Dealing with Human Issues throughout Systems Implementation: Guidelines from a Psychodynamic Perspective

Abbas Moshref Razavi [1] and Rodina Ahamad [1].

[1] Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology, University of Malaya

Abstract. This study is devoted to study the nature and the effects of human issues throughout information systems (IS) implementation projects. These issues normally transcribed as resistance, i.e. negative reactions that impact the project success. Moreover the lack of acceptance can interpret as another type of negative reactions as well. Both have been considered here as reactions to the imposing changes, that attempt to revert to the previous stable state. This paper provides an adaptation of individuals and groups' *identification processes* from a psychodynamic view. The result is used to describe underlying dynamics of organizations (whether in individual or groups level) from a humanistic view that is particularly appropriate for analyzing irrational and/or unconscious phenomena within an organization. These dynamics are assumed to show the current balance of psychic forces and its resulting stability states of the organization and later, used as a source to extract general recommendations and guidelines for practitioners to deal with human issues throughout an implementation project. These recommendations and guidelines presume an extent of resistance-to-be in changing the current identification processes within the organization through introducing the new system, and attempt to minimize their potential side-effects.

Keywords: resistance, information systems implementation, organizational change, enterprise systems, identification, psychodynamic

1. Introduction

This study strives to provide a ground for understanding and dealing with human issues in Information Systems (IS) implementation projects. The projects' outcomes usually change an organization deeply and vastly, in terms of requiring changes in current procedures, work practices and information structure [1,2,3]. Moreover in a special subset of them, namely enterprise systems (ES e.g. ERPs - Enterprise Recourse Planning Systems) these changes more likely comprise change the organization's business processes; because such systems incorporate "best practices" of business processes in various disciplines as well [2], that it possibly results in more and deeper changes across the organization.

A potentially high degree of change is able to raise serious levels of negative human affections and their side-effects[4,16,36] by means of resistance and/or lack of acceptance [5]. To delimit the context, it should be added that, firstly, resistance is not an exact opposite phenomenon of acceptance [5] and secondly, both phenomena range from passive to active and even aggressive [4]. Thus, since this paper focuses on *negative* issues, in addition to resistance, we also include the levels of acceptance in a negation meaning in terms of *lack* of acceptance, *participation* and *cooperation* [7].

According to this elucidation, the problem is, the aforesaid phenomena potentially affect IS implementation projects and decrease their success rate dramatically [4,8,12] . Even more, numerous studies have shown that it is the most influential failure factor for such projects [2,28,29]. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to present some ways to stultify these negative affections and/or side-effects. In order to do so, we attempt to propose a common ground to understand the (psychological) *roots* of the human issues

---

[+] Corresponding author. Tel.: +603-26910836; fax: +603-7957 9249.
 E-mail address: amrazavi@siswa.um.edu.my

towards and against a new IS, and in the light of that, provide a better opportunity to manage and deal with it (as much as possible) in advance.

In this frame, the act of introducing a new system is considered as as a dramatic change in the organization and consequently in its people's milieu, so that it will affect the *existing balance* which is definable for individuals, groups of individuals whether they are formal (e.g. departments, people in the same managerial level, etc.) or informal (e.g. categorised by seniority, sex and speciality), as well as the organization as a whole. This conception of *balance* (within organizations) has been considered as a status quo [6] which is usually can be realized through existing interaction patterns within the organization [7]. Anyhow, if the project staff and system implementers do not take properly these issues into account, then most likely the people (i.e. individuals and groups who are supposed to accept a new system) will react oppositely e.g. reluctantly, severely or even aggressively [4,8]; and subsequently, endanger the implementation project and the adoption process in the sense of increasing the probability of failure [1,10]. Conversely, caring about these issues can lead to success [9] (i.e. a case comparable with [4], but successful). Nonetheless, we analyze this problem from a psychodynamic perspective.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Firstly we take a look on the literature related to the problem. In section 3, a short overview of identification processes in psychodynamic theories is given whether they are belonged to individuals or groups. In section 4, an argument is made to use an adaptation of the theoretical issues for explaining the concerned phenomena, with respect to the specific traits of a typical IS/ES. In section 5, targeted recommendation and guidelines are proposed. In the last section, further studies are suggested in this direction.

2. Difficulties in dealing with human issues

Most studies have addressed the problems which arise because of human issues and problems, like user resistance [4, 15]. Literature has mainly found the roots of user resistance (and lack of acceptance) in change in power, benefit [12] and accustomed work procedures and habits [15]. People always resist to (any) change [12]; they are opposed to any loss (job, power, work benefits) [4,12,28] and; they react against any perceived threat (whether the threat comes from an unpleasant change generally, or a specific loss) [4,8].

To delimit the problem, we are referring to such difficulties that originate from emotional [16] reactions to a new system. These reactions are principally based on some negative affections that provoke the people against the system implementation, so that they do, whether overtly or covertly, interfere with the planned and scheduled activities and consequently cause troubles in the implementation program [1,10,11]. In this sense, the affections are assumed to be the mediator between the *causes* (motives which is whether rational justifications, emotional moods or even unconscious drives) [16,17,36] and the effects (i.e. the turbulent actions for the implementation project). Thus, although the problem can be widely defined, including any reaction in terms of resistance and/or acceptance which people manifest against or in compliance with a new organizational change (e.g. system implementation), we focus those that seem apparently *interfere* with the *preplanned* and scheduled activities which are compelled by the management or any legal authority within the organization. Additionally, it is assumed that the reactions are attempting to revert an old or, acquire a new acceptable [5] setting. Even though the *causes* have been considered as changes in power, benefits or raising any kind of threat [4,8,12,36], but determining the exact manifestation form of the effects is not usually possible. Moreover regarding unconscious drives of individuals [13,14,17,23,36], and the fact that people not always are able to say what is clearly their problem (about the new system) [4,17,26,27,36], then relating the causes directly to the effects (e.g. resistance to system) appears to be inadequate.

2.1. Formulation of the problem

In this setting, the interest is in dealing with these affections. The reason is not only because the affections are perceived to be the direct indicators for the *effects*, but also due the fact that, different people have different affections for the same *cause* regarding their history and how they do perceive it. Moreover, as is described in psychoanalysis literature [17,26] the fantasia (as a product of the individual's history *and* individual's nature) is a key mediator which shapes the individual's mind (and can be said for group as well [17,26]), thereby determines how he or she should perceive and interpret a factual input. For instance, a not

serious accident may be perceived so severe in one's fantasia, according to whose personal character and history [17]. A similar phenomenon can be shown in groups' interactions [4,17,27,35]. However, the "inner interaction" realizes in a different way for *individuals* compared to *groups*. So as an implicit assumption, the reactions are a production of external *causes* and the *history* of individuals, as well as groups, in the form of fantasia. Therefore, contemplating the affections themselves is considered here as the core concept.

2.2. Lapointe model for resistance

In this subsection, we attempts to examine the Lapointe model [4] by the proposed conceptions. This is a relatively new and comprehensive and then, remarkable model. Her model shortly states that resistance is a function of "initial conditions" and "perceived threats" (imposed by the changes of a new system). Furthermore, this causal relationship can be repeated through cycles and escalate the problem i.e. resistance.

Despite the emphasis on the role of interactions and communication patterns among individuals and groups to intensify the resistance [4,7], our interpretation of the Lapointe case [4] is that the *interaction* (between the *initial conditions* and the *changes* in terms of the new system's features) was not the main cause and it was merely a facilitator that had developed a fantasia for the people that the problem is severer (than it probably was). Though it apparently seems that the exact counterpart of *fantasia* in the Lapointe work is "perceived threat", but we do not believe so. Firstly perceived threat in her formulation is somehow an effect (or a direct antecedent/determinant of it) and not as a stand-alone mediator. Secondly, perceived threat does not have any functionality in itself and cannot describe how different settings, e.g. dissimilar individuals, groups and organisational cultures result in different outcomes. On the other side, if the people's fantasia is assigned to "initial conditions" primitive of Lapointe model, the form of the causal relationship will be distorted i.e. it seems to "perceived threat" affects "initial conditions" and not vice versa! Since, two main problems with her model appears to be firstly, there is no room for an imaginary/virtual world and so, the people's perception has been harshly related to the reality. Secondly, the lack of considering the resistance as a function of a mediator that is a hybrid composition of an *old* history and a *current* perception, whereas both seem to be common in their nature i.e. *fantasia*. A detailed discussion is out of the scope of this paper and can be followed in psychoanalysis literature [18,27,35,36].

3. An adaptation of psychodynamic: adoption of identification processes

To summarize psychodynamic theories (psychoanalysis and depth psychology) in two or three paragraphs for our purpose, we approach to the notion of *identification*. Identification literally has been defined in various senses in dictionaries. Surprisingly almost all of these senses are different facets of the same psychodynamic term, namely identification so that, they are unified under the one notion and show its different developmental phases. In other words, general uses of the term unintentionally remind us different facets or stages of a single notion that has been articulated in psychodynamic theory through different processes and mechanisms [26,27].

Identification as *recognition*, refers to a mechanism through which individuals grow and obtain their (unique) identity. In the second sense, identification is an *incorporation mechanism* to make similar and fit the subject with/in its object. In this sense, the term oppositely (regarding the first sense) refers to a targeted similarity (rather than the uniqueness). Identification as *empathy* is another sense that somehow, connects two former senses, via going inside the object (someone else), to see the world from its eyes. In this process, the subject attains *uniqueness* via a *union* with the object (by the means of becoming as much as powerful as he or she is; e.g. empathy with parents). Identification as *association* is an outward, objective conception of the former mechanism (versus inward, subjective nature of empathy). In this mean, it associates the object's traits to itself [31]. Moreover it also associates its unwanted traits (unacceptable from its object viewpoint) to others (in pathological cases, to itself, or even again, to its object). Finally, identification as *determination*, refers to distinguishing and discriminating someone from others in a crowd or society by the whole process. Notwithstanding, paradoxically, there is some kind of contradiction within the process; i.e. to be (become) unique, one should be (or make him or herself as) someone else. Perhaps this is because, an infant is (or, perceives itself) initially as an unidentified object that must be recognized (generally, in the sense of obtaining an identity) through recognition by parents and incorporation of their power and knowledge. It

appears to be vital, because without such recognition in terms of attracting their attention, the infant cannot be survived.

For our purpose, we define an identification process as a set of states, through which the individual/group can be stimulated, motivated, activated and (to some extent) satisfied, by means of the aforementioned *senses*. This is normally perceived to be an ongoing cycle. Noticeably, not necessarily (but usually) it signifies an observable, concrete phenomenon. This predicate implies two meanings i.e. a process can be (sometimes, or even always) done in the fantasia/unconscious of the individual/group and, it can be virtually, imaginary assumed by the analyst to describe the equilibrating processes of the system (something like assuming the existence of reciprocal forces for an stable body in Newton's third law).

This definition is in contrast with the *identity statuses*, their criteria and the processes by which those statuses can be attained, as described for instance in [32]. In that interpretation, identity is some kind of (mature) *capability* for individuals (e.g. for better adaptation to their environment or, alleviation of their anxiety), whereas here, *identification processes* are some forms of perpetual, active psychic dynamisms like *ego defences* in general (or particularly, partly as *identification defence:* a specific type of ego defences) [33] which are necessary to discharge regular tensions of any individual. However, both interpretations refer to the necessity of identity/identification to maintain individual's balance; and share a presumed underlying process-nature for the notions (i.e. identity/identification). Moreover, the former is distinguished from the later by which it is a longitudinal, staged-growth process (i.e. identity formation process) passing through statuses during the individual's life-span [32]; yet the later (current notion) is defined based on a relatively preset *cycle* of sates, representing merely the course of a *psychic dynamism* (as mentioned previously, something such as a defence mechanism [33]), which is (can be) simultaneous with other dynamisms (e.g. other identification processes) all within one individual/group.

Identification can be assumed to be connected with almost all kinds of humanistic relations within an organization. The *humanistic* here stresses on those aspects of human-relations that imply emotionality, unconsciousness and irrationality aspects. This bias is in compliance with the problem under consideration (i.e. taking *human issues* as a barrier, or at least, as something that must be dealt throughout an organizational change process generally and, particularly in a system implementation project). Besides, we should add that, this interpretation does not exclude the rational aspects and formal planning issues totally, but only give a greater priority to the emotional/irrational ones so that during a complicated and prolix implementation project, these emotional issues most likely dominate rational and formal planning practices and not vice versa [11].

The quality and dynamics of identification processes mainly realized through projection and introjection mechanisms, whereby an individual (or group) absorbs the desirable traits and qualities of an object by the introjection and get rids of undesirable ones by projecting them into the same or other (mostly but not always, hated and outcast) objects [17,26,27], whether they in their turn are individuals, groups or even the organization as a whole. Meaningfully, identification works for individuals as well as groups. In this regard, we enumerate four exemplar types of mutual introjection-projecetion mechanisms that provide the basis and generally form most kinds of human interaction within an organization. Whereas the *individual to individual* case is the primitive type (mostly refers to child development regarding its adaptation to its parents or their substitutes), *individual to group* by means of *membership,* group to individual in terms of *leadership* and, *group to group* via the *splitting* should also be noticed. A detailed discussion can be found in the relevant literature e.g. [17,27], and here only a short formulation of these conceptions are provided aiming to show the similarity between all and, their determining strength to form different kinds of individual and group interactions (semi-static interrelations as well as dynamic communications). Individuals in the process to join to a new organization or department, severely attempts to absorb the cultural and emotional atmosphere as well as adopting their assigned tasks. As such, their sense of belongingness not only can help them to do their job more efficiently, but also, it relates them to the work's environment and then, motivates, controls and satisfies them in a more convenient way. The resulting relationships can be interpreted as a few *bands* that form the state of balance for that (part of) organization and should be positioned in the centre of interest for an organizational change case. In the next sense, groups can identify with individuals (e.g. organizational

heroes, or most likely leaders [17,27]) and incorporate their traits socially. In this sense, many cases of mutual influence and dependency can be distinguished [17]. In the last sense, groups use the *splitting* as a method for determining themselves from the outsiders. The whole mechanism originally backs to the infant conditions throughout its development course in that, it should attain its recognition and consequently its identity with associating good trait to itself and bad ones to the outsiders [18,26,27] to *be accepted* (morally) by its parents (identification in the sense of association). This also works in a similar manner for the groups as well (in the form of *splitting*) [17,27]. If we approach to define the state of balance in an organization in terms of maintaining internal groups' boundaries then, the role of splitting as the mechanism to do so should be significant. Specifically, since various groups can be formed based on diverse characteristics in a social system (e.g. organization) and in several layers and, considering the fact that any individual can be belonged to many groups at the same time, the complexity and criticality of this role appears to be more remarkable.

4. Argument: adaptation of the theory for IS implementation

According to the previous section, we argue that the *identification* processes are a considerable dynamism within an organization that can incorporates most of equilibrating mechanisms in many levels of psychic and social phenomena (referring to whether individual, group or the organization as a whole) in terms of providing meanings and goal to, and thus motivate, any communication and interaction. In other words, all forms of communication and commensurate communication patterns (viewing from a psychic perspective) can be derived from identification processes. In this view, all individuals are in balance when they are satisfactorily recognized in all levels. This premise implies two subsidiary assertions. First, *recognized* here, as a matter of relativity, means the commensurate needs (from need to be fed and safety to very highly social and sublimated needs [18,26]) should be related to the identification processes by which they are satisfied. The reason why even gratifying basic needs must be connected to the state of being recognized, is that if any infant cannot be recognized, then it cannot be fed and attains any gratification. And this is exactly true for a social individual that if he or she cannot be recognized by others (e.g. an employer, a food seller), then he or she definitely cannot be survived. And these are the facts that they very clearly know, even unconsciously. Then the basic assumption here is, people are certainly are anxious about their position so that, being able to preserve their living capability is contingent upon the state of being recognized *and,* its critical significance almost always is unconscious. In other words, people are very worried about their identification, but normally they do not overtly express their fear, and transform the related feelings into social points and prides that they perceive they are essential [17,27]. The second assertion is, people generally attempt to *realize* these needs through their moves and accomplishments and, in the form of social motivations (or social motivating forces) and communications. So again, their *activities* to satisfy the needs, whether basic or sophisticated, are somehow connected to their identification processes (regarding the assumed role of identification in social motivation and communication). Therefore, according to this argument, the notion of identification should be placed at the heart of any conflict resolution model or method in organizations (see e.g. [34]; other possible applications, such as resolving social and political conflicts, are out of the scope of this paper). Nonetheless, in this paper as a short communication, we do not intend to provide a detailed discussion about the theories, but do merely state a few interrelated hypotheses and, show some of their relations, indications and implications.

Subsequently, to relate the context to IS and specifically, ES, some specific characteristics of such systems are discussed here. Firstly a new ES strongly contribute to redefine and represent the current information structure of the organization in a new form (in all levels, from strategic planning to low level transactions[1,2,3]). This representation as a reflection of the organization's facts, take its place and roles in all individuals' minds who are within the organization. Secondly, ES almost always impose their rules and and regulations for doing existing work practices differently. These controls explicitly can and most likely do interfere and eventually combine with the internal/psychological control habits that exist in people's minds. Notwithstanding, these two aspects of ES (i.e. relying on the knowledge is saved on the machine as the final reference and, imposing the automatic controls of the machine) are in addition to some usual changes that are likely expected to be proposed by any organizational change program, in terms of change in organizational work procedures and information structure.

As a result, it is expected that the impact of introducing a new system will be discerned in the form of threatening forces towards equilibrating processes of the organization, and will be mainly realized and conceived as a turbulence for identification processes which are ongoing across the organizations, whether for individuals or, formal (e.g. departments) and informal groups.

5. Discussion and guidelines

we can hypothesize the identification processes in the course of system implementation in two different views. Firstly, considering it as a new factor (in addition to perceived threat in general [4,8] or, losing power and benefit [12,28] and, information and control [24,25] more specifically) that works mostly in irrational *and/or* unconscious levels. It is expected to help considerably in organizational dysfunctionally cases [14,17,23,36]. The second view is considering it as an underlying dynamism to analyze and understand *why* and *how* people react resistingly when they are under threats (generally, or as is mentioned, specifically losing power and benefit). In this manner, *identification* is a core mediatory concept that *usually* connects and unifies basic needs and high level social wishes in a homogeneous system of values. We say "usually", because always there is a place for raw manifestations of urges. This conception is refers to Freud's theory of cultural socialization [31,17]. In this way, all types of dependent or independent desires are somehow connected to this central concept. Moreover, it also implies a structure for contained forces and ongoing processes that are being realized through communication. Nevertheless, more sophisticated conceptual models appears to be necessary to be able to describe these processes and their ongoing operations, balances and relationship with other phenomena of organizations in individual, group or organization level.

Based on the above discussion, a few targeted guidelines in terms of some cautions and recommendation to avoid resistance to system implementation are as follows. Nonetheless, it is noticeable that these suggestions assume a potential resistance (i.e. resistance-to-be) in advance only because of changing into accustomed identification processes, whether in individual or group levels.

To discover the identification processes, we suggest two ways. Firstly, it is recommended that system implementers be aware of current identification processes by taking into account how the people (e.g. managers, system users and so on) perceive their position after introducing a new system. So as, regardless of the power, control or benefit they may lose (or gain), do they perceive the new setting as a *degradation* for themselves? For example, consider an old setting in which, a group of professionals check and correct others as a duty. Do (will) those people have sufficient tasks in that old (or a new) setting to be recognised as they need? Nevertheless, getting rid of such duties could be regarded as a degradation, even if doing that does not come with any considerable reward or power and even more, they were complaining about this extra work in that old setting. Alternatively it can be said that it decreases the extent of recognition in terms of lessening the level of communication [7]. Awareness of such conditions is important because they normally cannot pinpoint this as a *difficulty* for themselves, but still it acts (mostly unconsciously) as a kind of degradation. Losing *uniqueness* (in their identities, skills and duties) can be considered in this direction as well, whereas it can be simply observed by the analyst too. The effectiveness of this recommendation is partly due to the fact that even if they are unconscious about such a degradation, but it should still be evident for an interviewer that whether the individual (independently or as member of a group) experiencing a feeling of degradation while they are talking about the new system setting in detail or not. In other words, even if the new conditions appear to be acceptable (in terms of power and benefits) and at the same time, there is some kind of lose of recognition (e.g. in terms of losing communication or value of communication – in this sense, we do not assume communication is power in itself, yet communication plus *control* indicate power [24]) together with unconscious feelings of degradation, it can be shown (possibly) in their speeches and reactions unintentionally and indirectly, and "from a distance" [13].

The second recommendation to discover an identification process is about being aware of boundaries. Regardless of physical boundaries (as described by socio-technical authors, e.g. Miller [30], p.106, 113; that there is no interest in it here), two possible ways of evaluating boundaries are as follows. Firstly the degree of rituals that should be changed for the new setting. Organization rituals are considered as some kind of discernments to distinguish organizations' people from outsiders [17] and, they work as (invisible, humanistic) boundaries. It is noteworthy that work procedures are partly organizational rituals and vice versa.

However, not all rituals can be interpreted as work procedures (and even as workarounds; i.e. anyhow related to work duties) and not all procedures are considered so important to be rituals. In spite of the fact that even a very simple part of work can be of great ritualistic value [17,36], as the first priority, the suggestion is to be aware of those *work procedures* that are of ritualistic value *and* which are/will *being changed* by introducing the new system.

The second way to identify and distinguish boundaries is to consider the splitting traits and mechanisms [17,27] (generally for groups, but can be for individual as much well as). In this way the question is whether the group/individual perceives itself as much as good (recognised) in the future as it is in the current setting, rather than the *others*. A better question is, for the people under consideration, do the others will be as much they want bad (worse than themselves) as they are now? Admittedly it is not the system implementer responsibility to make sure those people that no one can be better than what he or she is now only because of them, but despite that, having knowledge about this matter is recommended as a key point for the sake of taking some actions (preferably, in advance) to moderate and (even pretend to) compensate the resulting/anticipating outrages. Many case studies (e.g. [8,9]) have collected valuable data in this regard.

Along with employing the aforementioned ways to discover the identification processes, three general guidelines are proposed here to classify and summarize the discovered processes. Although, these guidelines can be possibly enriched by borrowing more notions from psychoanalytical/organizational consultancy literature, yet we believe doing so need a comprehensive conceptual model to relate successfully corresponding conceptions in different domains, and now out of the scope of this paper. Firstly, to evaluate the relative importance among different identification processes, the analyst (i.e. system implementer) can ask some questions about the works are being done and the information are being maintained as the criteria to estimate how much they participate in the uniqueness and the recognition of the individuals and groups and, understand how people attain prestige and, are credited and identified by them. In this way, analyst can prioritize the identification process among each other. As an extra tip, it could be suggested that all discovered processes should be kept in the list so that, any newer discovered process whether for individual or group *must not* override the old ones. In other words, any *identification* process that is already discovered and identified by the analyst can very rarely be *wrong* or, must be *completely* replaced with some other (possibly, newer) discovered processes. It is referred to a classic formula in psychoanalysis that states: "this or that" is not likely the rule, but "this as well as that" is usually the case [18]. Herein, it literally means that, any motivation and action has an *interpretation* (in fact, potentially more than one) and can be symbolically effective in the context. In this regard, weighting to obtain a comprise among several processes should be done extremely carefully, because sometimes even a minor identification process, as is perceived by the analyst, may be of a crucial importance in practice (see a general discussion about organizational rituals in [17]). As the second guideline, and after finding these processes, the analyst should contemplate the forthcoming changes of the new system by means of change in work habits [15] and access to information (which is a source of power [24,25]), and carefully examine which ones possibly contradict with the discovered identification processes. And finally, he or she should be aware of the *explicit* changes in the power and benefits of the individuals and the groups and how they will be reconciled to a set of new identification processes. The point is, he or she should avoid to neglect an *old* identification process which does not have any exact counterpart in the *new* structure of power, control and benefits. These are more inclined to result in resistance to the new setting (i.e. new system).

6. Conclusion and further studies

We end up this discussion with a few opportunities for experimental researchers to investigate the proposed conceptions and guidelines through quantitative as well as qualitative cases.

There will be numerous opportunities to test these hypotheses such as follows. Firstly, measuring organizational identification boundaries and their perceived importance (for different stakeholders). Secondly, finding and distinguishing different *patterns* of identification processes in organizations. Thirdly, working on the ways that the sensitive individuals or groups can be determined in advance (for the purpose of estimating the prospect resistance). And lastly, achieving the stabilizing conditions in which all these patterns are in balance and; *how* they can approach the *previous* (or a *new*) balance in a *new* system setting.

Moreover, a deep investigation of psychoanalysis, group dynamics and organization psychoanalysis literature expected to provide an appropriate comprehensive model. It should be note that, though some similarities between conceptions have been shown here, but a full analysis of the concepts and terms is necessary aiming to find some universal constructs that should be usable for all levels of identification processes within organizations. Additionally, the concept of organization identification as discussed in literature, e.g. in [19,20,21,22] should be related to this discussion, even if it does not refer to an exact psychodynamic term and more, is a cognitive and/or behavioural construct.

The final point should be this proposition that, if we know the existing identification processes and balance in an organization, then it will be possible to easily transform it into a new setting.

7. References

[1] A. Aladwani. Change management strategies for successful ERP implementation. *Business Process Management Journal,* Vol. 7 No. 3, 2001, pp. 266 -275.

[2] M. Shields. *E-Business and ERP: Rapid Implementation and Project Planning.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc., United States, April 20, 2001.

[3] I. Kemppainen. Change Management Perspectives in an ERP Implementation. *Proceedings of the 12th European Conference on Information Systems*, Turku Finland, June 14-16, 2004.

[4] L. Lapointe, and S. Revard. A Multilevel Model of resistance to Information Technology Implementation, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 2005, pp. 461-491.

[5] A. Giangreco. A Review of the Literature and a Discussion of Six Issues in the Analysis of Resistance to Change. *Cattaneo University (LIUC) Papers in Economics,* n. 79, Serie Economica Aziendale 7, 2000.

[6] H. Kim, and A. Kankanhalli. Investigating User Resistance to Information Systems Implementation: A Status Quo Bias Perspective, *MIS Quarterly*, 2009.

[7] A. Burton-Jones, and M. Gallivan. Towards a Deeper Understanding of System Usage in Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 2007.

[8] L. Lapointe, and S. Rivard. A Triple Take on Information System Implementation. *Organization Science, 2007.*

[9] E. Davidson, and W. Chismar. The Interaction of Institutionally Triggered and Technology-Triggered Social Structure Change: An Investigation of Computerized Physician Order Entry. *MIS Quarterly*, 2007.

[10] M. Al-Mashari. A Process Change-Oriented Model for ERP Application. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 16(1),* 2003, pp. 39–55.

[11] B. Aubert, H. Barki, M. Patry, and V. Roy. A Multi-level Multi-Theory Perspective of Information Technology Implementation. *Info Systems*, Vol 18, 2008, pp.45-72.

[12] L. Markus. Power, politics, and MIS implementation. *Communications of ACM*, 1983

[13] W. Bovey, and A. Hede. Resistance to organisational change: the role of defence mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.* 2001

[14] A. Kersten, Organizing for powerlessness. A Critical Perspective on Psychodynamics and Dysfunctionality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management.* 2001.

[15] P. Sobreperez, E. Ferneley, and F. Wilson. Tricks or Trompe L'Oeil? An Examination Workplace Resistance in an Information Rich Managerial Environment. *Proceedings of the 13th European Conference on Information Systems*, Regensburg, Germany. 2005. Paper 41. pp. 484-494.

[16] K. McGrath. Affection not Affliction: The Role of Emotions in Information Systems and Organizational Change. *Information and Organization*. 2005. Volume 16. Issue 4.Pages: 277-303

[17] Y. Gabriel. *The Psychoanalysis of Organizations*. Sage Publications Ltd, 1999.

[18] F. Alexander. *Fundamentals of psychoanalysis*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1963.

[19] R. Dick, U. Wagner, J. Stellmacher, and O. Christ. The utility of a broader conceptualization of organizational identification: Which aspects really matter? Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 2004, 77, pp 171-191.

[20] C. Spitzmuller, and M. Stanton. Examining employee compliance with organizational surveillance and monitoring. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2006, 79, pp. 245-272.

[21] J. Bartel. Employee identification before and after an internal merger: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2009, 82, pp. 113-128

[22] J. Lipponen, A. Bardi, and J. Haapama. The interaction between values and organizational identification in predicting suggestion-making at work. *Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2008, 81, pp. 241-248

[23] D. Wastell. Learning Dysfunctions in Information Systems Development: Overcoming the Social Defenses with Transitional Objects, *MIS Quarterly,* 1999, 23(4), pp. 581-600.

[24] R. Koop, and R. Grant. Information Systems and Power: Structural versus Personal Views. *Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research Annual Conference, Proceedings of the 1993 conference on Computer personnel research.* ACM, 1993.

[25] L. Attygalle, L. von Hellens, L. Potter. Information Systems and Intra-Organisational Power: Exploring Power & Political Aspects Associated With the Adoption of a Knowledge Sharing System in an IT Services Department. *Journal of Information, Information Technology, and Organizations.* 2010, Volume 5.

[26] C. Brenner. *An Elementary Textbook of Psychoanalysis*. International Universities Press, 1955.

[27] G. Bullen. *A Psychodynamic View of the Consulting Relationship: A Case Study*. University of South Africa. 2003

[28] K. Peszynski, and B. Corbitt. Politics, Complexity, and Systems Implementation. *Social Science Computer Review* Vol. 24, No. 3, Fall 2006, pp. 326-341.

[29] M. Markus. Technochange Management: Using IT to Drive Organizational Change. *Journal of Information Technology*, 2004, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 4-20.

[30] W. Pasmore, and J. Sherwood. *Sociotechnical Systems: A Sourcebook.* International Authors, United States, 1978.

[31] S. Freud. *Civilization and its Discontents*. The Hogarth Press, London, 1930. Revised 1963. Reprinted 1969.

[32] J. Marcia, J. Marcia, A. Waterman, D. Matteson, S. Archer, and J. Orlofsky. *Ego Identity: A Handbook for Psychosocial Research*. Springer Verlag, New York, 1993.

[33] H. Laughlin. *The Ego and its Defesnes*. Meredith Corporation, New York, 1970.

[34] H. Barki, and J. Hartwick. Interpersonal Conflict and Its Management in Information System Development. *MIS Quarterly,* June 2001, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 195-228

[35] S. Freud, *Group Psychology*, Liveright Publishing Corporation, New York, 2nd Imp, 1967.

[36] Y. Gabriel, and A. Carr. Organizations, Management and Psychoanalysis: An Overview, *J. Managerial Psychology*, vol. 17, No. 5, 2002, pp. 348–365