

Jason Canning, Pauline Anne Found, (2015) "The effect of resistance in organizational change programmes: A study of a lean transformation", International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences, Vol. 7 Issue: 2/3, pp.274-295, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-02-2015-0018>

This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article published in the International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences. To access the final edited and published version visit <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-02-2015-0018>."

The Effect of Resistance in Organizational Change Programmes: A Study of A Lean Transformation

Introduction

The failure of change programmes is well publicised; IBM's 2008 *Making Change Work Study* of 1,532 change practitioners, noted that only 41% of projects were considered a success (Jorgensen, et al., 2009). Chawla & Kelloway (2004) quote a 40% failure rate, whilst Decker, et al. (2012) claims failure rates of anywhere between 28% to as high as 93%. Many of these cite resistance to change as being a significant cause of failure. However, Lawrence (1969) suggested that key to the problem is to understand resistance. This paper attempts to do this by developing and testing a comprehensive model of resistance.

The Resistance Model is developed from a systematic review of the literature, which was subsequently tested empirically in a case study of a manufacturing and engineering company based on the south coast of the United Kingdom. The chosen business employs a mix of approximately 170 manufacturing, engineering, and administration staff. The organisation is known to be going through a number of change programmes, an on going extensive 'lean improvement programme', and a cross-business optimisation programme involving extensive physical changes to layouts with departmental restructuring and resultant staff losses.

This paper develops a model of the issues that can lead to failure, and tests this in a case company that is undergoing change. In doing so it explores some of the 'organisational factors' that lead to resistance, and seeks to ascertain if it is possible to create a change programme structure that is better suited to the business?

Methodology

Data Collection

A systematic review of current literature pertaining to change resistance and organizational culture was conducted and a testable model (The Resistance Model) developed. A case study, involving an anonymous survey (Table I) of all employees, semi-structured interviews with randomly selected employees is used in order to test some of the issues identified in the literature. Case studies are useful where the boundaries between the issue being studied and the context in which it is being studied are not clear (Saunders *et al.*, 2009), the behaviours of those being observed cannot be manipulated (Rowley, 2002). According to Yin (1994) a case study is useful when a 'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of issues in which the researcher has little control. Finally the literature research and case study results are drawn together to present a new model of resistance.

Survey Reliability

Internal consistency is ensured with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.9270 (on a scale of 0 to 1) when tested via a pilot study conducted on one sub-group within the case study. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency, that measures how closely a related set of items are as a group, where a 'high' value of alpha is often used as evidence that the items measure an underlying construct (UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group, 2013). A check of 25 randomly selected surveys showed that 23 (92%) conformed to this assumption, adding further weight to the reliability of the survey.

Constructs and Validity

The main concepts of this research are firstly, that attitudinal and behavioural resistance are factors of motivation, habit, selected perception, and insecurity, which in turn are formed from issues, that include perceived control and perceptions of loss. It is therefore reasonable to expect that individuals, who feel less confident about their role going forward, or feel that the changes will have a negative effect on the business, are less likely to support change.

Secondly, that good two-way communication and participation in the process of change are essential to reducing resistance (Chawla and Kelloway (2004); Singh *et al.*, (2012); Dent and Powley (2003); Karp and Tveterass Helgo (2009). Therefore, individuals who have had a high level of participation, and the opportunity for high quality communications, will be more favourable to change than those who have had little participation and poor communication.

Therefore the questions in the survey (Table 1), the basic structure of the semi-structured interviews, have been chosen to provide ‘content validity’ by directly assessing case study employees’ perception of communication and participation, and their subsequent feelings in relation to recent and ongoing changes.

Take in Table I – Survey statements and key used in figures

Review of the literature

A systematic review of the extant literature was conducted that initially returned 54,586 full text academic sources. These were filtered to extract only those that referred to the relationships between organisational change, resistance to change and organisational culture (or mind-sets), which returned 1500 potential papers.

Resistance to Change

Change, or organisational change, is the movement from the current known state to a new, potentially unknown state (Smith, 2005). It is often concluded in the academic literature that an inherent aspect of this organisational change behaviour is resistance, as employees attempt to negate the power and influence of their employers (Smollan, 2011).

Types of Resistance

Whilst there is little disagreement amongst the papers reviewed that resistance is complex, there are differing opinions as to the forms in which this resistance can manifest. Smollan (2011) citing Hultman (2006) identifies that resistance can be active (being critical, finding fault, appealing to fear, selective use of facts), or passive (agreeing but not following through, procrastination, withholding information), Singh *et al.*, (2012) agree with the concepts of passive and active resistance, but also identifies aggressive resistance. Smollan (2011) also identifies that change resistance can be exhibited against multiple levels in an organisation, that is to say against superiors, subordinates, peers, and external organisations, and goes on to recognise that a person may agree with the change for the overall organisation, but resist the change at a personal level.

Singh *et al.*, (2012) also categorises three ‘levels’: Organisation-Level (resulting from power and conflict, functional orientation and culture), Group-Level (resulting from group norms and group thinking), and at an Individual-Level (resulting from uncertainty, insecurity, selective perception and habit). Chawla and Kelloway (2004) however, classifies resistance in two components: attitudinal, a psychological rejection of the need to change, and behavioural, behaviours that reflect an unwillingness to support the change. Conversely, Smollan (2011, citing Prasad and Prasad, 2000) states that this is in fact a “fourfold typology” of resistance whilst Chreim (2006) offers three alternative indicators of resistance, shown in Table II. Figure 1 shows a model of resistance identifying the links identified from the literature.

Take in Table II. Typologies and Indicators of Resistance

Take in Figure 1– Links of Resistance (Source: Authors)

The Psychology of Resistance

Both Chreim (2006) and Dent and Powley (2003) argue that employees do not actually resist change, resisting rather perceived threats to their sense of autonomy, integrity, ideals, loss of status, pay, or comfort. Smith (2005) parallels this to some degree stating that, resistance can be exhibited when organisation change challenges values and perceived rights.

Taking an alternative view, Karp and Tvetarass Helgo (2009, citing Rock and Schwartz (2006)) argue that resistance is due to the effect of people’s brains resisting any form of change not directly linked to personal

survival. Certainly Smollan (2011) states that psychological researchers have noted that perception, emotion and behaviour frequently operate in unconscious or semi-conscious ways, and that behaviour is usually the outcome of cognitive affective processes.

Bovey and Hede (2001) focus on the concept that resistance is a result of perception, stating that perception of change, and reduced resistance to change, is influenced by an individual's personal growth and development. Weller and Bernadine (2007) pick up on the idea of perception, but argue that positive engagement in change is influenced by an individual's perception of how fair the change is (procedural justice).

Chreim (2006) and Karp and Tveterass Helgo (2009) posit the view that resistance is influenced by people's previous experiences, Chreim (2006) going as far as to suggest that studying how employees interpret their experiences of past changes can indicate how they will respond to future changes, and Karp and Tveterass Helgo (2009) stating that people will put together a future state, and a case for or against change that is based on their history.

Figure 2 describes the antecedent issues that may influence factors that lead to resistance.

Take in Figure 2 - Antecedent Issues of Resistance (Source: Authors)

Issues Affecting Resistance

Decker *et al.*, (2012) provide a breakdown of 'Critical Failure Factors'; issues assist in the failure of change, listing some sixty potential failure causes, and concluding that predicting success or failure is a complex process.

Chawla and Kelloway (2004) offer five factors that may influence resistance to change: trust, communication, participation, job security and procedural justice. Singh *et al.*, (2012) reduce this even further to four: awareness, understanding and concerns in relation to performance and effect. Bovey and Hede (2001, citing Kyle, 1993), argue that there are two major factors leading to resistance – 1) Control; the more the individual has control over the change, the lower the resistance; and 2) Impact; the greater the impact on the individual, the greater the resistance.

a) Communication

One area of little disagreement is the importance of communication. Smollan (2011) cites one study (Riulli and Savicki, 2006) identifying that of two groups studied, the one that had only cursory attention and information showed the greatest resistance to change. Citing IBM's 2008 *Making Change Work Study*, Jorgensen *et al.*, (2009), identified that 70% of people surveyed listed honest and timely communications as key factors in change success. Chawla and Kelloway (2004) identifies that good communication is a predictor of trust in the organisation, and therefore leads to openness, leading to a positive approach to change. Weller and Bernadine (2007) argue that effective change can be measured through the organisations ability to present, argue and describe the change. Singh *et al.*, (2012) assert that not only is communication important, if this is lacking or inaccurate then employees will fill in the blanks themselves, with inaccurate or damaging information. Found and Harvey (2007) follow a similar line, stating that change success depends on communicating an unambiguous reason and need for the change.

Dutton and Jackson (1987), determine that a positive attitude is more likely if the change is framed as having a positive outcome. This idea of a positive message is aligned to Bovey and Hede's (2001) concept that an individual's personal growth and development is likely to alter their perception of change.

b) Involvement / Participation

Further consistent agreement is the concept of the need to engage employees being affected in the management of the change. Levasseur (2010) states, that to overcome resistance to change, ensure that those affected by the change are involved early and often. Jorgensen *et al.*, (2009) identified that 72% of respondents listed employee involvement as a key factor in change success, arguing for a broader inclusion

of people in change management, and maintaining that a strong culture of empowerment and delegated power is a key factor in change success. Dent and Powley (2003) conclude that the individuals were more positive about the change when they initiated it or took part in its implementation, whilst Chawla and Kelloway (2004) contend that process control participation positively predicts trust.

Chreim (2006) advises that employees will accept a change if they feel they have control over it. Weller and Bernadine (2007) argue that change success is associated with the quality and level of the participation of employees and, going on to cite Dunphy and Stace (1998), that the concept of linking meaningful employee participations to successful change is an accepted theory.

Bovey and Hede (2001) raise a different view, citing Ellis and Harper (1975) in identifying that when individuals cannot take control of their own destiny, they will seek to control that of others. It could be concluded that this manifests in peer created resistance to change, where the resistor tries to change the perceptions of those around them.

Figure 3 summarises the issues emanating from communication and participation that affect resistance.

Take in Figure 3 - Issues Affecting Resistance (Source: Authors)

Managing Resistance

Singh *et al.*, (2012) define change management as:

“...means to plan, initiate, realise, control, and stabilise the change process on both the corporate and the personal level by handling obstacles carefully”

Going on to identify that management’s ability to achieve maximum benefits from change, in part, depends on how effectively they create and maintain a climate that minimises resistance.

As Levasseur (2010) concludes, successful change management requires the acknowledgement of the interconnectedness of the people affected by the change. Additionally, Jorgensen *et al.*, (2009) argue that it would benefit organisations to assess the people, cultural, behavioural and organisational dimensions of change management, and their impacts, and to not simply consider the technical aspects of the change. Further identifying, that learning from the historical records and “war stories”, are a good way of identifying the aspects that may affect the organisation, in a process that clearly echoes Chreim’s (2006) concept of perceptions of previous change.

Cultural, behavioural and organisational dimensions

Organisational culture can be described as the traditions, beliefs, values and sense-of-self of an organisation, based on historical factors, established notions, rituals, and leadership (Sopow, 2006; Hoogervorst *et al.*, 2004), or as the collective mind of an organisation (Sackmann, 1991). Bechtold (1997) recognises that there is general agreement that an organisations culture is formed over a period of time as groups interact to succeed in their goals, and further that the culture emerges from the collective learning experience of the groups as the organisation evolves.

Pech (2001) states that for some organisations there is an overbearing need for employees to behave in conformist ways, rather than encouraging leadership and individualism, identifying this need as ‘normative influence’. Pech goes on to argue that organisation do this under the misunderstanding that conformity and structure reduces the cognitive load on individuals, thereby making their day to day activities easier. This will emerge as developed pattered thinking, where security is found in the establishment of routines such as meetings, and standardised, regimented decision making. Ultimately, this leads to a culture that is inert, resists change, and is intolerant to creative thinking. This permeates not only as resistance to creativity, but can lead to a situation where any influencing stimulus, for example market intelligence, is ignored if it does not conform to the norm.

Lok *et al.*, (2011) identify that, for some, organisational culture may be too abstract and distance to day to day activities, and that individuals will therefore identify with the culture of their local work group, defining these sub-cultures as affiliations based on aspects such as role, location, profession, or demographic. Bechtold (1997) also cites the importance of organisational sub-cultures, arguing that organisation culture is a factor of the sub-cultures rather than the other way around, but goes on to agree with the concept that individuals may identify more strongly with their local groups, than with the organisation.

Figure 4 describes the effect of sub-cultures.

Take in Figure 4 - Effects of Sub-culture (Source: Authors)

Culture and Change

Sopow (2006) argues that many change programs fail because that they misunderstand the interrelated roles of culture and climate in the organisation. Hoogervorst, et al. (2004) expand this, stating that many change programmes focus directly on employees, rather than the conditions that determine behaviour, going on to argue that change programs should change the internal environment, and not the employee directly. Kotter and Cohen (2002) calls these centralised bureaucratic processes ‘systems barriers’, describing them as “the hierarchy, rules, and procedures – which ties the hands of employees...” Galpin (1996) suggests that for changes to be effective, they need to be clearly connected to an organisations culture, and that potential changes can be passed through a “cultural screen” of 10 elements that include – goals and measures, customs and norms, training, ceremonies and events, management behaviours, rewards and recognitions, communications, physical environment, and organisational structure. Pech (2001) also identifies the link between culture and resistance to change (non-conformity), and suggests that organisations need an open culture that inspires trust, where leadership is communicative, and where decision-making is decentralised.

Bechtold (1997) suggests a number of important cultural factors that influence positivity towards change, including: participative cultures, democratic principles and balanced power distribution. In keeping with this, Sopow (2006) identifies that for change to succeed, those factors of culture and mind-set that have a positive or negative on impact on the organisation need to be addressed, going on to provide twenty cultural and climate factors to be considered including feeling safe to express their views, encouraging new ideas, feedback, information sharing and authority to make decisions. Butcher and Clarke (2003) take a somewhat more political and managerial view, arguing that many organisations are innately motivated by self-interest and internal politics. Whilst Pech (2001) suggests that an over emphasis on conformity (normative behaviour) may actually force individuals to abandon their own views in order to simply maintain the status quo. Interestingly, Pech (*ibid*) argues that this conformist attitude becomes a self-fulfilling cultural phenomenon for an organisation, as by the time employees rise to senior positions, the influence of this culture on the individuals conformist mind-set may actually reduce their ability to recognise opportunities, thereby further perpetuating the behaviour for the organisation.

Kotter and Cohen (2002) also reference the influential role of managers in change efforts, suggesting that often the biggest barrier to change is when a manager or supervisor either explicitly, or implicitly, fails to support the change and shuts down support from employees, thereby effectively disempowering them.

Figure 5 describes the role of culture and organisational mind-set in change

Take in Figure 5 - Role of Organisational Culture (Source: Authors)

Behaviour and Change

The ‘Theory of Planned Behaviour’ (TPB) is an extension of the ‘Theory of Reasoned Action’ (TRA), which postulates the concept that the determinant factor of volitional (the act of making a conscious decision) behaviour is the a person’s intention to engage in that behaviour, where intention is classified as a person’s motivation to exert effort on the said behaviour (Conner and Armitage, 1998). As with the TRA, an individual’s intention to perform a given behaviour is a central factor of TPB, but unlike the TRA, the TPB

adds in the concept of ‘perceived behavioural control’, where perceived behavioural control refers to an individual’s perception of the ease or difficulty of the behaviour, their expectations of success, and their confidence in their ability to perform it (Ajzen, 1991). It is interesting to note therefore that Kotter and Cohen (2002) identifies that one of the biggest obstacles to change is the mind, stating that an individual’s thoughts of “I can’t do it” is a significant source of disempowerment. Ajzen (2006) adds to the concept of ‘perceived behavioural control’ by identifying ‘actual behavioural control’, referring to the actual skills and resources that a person has to perform a given behaviour, suggesting that successful performance of a behaviour depends on a sufficient level of actual behavioural control, as well as a favourable intention to perform it.

Jimmieson *et al.*, (2008) propose the idea that the TPB can in fact be used as a predictor of support for a change programme. In line with the consistent theme of the literature reviewed, they present the idea that employees who felt that they had received sufficient information, and had participated in the decision making process, had a greater positive attitude to the change. Combining this with the TPB it is suggested that, as planned behaviour is significantly affected by attitude, then timely, accurate information combined with participation with the decision making process creates a positive attitude about the change, and therefore greater likelihood that the change will be supported. Figure 6 describes the role of communication and participation in the TPB.

Take in Figure 6 - Communication and Participation in TPB (adapted from Jimmieson *et al.*, 2008)

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) is recognized as one of the most promising conceptualizations for the driving factors of individual motivation (Burton, et al., 1993). Lawler and Suttle (1973) suggest however that some caution should be taken with the application of expectancy theory; their studies suggest that whilst there is evidence to support its basic application, factors such as valence may not act as such a good predictor as these can be biased by social pressures of what is important, or simply by an individual’s ability to identify what is important. Figure 7 describes the interactions between Expectancy Theory and attitude.

Take in Figure 7 - Expectancy Theory and Attitude (Source: Authors)

Kegan and Lahey (2001) introduce the concept of ‘competing commitment’; were individuals may resist change, not because of the change itself, but due to an ‘underlying assumption’ informed by a previous experience.

This concepts works on the principle that individuals (and indeed groups) hold something that Kegan and Lahey (ibid) describe as “Big Assumptions”. Big Assumptions are the idea that a course of action will lead to a perceived undesirable result. The resulting actions, which are often unconscious, manifest as behaviours aligned to resistance. Undoubtedly there are equivalents to be drawn here with the concept that previous experience informs selective perceptions. Further to this however, it can equally be argued that Big Assumptions will, not only have a negative effect on an individual’s instrumentality, and subsequent motivation to adopted a required attitude, but will also shape their perceptions of loss; these concepts are described in Figure 8.

Take in Figure 8- Effects of ‘Competing Commitments’ on Attitude (Source: Authors)

The Resistance Model

The issues described in the main body of the review have been graphically illustrated in Figures 1 to 8. However, none of these individual models stand in isolation when the full impact of culture, resistance, and behaviour are considered. Therefore Figure 9 brings these together as an illustration of the issues, their interactions, and consequences that should be considered.

Take in Figure 9 – The Resistance Model (Source: Authors)

Empirical Testing

To test the assumptions that communication and participation have a significant role on reducing resistance to change the following three hypotheses were developed:

H1_A: Communication and engagement during organisational change reduces resistance to change.

H2_A: Levels of employee communication and engagement are a factor of organisation mind-set (culture).

H3_A: Change programmes that address the subtle indirect issues of resistance have more potential for acceptance.

The hypotheses were tested empirically in the form of a case study, involving an anonymous survey and a series of semi-structured interviews.

Findings

A total of 46 ($n = 46$) surveys were returned, which equates to just over 27% of the population in the case study organisation. Figure 10 shows a graphical representation of this data, where each bar of the chart refers to a statement (shown in Table I), and the sections of each bar representing the proportion of responses that conform to an agreement level.

What can be immediately seen from the results is that only 6% of respondents disagreed with the statement: “Recent changes have had an effect on my role within the business”, with 70% of responses being either ‘Somewhat Agree’ or ‘Strongly Agree’; this indicates that the case study is appropriate for studying change and its antecedents.

As well as exploring the strength of the perceptions, the relationships between the various responses were tested using Kendall’s ‘rank order correlation coefficient’ (Kendall’s Tau (r)), Table III.

Take in Figure 10 - Survey Result Proportions (Source: Authors)

Take in Table III – Kendall’s Tau Assessment of relationships between responses to statements, shown in Table I (Source: Authors)

Table III illustrates the strength of the relationships where very strong ($r > 0.7$ or $r < -0.7$) are highlighted in black, reasonably strong ($r = 0.6$ to 0.699 or $r = -0.6$ to -0.699) in medium grey, and moderate ($r = 0.5$ to 0.599 or $r = -0.5$ to -0.599) in light grey. Relationships with a r between 0.499 and -0.499 were discarded.

It is obvious that there are ten very strong relationships. The relationship between 'C' ("*The changes make me more confident...*") and 'B' ("*The changes make me less confident...*") with a value of $r = -0.751$ refers to the 'check question' and the strong negative correlation coefficient is as expected, indicating that the respondents have considered the questions.

The relationship between statements 'H' and 'I' ($r = 0.718$) seems to indicate, that for those respondents who felt that they were given opportunity to provide feedback, also felt that their feedback was considered and responded to.

A cluster of high r 's exists between statements 'J', 'K', and 'L'. This cluster appears to show a strong positive relationship between the scopes of involvement; indicating that where involvement is sought, it is not restricted to just the change, but to the effects on both the individual, and the department. This is supported by the strong positive relationship seen between 'P' and 'Q' ($r = 0.762$), where there is a link between feelings of positivity regarding the effect on an individual's role, and the effect on the department.

An interesting cluster appears around statements 'M', 'N' and 'O'. What stands out here is the relationship between support for the changes ('N'), feelings of positivity ('M') ($r = 0.722$), and positive effects on the business ('O') ($r = 0.769$). Parallels can be drawn between this and the idea that, when support is forthcoming, it creates a positive attitude (Chawla and Kelloway, 2004; Chreim, 2006) and aligns with individual needs (Armenakis and Harris, 2002; Karp and Tveterass Helgo, 2009).

The data identified is also analogous with the idea of 'expectancy theory'. Given that a positive attitude could be indicative of a perception that the change would result in an increased level of performance, and aligns with the individuals' personal valence. Given that performance and valence are important factors in creating motivation (Dinibutun, 2012), it is argued that the individuals involved, are motivated to support and feel more positive about the change.

However, a number of observations had large standardised residuals. Removing the large standardised residuals, and recalculating the results, returns r^2 value of 79.9% ($n = 39$, $p = 0.000$), therefore it can be reasonably concluded that, with regards to the change, feelings of positivity have a significant effect on an individual's support of that change.

Viewing this data in relation to the 'Resistance Model' supports a number of the concepts previously suggested; these are shown in an extract of the 'Resistance Model' in Figure 11, where 'security' and 'future ability' results in both an emotional state, as well as perceptions of loss, which in turn via selective perception, uncertainty and insecurity, leads to resistance.

Take in Figure 11 - The Effects of 'Security' and 'Future Ability' on Resistance (Source: Authors)

Whilst there is strong support for communication, most striking is the low level of relationship between the factors concerning involvement ('J', 'K', and 'L') relating to positivity or support. Whilst the relationships in relation to 'M' (positivity) and 'N' (support) are statistically significant (all have $p < 0.05$), the r^2 values are all relatively low (typically less than 20%). This issue, and that of communication, was explored more fully in the interviews.

All interviewees expressed concerns about a general lack of communication during various changes, but in particular at the early stages of the changes. This is consistent with the results of the survey, which suggest that a higher percentage of respondents felt that there was a lack of adequate opportunity to provide feedback; again supporting the concept that two-way communication is important during changes programmes.

Given the unexpected lack of relationship between support and involvement seen in the survey results, involvement was explored in some detail during the interviews. Interestingly, the overwhelming opinion of

those interviewed was, that those affected by the changes, should be involved in the details of the changes. More importantly however, that involvement is necessary to gain support. Whilst this is consistent with the results of the literature review and the 'Resistance Model', it does not seem to match the results of the survey.

Analysis of findings

Taking the hypothesis in order we discuss the findings.

H1_A: Communication and engagement during organisational change reduces resistance to change.

Firstly, the analysis of the relationship between survey statements clearly indicates that feelings of positivity are an important indicator of support ($r^2=79.9\%$ with large residuals removed). Following this, the data indicates that feelings of positivity are a factor of good communications about the reasons for the change ($r^2=67.7\%$ with large residuals removed), indicating that communication has a role in creating support. More importantly however, is the relationship between support and good communications about the reasons for the change ($r^2=35.1\%$ with large residuals removed), for whilst not as strong as the relationship with positivity, this still supports the concept that communication plays a direct role in creating support.

Turning to the interview data, firstly this supports the importance of communication and provides significant weight to the concept of involvement. Not only is involvement equal in prominence to communication but also that involvement is required to create support.

Taken together, the data from the survey, along with the output of the interview, the concept that communication and engagement (involvement) are a factor in support for change is evident, and therefore that hypothesis H1_A is supported.

H2_A: Levels of employee communication and engagement are a factor of organisation mind-set (culture).

Firstly, in considering the survey data it can clearly be seen, from Figure 10, that a larger proportion of respondents disagreed with the statements relating to two-way communication and involvement. The survey clearly shows that the case study organisation fails in communication and involvement and that these are reflected in the organisational culture. This was further tested in a later study (not reported here) by measures of organisational culture that supported H2a.

H3_A: Change programmes that address the subtle indirect issues of resistance have more potential for acceptance.

The case study shows that many of the issues that can lead to resistance to change are present. This is shown by the 65% of survey respondents who disagreed that they had been given the opportunity to be involved in the details of the change, the 48% who disagreed that the organisation communicates well, or the 52% who felt that their views and opinions were generally not considered. Clearly by understanding and addressing these issues support could be garnered, which in turn supports H3a.

Conclusions

Change and resistance to change, are complex, multi-dimensional concepts that contain many 'subtle issues'. These issues can have a myriad of effects on those involved, often in ways that are not immediately obvious to organisations.

Simply stating that individuals will resist change, and that resistance is therefore an inevitable consequence that organisations must face is not enough. Employees do not actually resist change itself, but rather, resist the perceived effects of the change. Particularly, when those effects are misaligned with their personal agendas, appear to be the precursor to loss, or when they have previous experience of poorly managed change efforts.

Unfortunately, the manifestations of resistance can be as complex, contradictory, and numerous as their causes. In understanding the causes of resistance, the psychological, psychodynamic, and cognitive processes that underlie the reactions to change need to be examined.

An individual may resist change due to their perception of the consequences of the change, the fact that the change does not align with theirs or their group's concept of values, or that the results of the change are not believed to be important. The reality unfortunately, is that it is actually a combination of many factors, some of which may be contradictory, that are influencing an individual's perception and therefore, their ability to support the change. These complexities can result in misunderstanding. Many organisations, rather than seeking to understand why the resistance exists, or viewing it as a potential result of issues with the change programme, simply try to stamp out the resistance. However, attempting to control resistance without understanding and addressing the underlying causes, simply has the potential to create even more resistance.

From both the literature and the case study findings it can be concluded that change programmes that address the subtle indirect issues of communication, involvement and resistance have more potential for acceptance.

The 'Resistance Model' is presented as a valid representation of the relationships between, and the factors that lead to, resistance in change programmes.

Finally, it is concluded that, by understanding the factors that lead to change resistance, it is possible to create a change programme that is better suited to an organisation.

Limitations, Reflections, and Future Research

This is only one case study of one organisation, and therefore there are limitations in making generalisations to all organisations. That said however, the simple fact that 70% of survey respondents agreed that recent changes had affected their role in the organisation, shows validity in choosing this case study.

The weight of evidence therefore raises two interesting questions. Firstly, why when surveyed did more respondents feel they could support the change than not? Secondly, why was there such a weak relationship between involvement and support?

For involvement, it is believed that two factors play a part here. As identified, participation at later stages of the changes was encouraged, and whilst this is clearly not as effective as early involvement, it does lessen the effect somewhat. The second factor is communication. Communication plays a significant part in change acceptance, when communication is lacking or inconsistent, it overrides other issues significantly. This can be seen in the causal relationship between communication and positivity, and positivity and support. It is suggested that in the case study, this lack of communication made involvement a secondary issue.

Whilst the evidence presented strongly supports the presented hypothesis and 'Resistance Model', further research should be conducted to confirm this in other organisations.

Finally, it is suggested that using the evidence presented, along with the 'Resistance Model', research may be conducted into the creation of a generalised set of guidelines for change programmes; initially identifying and therefore addressing organisational cultural issues that affect subsequent change success.

References

Ajzen, I., (1991), "The Theory of Planned Behaviour", *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), pp. 179-211.

Ajzen, I., (2006), Icek Ajzen: Theory of Planned Behaviour. Available at: <http://people.umass.edu/ajzen/tpb.diag.html> (Accessed 16 March 2014).

Armenakis, A. A. & Harris, S. G., (2002), "Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness", *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, 15(2), pp. 169-183.

Bechtold, B. L., (1997), "Towards a participative organisational culture: evolution or revolution?", *Empowerment in Organisations*, 5(1), pp. 4-7.

Bovey, W. H. & Hede, A., (2001), "Resistance to organizational change: the role of cognitive and affective processes", *Leadership & Organisational Development Journal*, 22(8), pp. 372-382.

- Burton, F., Chen, Y., Grover, V. & Stewart, K., (1993), "An application of expectancy theory for assessing user motivation to utilize an expert system", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 9(3), pp. 183-197.
- Butcher, D. & Clarke, M., (2003), "Redefining managerial work: smart politics", *Management Decision*, 41(5), pp. 477-487.
- Chawla, A. & Kelloway, E. K., (2004), "Predicting openness and commitment to change", *Leadership & Organisational Development Journal*, 25(5/6), pp. 485-498.
- Chreim, S., (2006), "Postscript to change: survivors' retrospective views of organisational changes", *Personnel Review*, 35(3), pp. 315-335.
- Conner, M. & Armitage, C. J., (1998), "Extending the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A Review and Avenues for Further Research", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), pp. 1429-1464.
- Decker, P. et al., (2012), "Predicting Implementation Failure in Organizational Change", *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 16(2), pp. 29-49.
- Dent, E. B. & Powley, E. H., (2003), "Employees Actually Embrace Change: The Chimera of Resistance", *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), pp. 40-56.
- Dinibutun, S. R., (2012), "Work Motivation: Theoretical Framework", *Journal on GSTF Business Review*, 1(4), pp. 133-139.
- Dutton, J. E. & Jackson, S. E., (1987), "Categorizing Strategic Issues: Links to Organizational Action", *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), pp. 76-90.
- Galpin, T., (1996), "Connecting culture to organisational change", *HRMagazine*, 41(3), pp. 84-89.
- Hoogervorst, J., van der Flier, H. & Kooperman, P., (2004), "Implicit communication in organisations: The impact of culture, structure and management practices on employee behaviour", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(3), pp. 288-311.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Peach, M. & White, K. M., (2008), "Utilizing the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Inform Change Management: An Investigation of Employee Intentions to Support Organisational Change", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(2), pp. 237-262.
- Jorgensen, H. H., Owen, L. & Heus, A., (2009), "Stop improvising change management!", *Strategy & Leadership*, 37(2), pp. 38-44.
- Karp, T. & Tveterass Helgo, T. I., (2009), "Reality revisited: leading people in chaotic change", *Journal of Management Development*, 28(2), pp. 81-93.
- Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. L., (2001), "The Real Reason People Won't Change", *Harvard Business Review*, 79(), pp. 85-92.
- Kotter, J. P. & Cohen, D. S., (2002), "Creative ways to empower action to change the organisation: Cases in point", *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 22(1), pp. 73-82.
- Lawler, E. E. & Suttle, J. L., (1973), "Expectancy Theory and Job Behaviour", *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Issue 9, pp. 482-503.
- Lawrence, P. R., (1969), "How to Deal With Resistance to Change", *Harvard Business Review*, available at <https://hbr.org/1969/01/how-to-deal-with-resistance-to-change> (accessed 14 February 2015)
- Levasseur, R. E., (2010), "People Skills: Ensuring Project Success - A Change Management Perspective", *Interfaces*, 40(2), pp. 159-162.

- Likert, R., (1932), "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes". *Archives of Psychology*, Volume 140, pp. 1-55.
- Pech, R. J., (2001), "Reflections: Termites, group behaviour, and the loss of innovation: Conformity rules!", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(7), pp. 559-574.
- Rowley, J., (2002), "Using Case Studies in Research", *Management Research News*, 25(1), pp. 16-27.
- Sackmann, S., (1991), *Cultural Knowledge in Organizations: Exploring the Collective Mind*, Sage Club, Newbury Park.
- Saunders, M., Philip, L. & Thornhill, A., (2009), *Research methods for business students (5th Edition)*. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- Scott, T., Mannion, R. D. H. & Marshall, M., (2003), The Quantitative Measurement of Organisational Culture in Health Care: A Review of the Available Instruments. *Health Services Research*, 38(3), pp. 923-945.
- Simon, L. J., (2004), Lesson #5: Model Checking Using Residuals. Available at: http://online.stat.psu.edu/online/development/stat501/05model_check/05model_check_nonlinear.html (Accessed 27 April 2014).
- Singh, K., Saeed, M. & Bertsch, A., (2012), "Key Factors Influencing Employee Responses Towards Change: A Test in the Telecom Industry in India", *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 13(3), pp. 66-81.
- Smith, I., (2005), "Continuing professional development and workplace learning: Resistance to change - recognition and response", *Library Management*, 26(8/9), pp. 519-522.
- Smollan, R. K., (2011), "The multi-dimensional nature of resistance to change", *Journal of Management & Organization*, 17(6), pp. 828-849.
- Sopow, E., (2006), "The impact of culture and climate on change programs", *Strategic Communication Management*, 10(6), pp. 14-17.
- Weller, S. & Bernadine, V. G., (2007), "Attitudes towards Workplace Change in the Australian Higher Education Sector: a tale of divergence and a case for reform", *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 32(2), pp. 53-68.
- UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group, 2013. What does Cronbach's alpha mean? Available at: <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq/alpha.html> (Accessed 07 February 2015).
- Yin, R. K., (2003), *Case Study Research - Design and Methods*. 3rd ed. Sage, Thousand Oaks, C.A.
- Xenikou, A. & Furnham, A., 1996. A Correlational and Factor Analytic Study of Four Questionnaire Measures of Organizational Culture. *Human Relations*, 49(3), pp. 349-371.