liken him to Weber's charismatic leader.

Two examples of the Key Change Agent are Ralph Nader and Martin Luther King, Jr. King was a nonviolent demonstrator in the streets which was rooted in his doctoral work on Gandhi. His followers took the same method, style, and values. Nader, on the other hand, is a lawyer. He uses the legally trained "Nader's Raiders" who follow his style, method, and values.

The issue that each converted into a felt need had existed in varying degrees of visibility, for a long time. King was not the first to attempt to

arouse America's concern for the inequality of black Americans. Also, he may not have been able to do it even then if it had not been for Rosa Parks refusing to sit at the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama. Further, if she had not been a member of his congregation, he may not have had his initial start. There seems to be a role for chance and luck in all change processes; or, it is apparent that there are still many unknowns in the change process. But there is also something about King, in spite of luck, that enabled him to do what other black pastors in the South had not been able to do.

Nadar is similar in this way. He was not the first to say that autos are *Unsafe At Any Speed*. In the United States the National Safety Council has a standard message every holiday urging people to drive slowly, projecting how many deaths will occur on the highways, and attempting to get through to the felt needs of the public. But Nader's book broke through with the message. Nader, like King, is prototypic because he was able to become the leader of the movement. It is essential that the prototypic change agent accomplish this task. There are many cases similar to these except that the leader was not able to carry on to the conclusion. For example, Mainread Corrigan and Betty Williams received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1977 for founding the Ulster Peace Movement, but their movement has fallen apart.

The Key Change Agent is the most ad hoc of the change agents because he can work in the moment only. He does not need the usual supports and direction of tradition, organizations, or intimates that most of us take for granted. Nadar once said in *Time* magazine, in response to the question of how he sustains himself, "You cannot need to be loved." It may well be this characteristic of change generators in general, and Key Change Agents in particular, that forces many who experiment with it to give it up as inappropriate for them.

Demonstrator. The task of these change agents is to demonstrate their support of the change process being set into motion by the Key Change Agent. They are the first line of confrontation between the change agents and the change resisters. They must have a high tolerance of conflict, confrontation, public rejection, and visibility. Since they are visible by definition, and usually local, they receive more hostility than any other change agent in the change process.

Examples of this category are common to everyone's knowledge of a particular change process. They include the demonstrators in the streets, at strikes, at annual stockholders' meetings, press conferences, voting campaigns, and marches.

Patron. The task of the Patron is to generate financial and other public support for the change process. This support is usually given to finance the Key Change Agent's organization and the Demonstrators' expenses. Often this money is used for lodging, advertisements, and legal fees.

Since the early Generators can often survive at first on their own enthusiasm and personal income, this change agent does not usually come into force until the movement, as the change process is often called, has developed. The type of partonage may vary. The Patron is not always a person of wealth who gives money; he or she may be a person of fame, able to use publicity as patronage. An interesting example related to the Indian cause in America was when Marlon Brando sent an Indian girl to accept the Oscar for his role in *The Godfather*.

Patrons have a wide range of examples. Locally, they play an important role in the change process. Opinion leaders in the community are possible Patrons for a change process. These include editors, preachers, lawyers, politicians, union leaders, managers, and academics. The Patron role becomes more diffused the nearer it gets to the Defender.

Defender. The task of the Defender is to defend the change process at the grass roots. Defenders keep the issue alive and also help work out the implications of the consequences of the proposed change at the lowest level. In essence they defend the action of the earlier change agents in the change process. Until large numbers of Defenders exist, the felt need to change is not present.

An important example of Defenders is those whose cause is being fought at the early stages. These Defenders may have to defend the cause in two directions. For example, the black people in America were expected by whites to defend King and the demonstrators. Not all blacks thought alike on this issue. Some differed with the principles while others differed with the tactics. So, often the blacks also had a Defender role among the blacks. Secondly, the resistors often push beneficiaries into defending the cause. The same could be said about the beneficiary of any change process: women's rights, homosexual rights, youth movements, unions, and so on. One reason for the recent failure of the Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution might be the inability of the movement to attract large numbers of Defenders, that is, average women to back the cause.

The Defender is the most diffuse form of the Change Generator. They appear as discussants at community debates, political meetings, forums, as writers of letters to the editor, answers of opinion polls, in civic clubs, at academic debates, at Sunday School classes, and in voting campaigns. The most distant from the conflict action and the least useful (but still useful), is the village liberal who can be trusted to bring up the change he espouses at social events, pubs, and on the commuter trains.

Change Implementors

The Change Implementors enter the change process after the work of the Chaange Generators is completed, which is, after a need for change is felt.

The two may overlap in time since the felt need might be manifest in a limited number of cases at the outset. The task of Change Implementors is to implement change in the social systems that now feel a need to change. They are intentional in that change is the intent and purpose of their activity.

The generation of a felt need may be very dramatic and all happen in a short time. But the implementation process might go on for years or even decades. This task is more in-depth and usually takes place at the grass roots in organizational settings. Therefore, the execution of this task requires a different change agent.

The Change Implementor works very closely with the organization that is changing. He may work with the change resisters and has to assist them in implementing the change which they are resisting. He may be the focus of much of their hostility while, at times, they may be very dependent on him. The result of this dynamic is that the Implementor has a very intimate working relationship with a significant group of people for a long time.

His role might be termed enabling. It is less coercive than the earlier categories. Most of the change agents defined by the authors in behavioral science are Implementors. Trust is more important for Implementors than for Generators. If the organization does not trust the Implementor, he has little hope of carrying out his intention.

He may also play a more technical role than the earlier change agents. He has to know technical skills as much as diagnostic skills of organizational behavior, how to develop personal skills, and the dynamics of planned change.

External Change Implementors. The External Change Implementor is invited in from the outside to implement change in an organization that has felt a need to change. He is like the earliest definition of a change agent developed by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958). He occupies the first category in this group because it seems that most new change processes use outsiders to experiment and develop the change processes required to implement the change.

These change agents will be small in number in the early days of a change process. They might be working from funded research, experimental action programs, or universities. Examples of this change agent vary widely, including: organization development consultants, community development workers, management consultants, designers of organizations and systems, training specialists and designers, and educational methodologists.

External/Internal Change Implementors. The task of the External/Internal Change Implementors is to develop Internal Implementors. They usually work out of a setting such as the corporate headquarters of the organization. They have some of the characteristics of

the external, in that they are strangers to their clients. They also have some of the characteristics of the internal in that they are paid a salary and have the supports of the organization to meet their personal needs.

They are placed in this position because they are involved in a change process that is well enough advanced for the larger organization to make implementation available. But it is not advanced enough for each organization, or subsystem within it, to have its own implementation abilities. Typical examples might be head office advisory staff in finance, methods, training, etc. Governments often have helping resources available to fulfill this task. University lecturers who also act as consultants as well as staff of large, established consulting firms also fit into this category.

Internal Change Implementors. The task of an Internal Change Implementor is to implement the proposed change in his own group. He is briefed and charged to do this as his full-time task. They may work with the External and the External/Internal Change Implementors.

Examples of the Internal Change Implementors may be specific personnel modelled after the External or External/Internal Change Implementors. In this category may be examples such as: organization development personnel, operations research personnel, training and development personnel, planning personnel, and research and development personnel.

Change Adopters

The task of Change Adopters is to practice the new change and thereby normalize the change. They practice the new behaviors as part of their primary task in the organization, but do not consciously contribute to the change process.

Early Adopters. The task of the Early Adopters is to be the first adopter of the change and therefore the prototype of the adoption of the change in this change process. Their commitment to change is the highest among the adopters. They are the link between the Implementors and the Adopters. They are the advocates of change in the organization. They often bring the Change Implementors into the system. Being the first to adopt the soon-to-be normative behavior, they are often called the in-house radicals; they will often call themselves change agents. (This category was added when managers noted that they were not included in the taxonomy.)

Early Adopters are self-nominated in the sense that position, education, age, or status seems to have little to do with who performs this task. The Change Implementors will seek them out early. There will be a natural affinity between these two groups. The Early Adopters are often supervisors, shop stewards, managers, significant informal leaders who are the first to say, "I'll try it."

Maintainers. The task of Maintainers is to adopt the change while retaining their primary commitment to maintaining the organization. Their primary commitment is to their work roles even as these roles are changing. They are essential to all the above categories. If those who maintain the organization do not change, there is no change. In a sense, they change rather than resist change at the risk of destroying the organizations. Their primary loyalty is to the organization and, "changing is just one of those things you have to do now and then."

Examples of the Maintainers are teachers in desegregated schools in the United States who did not involve themselves in the desegregation issues during that period. But when it came to teaching black and white children in the same classroom, commitment to teaching children was greater than anything else. Therefore, they taught in the desegregated situation the same as they did in the segregated situation. They did not resign rather than teach blacks, or black and white together, as a Resister would.

Other typical examples of this taxonomy are police enforcing new laws, managers, union members, and employees of changed organizations, and doctors and nurses in the reorganized health service in Great Britain.

Users. The task of Users is to make a habit of using the products or services of the changed organization. In the last analysis, if there are no Users of the changed organization then the change will not take place. Whereas these change agents are the most diffuse, least clearly defined, most benefitted by the change, and make the least commitment to generating, implementing, or adopting the change, they are just as important change agents as any other. It is at this level that most of us are change agents.

Examples of the User are the public in desegregated schools in the United States, pupils in comprehensive schools in the United Kingdom, consumers of changed services and products such as law-abiding citizens, hospital patients, purchasers of automobiles with seat belts, etc.

Summary

Table I illustrates the fit among some authors (Jones; Rogers & Shoemaker; Tichy; and Havelock & Havelock) with the taxonomy and Lewin's three phase change paradigm. All the definitions appear to fit into the taxonomy except the "pacemakers" from Jones' work.

Lewin, the chief conceptual figure in change agent studies, and Rogers and Shoemaker, who produced the most comprehensive study of change agents, fit all the categories of the taxonomy with examples of change agents. Rogers and Shoemaker have not developed the Generators as fully as the taxonomy. The taxonomy is less well developed on Users than Rogers

Table I. Change Agents in the Taxonomy As Compared to Other Definitions

Taxonomy	Key change agent	Demonstrator	Patron	Defender	External implementor	External/internal	Internal implementor	Early adoptor	Maintainer	User
Lewin		Unfreezer							Refreezer	
Jones						Mover		Catalyst	Client system	
						Change agent				
Rogers & Shoemaker		Change agent				Change agent		Opinion Leader	Adopter:	Innovators, Early Adopters, Early Majority, Late Majority, Laggards
Tichy		Outside pressure				Advice for top, Organizational development, People change, technology				
Havelock & Havelock		Catalyst		Solution givers"		Solution giver[a], Process helper, Resource linker[a]		Resource linker[a]		
Taxonomy		Generators				Implementors			Adopters	

[a]These do not clearly fit into any one of the taxonomy categories.

and Shoemaker. They provide five categories of Users which is a development of the taxonomy.

Havelock and Havelock (1973) seem to concentrate on Generators and Implementors (unfreezers and changers) leaving themselves open to criticism, such as Argyris makes (1970; p. 22), "Change agents may be so imbued with the importance of change that they enter the situation without realizing they may have a bias against stability." The key to stabilizing into a new behavior seems underemphasized. Without the third category the change fails to become institutionalized.

Tichy and Jones do not intend to define the change agents required in a process of change as much as the other authors discussed. Jones is looking at cases for the ingredients of successful change and names the change agents he finds there. Tichy sets out to study change agents and selects a sample for that. The impression may be gained from Tichy that he thinks of change agents as a particular group operating at the unfreezing and changing phases.

The taxonomy gives a comprehensive definition of change agent in 10 categories covering the whole process of the social change from an old set of customary behaviors to a new set along with brief description of the task to be accomplished by each in order for the change to progress. My observation of social change processes since constructing the taxonomy leads me to think that there are additional categories involved. Future development of the taxonomy may center on two categories which I call pretaxonomic. Two groups seem to operate before the change process gets into full movement. One I am tentatively calling the mentor. I noticed that many key change agents give credit to a very influential person in their life. Martin Luther King had Gandhi, as an example. The second pretaxonomic change agent is what I call the trigger agent. This person, often unaware or almost unconsciously, triggers the process into life. Two examples come to mind. The first is Rosa Parks, the woman who sparked off the Montgomery bus boycott which set King into motion as a key change agent. The other is Anna Walentynowicz, the crane operator at the Lenin Shipyards in Gdansk whose dismissal led to the birth of Solidarity and Leach Walesa as a key change agent.

Within the taxonomy, future efforts may be directed toward refining the definitions and tasks associated with each. At the moment they often appear too black and white. There are confusing overlaps among them. For instance, the example of modeling new behaviors by the Internal Implementor may be confused with the Early Adopter. Often with social issues, such as promoting women to more responsible roles, the training department may take the lead to model the behavior they are attempting to implement. Also, the work of Rogers and Shoemaker indicates a further

refinement of the Adopters will be helpful. The same refinement might be appropriate for Demonstrators, Patrons, and Defenders.

The early adopters may develop into several subgroups. I am now including three subgroups in classroom discussions: brokers, reality changers, and cadre organizers. The broker acts to get the Implementor into the system and give legitimacy to the change (Ottaway, 1976a). This is a low-risk role but a very important one. The reality changer involves more risk but is basically working within the Berger-Luckman model (1966) of being a significant person in the system who is influencing the "chorus" (majority members) to disconfirm old realities and legitimate new realities. The reality changer works at change by impression management. Goffman (1959) discovered that everyone manages the impression they make in order to create the environment they want. If one is committed to a new reality, a presentation of self in everyday life can be a change agent activity. It is a long-term, low-key activity.

The cadre organizers include those persons who try to change an unwilling system from the inside. In a sense, they are internal key Change Generators organizing an internal cadre (closely knit group operating like an underground cell) to subvert the system. Student protests of the 1960s are an example of this (Bennis, 1976) as are the union organizers in South Africa today. This is very high risk in terms of psychological rejection and possibly forfeiting the rewards of the system, such as receiving a degree.

The most important next step for the future is research to validate the taxonomy and assign psychological characteristics to the categories. Some preliminary research has been conducted with encouraging results. I conducted research on the effective implementor (British OD practitioners) which indicated that confident-appearing, strong, authoritarian, hard-working, sincere but not too humanistically oriented consultant were valued by their clients and peers (Ottaway, 1979). A preliminiary study has been done to attempt to identify the psychological characteristics of early and late adopters of change in the workplace. The study (Cox, 1981) indicates that the early adopter is a loner, not bound by conventional rules or expectations of others, but lacking some desire to persist in new behaviors to their logical conclusions. The late adopters appear to be influenced by peers and group opinion as well as keen to follow the rules. They also seem to be more able to make critical judgments and probably stick with the change once made. Hingley (1981) conducted a study on key change agents in Britain to find that they seem to have had emotionally deprived childhoods, see themselves as loners, possess supraordinate belief systems, exhibit a high level of motivation, and possess a high level of skill in decision-making and communication. All of these studies are of the most exploratory level; but they

give support to the notion that research can be and should be conducted on change agents in the taxonomy.

REFERENCES

ARGYRIS, C. *Intervention theory and method.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

BARNES, L. B. Organizational change and field experiment methods. In J. D. Thompson & V. H. Vroom (Ed.), *Organizational design and research.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

BECKHARD, R. *Organizational development: strategies and methods.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

BENNE, K. D. The process of re-education: An assessment of Kurt Lewin's views. *Group and Organization Studies,* 1976, 1(1), 26-42.

BENNIS, W. G. The change agents. In R. T. Golembiewski and A. Blumberg (Eds.), *Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach.* Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1964.

BENNIS, W. G. *Organizational development: Its nature, origins, and prospects.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

BENNIS, W. G. Who sank the yellow submarine? In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, R. Chin, and K. E. Corey (Eds.), *The planning of change* (3rd edn.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

BENNIS, W. G., & SCHEIN, E. H. Principles and strategies in the use of laboratory training for improving social systems. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change* (2nd edn.). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

BENNIS, W. G., BENNE, K. D., & CHIN, R. *The planning of change* (2nd edn.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969.

BERGER, P. & LUCKMAN, T. *The social construction of reality.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

BLAKE, R. R., & MOUTON, J. S. *Consultation.* Reading Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

BLOOM, B. S., KRATHWOHL, D. R., & MASIA, B. B. *Taxonomy of educational objectives* (Vols. 1 & 2). London: Longmans, 1964.

BRINTON, C. *The anatomy of revolution.* New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1965.

CHIN, R., & BENNE, K. D. General strategies for effecting change in human systems. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & Chin (Eds.). New York: Holt, and Rinehardt and Winston, 1969.

COHEN, A. M., & SMITH, R. D. *The critical incident in growth groups.* La Jolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1976.

COX, A. *A study to identify the psychological characteristics of early and late change adopters.* Unpublished masters dissertation, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, 1981.

DALE, A. Coercive persuasion and the role of the change agent. *Interpersonal Development,* 1974, 5(2), 102-111.

DE BOARD, R. *The psychoanalysis of organizations.* London: Tavistock, 1978.

DUNCAN, W. J. *Organizational behaviour.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

ELLUL, J. *The technological society.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

FOSTER, M. An introduction to the theory and practice of action research in work organizations. *Human Relations,* 1972, 25(6), 529-556.

FRENCH, W. L., & BELL, C. H., Jr. *Organization development.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 1978.

GANESH, S. R. Organizational consultants: A comparison of styles. *Human Relations,* 1978, 31(1), 1-28.

GOFFMAN, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1959.

GROSS, N., GIAQUINTA, J. B., & BERSTEIN, M. *Implementing organizational Innovations.* New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

HALL, C. S., & LINDZEY, G. *Theories of personality (3rd edn.)*. New York: Wiley, 1978.

HALL, J., & WILLIAMS, M. S. *How to interpret your scores from the change agent questionnaire*. Conroe, Texas: Teleometrics International, 1973.

HARRISON, R. Choosing the depth of organizational intervention. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1970, *6*(2), 181-202.

HAVELOCK, R. G., & HAVELOCK, M. C. *Training for change agents*. Center for Research of Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973.

HINGLEY, P. *Personality characteristics of key change agents*. Unpublished masters dissertation. University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, 1981.

HOMANS, G. C. *The human group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.

HUSE, E. F. *Organization development and change*. New York: West, 1975.

JONES, G. N. *Planned organizational change*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969. *Applied Behavioral Science*, 1974, *10*(4), 485-502.

KAHN, R. L. Organizational development: Some problems and proposals. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1976, *10*(4), 485-502.

KLEIN, M., HEIMANN, P., & MONEY-KYRLE, R. *The directions in psycho-analysis*. London: Tavistock, 1955.

KRAAK, J. H. The manager as change agent. In G. Morello & M. B. Brodie (Eds.), *Management development for industralizing countries*. Geneva: United Nations National Industrial Development Organization, 1969.

KUHR, M. *Management consulting*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1980.

LANGRISH, J. Technological determinism. In R. N. Ottaway (Ed.), *Humanising the workplace*. London: Croom Helm, 1977.

LEACH, E. Race as a cultural concept. *The Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 26 December, 1975, p. 9.

LEAVITT, H. J. Applied organizational change of industry: Structural, technological and humanistic approaches. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

LEWIN, K. Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations*, 1947, *1*(1), 5-41.

LEWIN, K. Group decision and social change. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.) *Readings in social psychology*. London: Methuen, 1947. (b)

LEWIN, K. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Field theory in social science*. London: Tavistock, 1952.

LIPPITT, R. Dimension of the consultant's job. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1959, *15*(2), 5-12.

LIPPITT, R., WATSON, J., & WESTLEY, B. *The dynamics of planned change*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1958.

LUNDBERG, C. C. Images and meta-styles of change agents. An exploratory note. *Interpersonal Development*, 1974, *4*(2), 69-76.

MADGE, J. *The tools of social science*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1965.

MURPHY, B. *The world book of whiskey*. London: William Collins, 1978.

OTTAWAY, R. N. Developing the white, moderate leadership of community in racial conflict. *The International Review of Community Development*. 1976, *35/36*. (a)

OTTAWAY, R. N. *Proposed taxonomic classification of change agents*. (2nd edn.), mimeographed. University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, 1976. (b)

OTTAWAY, R. N. *The psychological characteristics of the effective change agent*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Manchester, 1979.

OTTAWAY, R. N. Defining the change agent. In B. Evans, J. Powell, & R. Talbot, (Eds.), *Changing design*. Chichester: Wiley, 1982.

OTTAWAY, R. N., & COOPER, C. L. Moving toward a taxonomy of change agents. *Management Education and Development*, 1976, *7*(3), 177-186.

PEARL, A. The psychological consultant as change agent. *Professional Psychology*, 1974, *5*, (3), 292-298.

PINCUS, A., & MINAHAN, A. *Social work practice: Model and method*. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 19873.

REDDIN, W. J. *Effective management by objectives.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

ROGERS, E. M. Change agents, clients and change. In G. Zaltman, P. Kotler, & I. Kaufman, (Eds.), *Creating social change.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

ROGERS, E. M. & SHOEMAKER, F. F. *Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach* (2nd edn.). New York: The Free Press, 1971.

ROGERS, E. M., & SVENNING, L. *Modernization among peasants: The impact of communication.* New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1969.

SHEPARD, H. A. Personal growth laboratories. Toward an alternative culture. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science,* 1970, *6*(3), 259-266.

SLOCUM, J. W. Jr. Does cognitive style affect diagnosis and intervention strategies of change agents? *Group and Organization Studies,* 1978, *3*(2), 199-210.

STEELE, F. *Consulting for organizational change.* Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1975.

TICHY, N. M. Agents of planned social change. Congruence of values, cognitions and actions. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 1974, *19*(2), 164-182.

TICHY, N. M. How different types of change agents diagnose organizations. *Human Relations,* 1975, *23*(5), 771-779.

TICHY, N. M., & NISBERG, J. N. Change agent bias. What they view determines what they do. *Group and Organization Studies,* 1974, *1*(3), 286-301.

WATSON, G. Resistance to change. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.). *The planning of change* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

WEIR, M., & MILLS, S. The supervisor as a change agent. *Industrial Relations Journal,* 1973, *4*(4), 61-69.

ZALTMAN, G., & DUNCAN, R. *Strategies for planned change.* New York: Wiley, 1977.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

RICHARD N. OTTAWAY received his PhD from the University of Manchester. Prior to coming to UMIST he was President of Human Enterprises Institute at Wake Forest University. Currently he is Visiting Associate Professor of Organization Management at the Graduate School of Management, Rutgers University. Dr. Ottaway's research and writing are on the social change process, who is involved in it, what are their characteristics, and how can they be evaluated. His publications include *Humanising the Workplace, Change Agents At Work,* and co-authoring *Introducing Organizational Behaviour.*