The theory I have chosen to evaluate is that of Dr. Elisabeth Kubler-Ross and her theory of the five stages

theory of dying leading to the Grief Curve<sub>-</sub>\_-(1969). <u>I have decided to do this as I selected this</u> theory because I-I have used an

adaptation of it this in some of my previous the work; I metdo with groups toin determine looking at how they, as leaders,

manage change for themselves and others, when they faceding changes at work — —the "change curve".

The stages of the change curve <u>very closely</u> resemble <u>very closely</u> the <u>ones presented by ose of Kubler\_Ross and her's grief curve.</u>

I became aware, that not only was the original research completed by Kubler--Ross was being questioned by , (Gorle (2002), -Fitchett (-(1980) & (Chaban\_-(1999), -Wbut work was also undertaken by others

such as (Dunphy and Stace (1988), Bridges (1995) and Senge (1999). They—were all putting forward their own ideas, assumptions and understandings of organisational change which conflicted with those of Kubler-Rosshers.

Why has the theory from Kubler-Ross and which was later adapted to apply as a tool to help individuals

to-manage change be<u>comeen</u> so popular\_until recently? In my opinion, the strength of the theory may <u>liebe</u> in its apparent simplicity. Dr Kubler—Ross presented 5 stages that a terminally ill person may go throughoften expereincesexperiences whenin attempting trying to cope with this news. She categorised these 5 stages as denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance. Although Whilst she never may not have explicitly stated that a person needed to experiencego through all 5 stages in sequence, many others have this is how it has been interpreted her theory this wayby many. Many health care professionals including doctors and nurses This has further have further revised been changed over the years by many, including doctors, nurses, and other health care professionals this theory over the years into the 5 stages of gGrief.

The change curve <u>is</u> (based on <u>the work of Kubler-Ross's work) aRoss, and is used by <u>certain some</u>-consultants (including the author. <u>This theory</u>) states that individuals facing change may progress through go through some or all of the following stages:</u>

• Sshock

• R, retreat

• S, self-D-doubt

• A<del>, a</del>pathy

• R, resolve

T, taking Sstock

• Nand new Ggoalss

- The stages of the curve represent <u>each of</u> the stages people may go through or become stuck at when change occurs, <u>whether regardless of whether</u> theat change is positive or negative; <u>t</u>The curve is applicable to <u>both</u> change that is acceptable and welcomed or unacceptable and imposed. <u>However</u>, <u>although</u> the latter <u>is generally will probably</u> <u>acknowledged as be-</u>more difficult to manage.

John Fisher (1999) <u>further also</u>-supports this work <u>further</u> with his personal transition curve <u>which</u>, outlinesing how individuals deal with personal change. The phases of this curve <u>include:are</u> anxiety, happiness, fear, threat, guilt, depression, disillusionment (this stage was added in 2003), hostility and denial. He argues that any change, no matter how small, has the potential to impact <u>on</u> an individual. It <u>may also</u> <u>and may</u> generate conflict between their existing and anticipated <u>changed</u> values and beliefs.

Fisher and, with Dr David Savage (1999) wrote about personal construct psychology theory. They, builtding on the work of George Kelly (1955),—which proposed that "we must understand how the other person sees their world and what meaning they attribute to things in order to effectively communicate and connect with them". This theory claimsviews that people have the power to change and grow; t-and-hey are only limited by their own vision they have of themselves and by their own internal "blinkers" that may might-prevent future development...

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

All of the above have stages or phases that people can begin to put a name to identify in order to and justify their feelings. In my opinion, people like to placeut themselves into a box and create meaning. For example, (Honey and Mumford's learning styles inventory (1982), Belbin's team roles (1981) and, Blanchard's situational leadership model (1969). It is not the author's view that the author does not claim that this is correct or to be should be encouraged. However, people like to know discover more about themselves and try to find outdetermine why they are thinking, feeling or, behaving a certain ways they are. Total experience for 20 Twenty years of experience working as as firstly an employed trainer within the public sector and then as a consultant working iin both large and small organisations throughout the UK shows that this may be soreveals that this may indeed be the case. In regards to managing others, it may provee helpful to beginstart to formulatinge a plan to help them through one stage and onto the next. I am not suggesting it will always be easy, but it is easy to understand.

However, does theis it's weakness of Kubler-Ross' theory lie in its simplicity?

The work that Kubler\_-Ross completed in the 1960's and 1970's has been questioned\_for numerous reasons. Nas none of her research has been published, there is no explicit empirical base exists, and the number of patients used was relatively low to formulate accurate predictions—upon. In addition, sSome patients did not know that realize they were dying and/or being studiedused for research purposes. While conducting research for her PhD thesis on Kubler-Ross, Chaban (1991) It is also alleged by Chaban, (1991) whilst doing some research for her PhD Thesis on Kubler-Ross that Kubler--Ross had had access to the work of many others. This includeding two books by Glaser and Strauss (-1965 and & 1968) which bore similarities to her subsequent book, On Death and Dying (1969).

Formatted: Font: Italic

In the September 1999 edition of the *Elm Street Magazine*, Heather Robertson expressed, writing in the *Elm Street Magazine* in September 1999 writes of her disappointment when she discovered that the research of Kubler-Ross's research "seemed to be derived from rambling conversations with anonymous patients at the University of Chicago's Billings Hospital".

Formatted: Font: Italic

She went ongoes on to describe how the book contained only partial parts of these interviews and that the work wasis difficult to verify because of Kubler-Ross's practise of using either first names or pseudonyms with no dates. Whilst Sthis might seem to be may have wantdwanted to protecting the confidentiality of the patients, However, this would also be in in conflict with her Kubler Ross' practice of interviewing patients, sometimes on television, without them and/or their families knowing they were dying. Consequently So, in my opinion, there are some questionable ethical issues must be seriously considered. In fact, Chaban goes on to to suggest that Carl Nighswonger, a professor at the University of Chicago Divinity School and a Billings Hospital chaplain who jointly interviewed patients with Kubler-Ross and was a professor at in the University of Chicago Divinity School, was in fact actually responsible for the theory. Kubler-Ross appears to reduce all personal experiences to predictable universal stages.