Implications of Lewin's Field Theory on Social Change

Vlad I. ROȘCA

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

vlad_rsc@yahoo.com

Abstract. *During the Second World War, Kurt Lewin was part of a wider research team commissioned by the U.S. Department of Defense to study how dietary habits of American citizens could be changed so as to avoid protein starvation due to the lengthy war efforts. Lewin's research on food habits can be linked to his earlier studies on social fields. This paper aims to interpret Lewin's findings on changing dietary habits by using his very own field theory approach, in order to hypothesize how the such findings can be drivers of social change, with the findings being applicable for business management settings as well. Concepts of time and space, as well as 'simultaneity' and 'psychological ecology' are brought up to discussion in order to back up the purpose of research.*

Keywords: field theory, social change, participative management, Kurt Lewin, change management.

Introduction

Kurt Lewin was a multidisciplinary researcher, concerned with various social sciences, ranging from psychology to organizational behavior. This open-mindedness has allowed Lewin to leave a rich legacy to the socio-economic theories and practices (Tapp, 1984). Among Lewin's most appreciated contributions are the "Field Theory", the "Action Research" and the "3-Stage Change Model", all of which have had an impact on how changes can be managed in modern societies. Although these contributions have not initially been conceived in order to explain economic thinking or to support economic practice, in time, they have come to be adopted by the world of business administration, which identified in them the necessary support for managing organizational changes. This paper brings together Field Theory, Action Research and the 3-Stage Model and tries to present how various notions which have flown among the concepts have come to shape an understanding of societal change, in general, and of business change, in particular.

Action Research and Social Change

In-between the two World Wars and as a consequence of the effects that the Great Depression had on the wider society, American politicians combined their efforts with scientists in order to identify solutions for getting out of the crisis situation. A so-called 'applied research' emerged in social sciences, which saw academics and scholars approach their research subjects more closely: a direct relationship between the researcher and the subjects thus emerged (Hoffer, 1961). Its purpose was to identify the immediate needs that people faced and offer tailor-made solutions for the politicians to implement and reduce poverty. Such types of activities continued during the Second World War, when the population was asked to rationalize consumption in order to sustain the war efforts. In the early 1940's, the Committee on Food Habits of the National Research Council led by renowned anthropologist Margaret Mead initiated a study on the consumption habits of American housewives (Dillon, 1980; Metraux, 1980). The goal of the study was to encourage to change their dietary and cooking habits (Lewin, 1943). Meat bowels such as kidneys, liver or belly were considered to be inferior goods and therefore disposed after cooking beef dishes. The Research Council tried to encourage housewives to make use of the intestines as

well, since this meant a reduced waste in times of restraints; savings on the disposable income of the households could also be obtained as a consequence of having more food.

Margaret Mead empowered Kurt Lewin of the University of Iowa to take charge of this study (Mead, 1954). Lewin, together with one of his teaching assistants, Alex Bavelas, accepted the challenge and applied an action research methodology (Mead, 1943). With the help of the Red Cross, Lewin and Bavelas identified 120 volunteer women for the study. The women were then split into smaller groups between thirteen to seventeen participants (Burnes, 2007). Some of the groups (labelled here as ‘first group’) attended lectures in which a nutritionist presented different recipes based on sweetbreads, while other groups (here as ‘second group’) attended meetings with Bavelas, who allowed the participants to discuss freely and share their ideas about how they could make the best use of the leftovers of cooking meat (Moreland, 1996; Sloat, Hoppe, 1990). After the meeting took place, Lewin allowed the participants to return home and apply what they had learned in their respective groups. Results showed that the participants in Bavelas’ group changed their dietary habits to a higher extent than did the ones in the nutritionist’s group. Lewin’s interest in this research were twofold: first, to provide Margaret Mead with the details of what strategies and tactics could be used in order to encourage the wider population to change its dietary habits; second, to test his theories on leadership styles, which indicated that participative leadership was more effective than authoritarian leadership (Wolf, 1973). Indeed, the nutritionist only provided the participants with information about how to cook intestines, but did not ask them to also consider making a change. Bavelas, on the contrary, specifically pointed out to the participants in his groups that they were asked to make a change in their cooking habits and use more intestines in their recipes (Copeland, 2005).

Field Theory and Social Change

Apart from its contributions to leadership styles, Lewin’s study on dietary habits also offered several valuable insights on Field Theory (Kariel, 1956). Lewin’s early scientific work was centered around the field theory, in which he demonstrated that, depending on the context, the same individual can interpret the same geographical landscape differently (Abreu, 1978; Lewin, 1926). This was the case in Lewin’s “*Kriegslandschaft*”, his programmatic work published in 1917, in which he showed that, while marching on a field, the soldier will look at the field differently in times of peace than in times of war (Bäumler, 2017; Keller, 2016; Previšić, 2016; Wieser, 2014). Starting from this idea, Lewin advanced his theory claiming that a field exists in a state of quasi-stationary equilibrium: it is neutral when there are no forces acting upon it or when the acting forces annihilate themselves (Autissier et al., 2018; Rouchy, 2009; Stützle-Hebel, Antons, 2017; Talpin, 2017). However, this neutrality is rarely met in real life, when driving forces and restraining forces impact upon a certain situation (Damian, Susanu, 2018; Watkins, Lundberg, 1998). Therefore, the equilibrium is only quasi-stationary: there seems to be an equilibrium, but, in reality, different types of forces will act upon the situation and motivate or demotivate change. Each kind of force has got a certain impact upon the situation and, depending on the intensity of the force, that situation will change more or less. In the study concerning dietary habits, it turned out that the force exerted in Bavelas’ group was stronger than the one in the nutritionist’s group. Lewin tried to prove a point that one of the strongest drivers of social change was communication: the more open, diverse and intense communication around a change issue was, the higher the chances for that change to occur (Fiol et al., 1999). Starting from a state of stability, in which no movement exists, communication has a key role to play in

breaking the 'status quo'. At least as important as communication between participants is the communication (guidance) that the change leader provides (Bavelas, 1942; Bavelas, Lewin, 1942). In his group, the nutritionist did not mention that the actual role of the experiment was to induce a change in the daily habits of the participants. Bavelas, on the other hand side, clearly provided this information and helped participants understand that what was actually expected from them was a modification of behavior. The insight for business managers is that, when starting a change, they need to clearly let their employees know what will follow and what the expectations are, so that people understand what they have to do.

Another key lesson for social change that the study on dietary habits has provided is that a field should not be understood as a self-standing element, but rather as an interplay of the elements constituting it. In "*Kriegslandschaft*", Lewin demonstrated that the trees, the rivers and the hills all played a role in how the marching soldier perceived the terrain. In a symbolic, non-geographical field – hence, in any given situation – geographical elements are replaced by contextual elements that might occur; moreover, a key to the success of any change is the interaction of the people populating that 'field' or situation: the negotiations and exchange of ideas that people carry out will have a major impact on the success of social change. One of the main explanations of why the housewives in the nutritionists' group didn't come to change their dietary habits was that they weren't allowed to share their own experiences and concerns; instead, they were only given directions on what meals to cook; the peer role of the group was diminished, as it could not exert any pressure on the situation for a change to happen. In Bavelas' group, on the contrary, the pressure for change came from the peers: the housewives exchanged ideas among themselves and thus united their capabilities in order to back up the change process. These findings have determined authors to assert that group decision is a valuable tool not only for social change, but also for democracy (McKeachie, 1951). This leads to a third important insight, namely that social change needs change agents: people with a strong belief in their ideas of change and who can back up the change (Buzdar, Fatima, 2018). In Bavelas' group, the change was backed up by most of the participants involved, while in the nutritionist's group only by the nutritionist himself, who had to convince the housewives about the benefits of change.

The 3-Stage Model of Change

Another important outcome of Lewin's Field Theory is the 3-Stage Model of Change (Autissier et al., 2018). With the Field Theory, Lewin asserted that driving forces were needed in order to initiate a change. However, the igniting forces alone were not sufficient to support a change until its implementation, but only to open the change. Change is a long-term process which needs to be managed over time (Nistoreanu, 2019). The 3-Stage Model makes recommendations of how changes can be mastered (Iacob, Pantea, 2008; Sarayreh et al., 2013). The model eventually became a tool for organizations to use when implementing changes. The first stage in the model is what Lewin called the 'unfreezing' change (Tripon, Ghiolțan, 1999). At this point, the strategies and the plans for the plan have to be prepared. Change managers have to take into account high levels of resistance at this moment. People find themselves in 'comfort zones' which they have for their own benefits (Nehyba, 2011). Comfort zones provide the necessary routines and experiences for rapidly accomplishing tasks (Banerji, 2016; Day, Schoemaker, 2020). A change forces people to break away from such routines, causing extra levels of distress (Jackson, 2020). Therefore, communication is important in the first stage of the change: people have to understand that, if the change is to happen, they will have to leave their comfort zones

and move into a 'danger zone' that is associated with change (Awang et al., 2020). The danger zone exists because the outcome of the change is yet unknown (Kansal, Chandani, 2014). People are aware that they will have to leave the 'status quo' behind.

The second stage represents the actual movement, the change per se, which people start to make in the organization. Organizational values and norms are currently being challenged by the moving grounds of the change. Insecurity can persist, as no matter how good or bad the change was planned in advance (in the first stage), it can still end up wrongly. However, once the change is being acted upon, people involved with it can readjust their behavior in order to make the change work properly. If, in the first stage, the management had to plan the change and communicate it, now, the change managers need to motivate behavior. People have already been informed by the change: what they now need to do is to start working on the change plan. At the same time, the management should be concerned with removing any potential (psychological or material) insecurities that might negatively affect the behavior of people. The last stage of the model is the so-called 'refreezing' stage and it has a particular importance for the change process, namely that a change is not complete without this step. The error that many managers do is that they initiate and make a change, only to forget to 'refreeze' it. The risk of not 'refreezing' a change is that people will return to their old habits they had before entering the change process. If the people go back to the way they did things before the change, then the change does not actually exist. Once a new (changed) behavior has been learned, it has to be practiced for so long until it becomes the new routine and it replaces the previously existing norms. The key for this stage is to allow enough time for people to practice with the changed behavior until they internalize it and make it their new way of doing things. Although often doomed as antiquated in a modern, rapidly changing world, which is subject to all kinds of pressures –cultural (Enăchescu, 2013; Jora et al., 2018a/2018b), technological (Anagnoste, 2018a/2018b; Clodnițchi, Chinie, 2015; Maniu, Marin-Pantelescu, 2015; Silvestru, Silvestru, 2019), demographic (Iorgulescu, 2016; Prada, Roman, 2014; Staicu et al., 2013), educational (Dima et al., 2019; Enăchescu, Damasaru, 2013; Silvestru et al., 2018), societal (Bumbac, 2019; Prada, 2015; Șerban, 2010) etc. – the change model can be still useful for organizations, mainly thanks to its simplicity.

The Field Theory and the 3-Stage Model of Change

Lewin claimed that change is driven by some factors that act upon the force field. If we consider an organization to be such a field, then it needs to be understood that the behavior of managers has a direct impact upon how people in the organization respond to the change. Hence, charismatic and visionary leaders can be the driving force of the change, by the way they motivate people to follow and to accept the change. On the contrary, managers can also restrain the change if they do not behave in a proper manner. It is important to understand that the management of an organization has got a crucial role on the change process, especially in the radical transformations that society has undergone over the past years (Brătianu, Nistoreanu, 2008; Chinie, 2014; Nistoreanu et al., 2010; Prada, 2017): the managerial actions influence how easily people in the organization will accept a change. Managers who really want to drive a change have to concentrate on the following when they use the 3-Stage Model of Change:

- Stage 1: properly plan the change and clearly communicate it to the people, so that potential unclarities are reduced as much as possible;

- Stage 2: motivate people to follow the plan and act upon the implementation of the change;
- Stage 3: allow time for people to repeat the new (changed) behavior all over again until they internalize in their own set of skills and procedures.

Conclusions

The value of Lewin's field theory resides in the idea that the environment stimulates change behavior. In a stationary situation, change would not occur. For change to happen, it needs to be stimulated by societal forces. Positive stimuli (or the driving forces) need to be stronger than the negative stimuli (the restraining forces) for change to happen. These findings have led Lewin to suggesting his widely acknowledged 3-Stage Change Model (Baesu, Bejinaru, 2014a/ 2014b; Bejinaru, Baesu, 2013/2018; Cojocaru, 2012; Paraschiv et al., 2019; Rujoiu, 2009). In the first stage, the quasi-stationary equilibrium needs to be unforzen: a move away from the existing situation needs to occur in order to open space up for change (Sarayreh et al., 2013; Păun, 2014; Talmaciu, 2014). Then, acting forces have to exist in order to stimulate the change, which would represent the second step in the model, the actual movement in itself (Tripon, Pop, 2000). Finally, once the change has been made, it must be consolidated so that the people impacted by the change do not change their habits and revert to their old habits of doing things; the change leader needs to make sure that the people will behave according to the change, hence the new situation has to be frozen into a permanent state (Iacob, Pantea, 2008; Mic, 2016; Popa, 2017).

References

- Abreu, M. V. (1978). Campo psicológico, sujeito e interacção ou a actualidade de Kurt Lewin. *Biblos (Coimbra)*, 54, 163.
- Anagnoste, S. (2018a, May). *Robotic Automation Process–The operating system for the digital enterprise*. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 54-69). Sciendo.
- Anagnoste, S. (2018). Setting up a robotic process automation center of excellence. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 6(2), 307-332.
- Autissier, D., Johnson, K., & Metais-Wiersch, E. (2018). Du Changement à la Transformation. *Question (s) de Management*, (2), 45-54.
- Awang, S., Kenny, C. S. L., & Chua, Y. P. (2020, March). *Readiness of Change Leadership Practices in the sustainability of International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) in MARA College*. In SA Conference Series: Industrial Revolution 4.0 (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 102-110).
- Baesu, C., & Bejinaru, R. (2014a). Leadership approaches regarding the organizational change. *The USV annals of economics and public administration*, 13(2(18)), 146-152.
- Baesu, C., & Bejinaru, R. (2014b). Issues of knowledge dynamics during organizational change. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 14(1(19)), 147-153.
- Banerji, H. (2016). An attempt to explore components of empathic architecture in hospitals—a study of Indian hospitals. *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 40(1), 8-17.
- Bavelas, A. (1942). *Morale and the training of leaders*. In G. Watson (Ed.), *Civilian morale: Second yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues* (p. 143–165). Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Bavelas, A., & Lewin, K. (1942). Training in democratic leadership. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 115-119.
- Bejinaru, R., & Baesu, C. (2013). Approaches to organizational change within modern companies. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 13(1(17)), 127-134.
- Bejinaru, R., & Baesu, C. (2018). Connecting Approaches Of Sustainable Development And Organizational Change In Business Companies. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 17(2(26)), 87-94.
- Bäumler, A. (2017). Latenter Krieg auf klassischen Friedensinseln. Räumliche Projektionen und akustische Trigger in Ulrich Bechers "Murmeljagd". *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge*, (26), 21-38.
- Brătianu, C., & Nistoreanu, B. G. (2008). Change and ethics in the higher education. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 10(23), 235-239.
- Bumbac, R. (2019). A Future-Oriented Entrepreneurship Education Process: The FRESHconsult Project. *The Romanian Economic Journal*, XXII(73), 63-75.
- Burnes, B. (2007). Kurt Lewin and the Harwood studies: The foundations of OD. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 213-231.
- Buzdar, M. A., & Fatima, T. (2018). Impact of thinking preferences on the leadership styles of school principals. *Management Research and Practice*, 10(3), 80-89.
- Chinie, A. C. (2014). Current concerns and trends in the business of renewable energy. *Management Research and Practice*, 6(4), 5-22.
- Clodnițchi, R., & Chinie, A. C. (2015). Factors of impact on the evolution of electricity markets from renewable energy sources: a comparison between Romania and Germany. *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 10(1), 34-52.
- Cojocaru, D. (2012). Appreciative Inquiry and Organisational Change. Applications in Medical Services. *Revista de Cercetare și Intervenție Socială*, (38), 122-131.
- Copeland, K. M. (2005). *Kurt Lewin's wartime work: a re-examination of a classic study in the context of morale, culture, and national character* (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University).
- Damian, D., & Susanu, I. O. (2018). *Freelancing-a new approach on the boundary between fragile and anti-fragile after the 2008 economic crisis*. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 251-262). Sciendo.
- Day, G. S., & Schoemaker, P. J. (2020). How Vigilant Companies Gain an Edge in Turbulent Times. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 61(2), 56-64.
- Dillon, W. S. (1980). Margaret Mead and government. *American Anthropologist*, 82(2), 319-339.
- Dima, A. M., Clodnițchi, R., Istudor, L., & Luchian, I. (2019, May). *Business excellence models in higher education—innovative solutions for management performance*. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 38-46). Sciendo.
- Enăchescu, V. A. (2013). Understanding multicultural communication and cooperation through multicultural Dobrogea. *Jurnalul Practicilor Comunitare Pozitive*, 13(2), 108-115.
- Enăchescu, V. A., & Damasaru, C. (2013). Innovation and creativity in human resource management. Why should we change the way we teach our students?. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 14(4), 644-653.
- Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 449-482.

- Iacob, M. I., & Pantea, V. V. (2008). Managing Change in Organizations. *Research Journal of Agricultural Science*, 40(3), 205-212.
- Iorgulescu, M. C. (2016). Generation Z and its perception of work. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 18(01), 47-54.
- Hoffer, C. R. (1961). The development of rural sociology. *Rural Sociology*, 26(1), 1-14.
- Jackson, L. (2020). Trauma, tragedy and stigma: The discomfoting narrative of reproductive rights in Northern Ireland. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 35, 100678.
- Jora, O. D., Apăvăloaei, M. A., & Iacob, M. (2018a). Cultural heritage markets: are traders traitors? Winners and losers from cross-border shifts of historical artefacts. *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 13(2), 897-912.
- Jora, O. D., Apăvăloaei, M. A., & Iacob, M. (2018, May). *The cultural heritage circulation in a globalized world: Should we build stronger borders or stronger bridges?*. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1069-1079). Sciendo.
- Kansal, S., & Chandani, A. (2014). Effective management of change during merger and acquisition. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 11(3), 208-217.
- Kariel, H. S. (1956). Democracy unlimited: Kurt Lewin's field theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62(3), 280-289.
- Keller, T. (2016). The Ecological Edges of Belligerency-Toward a Global Environmental History of the First World War. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales: English Edition*, 71(1), 61-78.
- Lewin, K. (1926). Vorsatz, Wille und Bedürfnis. *Psychologische Forschung*, 7(1), 330-385.
- Lewin, K. (1943). Forces behind food habits and methods of change. *Bulletin of the National Research Council*, 108(1043), 35-65.
- Maniu, L. C., & Marin-Pantelescu, A. (2015). The Internet Era Implications over the Romanian Travel Agencies. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 119-128.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1951). Group Decision Makes Democracy Work. *Religious Education*, 46(2), 90-91.
- Mead, M. (1943). The Committee on Food Habits. *Psychological Bulletin*, 40(4), 290-293.
- Mead, M. (1954). Cultural discontinuities and personality transformation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 10(S8), 3-16.
- Metraux, R. (1980). Margaret Mead: A biographical sketch. *American Anthropologist*, 82(2), 261-269.
- Mic, T. (2016). Cadru general pentru folosirea tehnicilor din jocuri video în procesul de schimbare organizațională. *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae-Științe Sociale*, 3(93), 159-168.
- Moreland, R. L. (1996). Lewin's legacy for small-groups research. *Systems Practice*, 9(1), 7-26.
- Nehyba, J. (2011). Zkušenostně reflektivní učení a komfortní zóna. *Pedagogická Orientace*, 21(3), 305-321.
- Nistoreanu, B. G., Hornoiiu, R. I., & Nistoreanu, P. (2010). The Adjustment of Perspective Among Students Regarding Protection of Educational Services' Consumer. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 12(28), 348-359.
- Nistoreanu, B. G. (2019). *Management strategic. Noțiuni, teorii, ipoteze*. București: Editura ASE.

- Paraschiv, D., Nițu, M., & Savin, M. (2019). *Change management within companies*. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 625-634). Sciendo.
- Păun, M. (2014). Models of change. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 5(3), 7-14.
- Prada, E. M., & Roman, M. (2014). Migration and social protection expenditures: empirical evidence from the EU countries. *Journal of Social and Economic Statistics*, 3(2), 33-44.
- Prada, M. E. (2015). An investigation of Romanians' return intentions from Spain. *Revista Romana de Statistica*, Supliment(5), 31-42.
- Prada, M. E. (2017). Migration and its Determinants: an Europe 2020 Perspective. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, 17(1), 231-236.
- Popa, E. I. (2017). The Manager–Key Element In The Process Of Change. *Annals of the University of Petroșani. Economics*, 17, 251-262.
- Previšić, B. (2016). Der Karst als Kriegslandschaft. *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge*, (25), 139-159.
- Rouchy, J. C. (2009). L'origine d'une pratique d'analyste de groupe. *Revue de psychothérapie psychanalytique de groupe*, (1), 71-82.
- Rujoiu, O. (2009). Janis's Groupthink Model and Unethical Behavior in Organizations. *Revista de Management Comparat Internațional*, 10(S1), 382-387.
- Sarayreh, B. H., Khudair, H., & Barakat, E. A. (2013). Comparative study: The Kurt Lewin of change management. *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology*, 2(4), 626-629.
- Silvestru, C. I., Ion, V., Botez, C., & Icociu, V. C. (2018). ISCED Classification Influence on E-Learning Education Systems. *Informatica Economica*, 22(4), 80-88.
- Silvestru, R. C., & Silvestru, C. I. (2019). Comparative Analysis of Policy Approaches Related to Non-Formal and Informal Learning in European Countries. *Proceedings in Manufacturing Systems*, 14(4), 157-162.
- Sloat, S. G., & Hoppe, R. (1990). Discourse and Coaching: Monologue versus Dialogue. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle*, 9(1), 143-155.
- Staicu, G., Bărbulescu, R., & Moraru, L. C. (2013). Is foreign aid effective in promoting development? The African case. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 12(1A), 489-501.
- Stützle-Hebel, M., & Antons, K. (2017). *Einführung in die Praxis der Feldtheorie*. Carl-Auer Verlag GmbH.
- Șerban, M. (2010). Conferința națională "România după 20 de ani: schimbări și probleme sociale. Calitatea vieții, încotro?". *Sociologie Românească*, 8(4), 3-5.
- Talmaciu, I. (2014). Comparative Analysis of Different Models of Organizational Change. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 5(4), 77-86.
- Talpin, J. M. (2017). Deux principes dans l'élaboration psychique institutionnelle des changements: pensée binaire et pensée qualitative. *Cliniques*, (2), 92-106.
- Tapp, J. L. (1984). Kurt Lewin Memorial Address: BV Zeigarnik. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40(2), 177-179.
- Tripon, C., & Ghiolțan, C. (1999). Despre rezistența la schimbare. *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*, 2(2), 94-115.
- Tripon, C., & Pop, I. (2000). Teorii ale schimbării sociale. *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*, 3(3), 132-145.

- Watkins, M., & Lundberg, K. (1998). Getting to the table in Oslo: Driving forces and channel factors. *Negotiation Journal*, 14(2), 115-135.
- Wieser, M. (2014). Von der Kriegslandschaft zur Topologie des Persönlichkeit: Strategien der Sichtbarmachung im Werk Kurt Lewins. *Psychologie und Gesellschaftskritik*, 38(3), 7-25.
- Wolf, W. B. (1973, August). *The Impact Of Kurt Lewin On Management Thought*. In: Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 1973, No. 1, pp. 322-325). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management. **PICBE | 625**