Emotional Reactions to the Experiences of Transformational Change: Evidence from the Department of Correctional Services of South Africa

Mbongeni A. Mdletye

Jos Coetzee

Wilfred I. Ukpere

*Department of Industrial Psychology and People Management, Faculty of Management
University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
E-mail: wilfredukpere@gmail.com*

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p501

Abstract

This is a follow up to a previous paper by the authors on transformational change within an offender correctional environment, which focuses on the human dimension of transformational change. The current treatise captures evidence gathered from Correctional Centres of the Department of Correctional Services of South Africa on correctional officials' and offenders' reactions to, and experiences of, transformational change, which entails a paradigm shift from a punishment-oriented philosophy to a rehabilitation-oriented philosophy in terms of treatment of incarcerated offenders (herein referred to as the DCS change). Lack of sufficient empirical evidence on the significant role that the human elements play in the success or failure of transformational change interventions motivate the authors to undertake an empirical study that sought to establish how correctional officials and offenders have reacted to and experienced the DCS change. This was an important study given the fact that arguments have been advanced to the effect that the high failure rate experienced in the implementation of transformational change efforts is due to the neglect of the human factor during transformational change planning process and implementation. This study was intended to benefit managers in both the public and private sector organizations globally and particularly in South Africa, where organizations are currently engaged in massive transformational change efforts as a result of the government's programme of reconstruction and development of the South African society. For purposes of contextualizing people's reactions to and experiences within the Department of Correctional Services and South Africa in general, an extensive literature study was undertaken. The literature study was followed by the empirical study whereby data was collected by means of two survey questionnaires, namely one for correctional officials, and the other for offenders. The empirical findings pointed to the fact that transformational change evoked various emotional reactions and experiences on the part of both correctional officials and offenders, which ranged from positive affect to negative affect through to introspective-anxious affect.

Keywords: Change leadership, change management, organizational change, transformation, emotional

1. Introduction and Background

The globalization of economic, social, cultural, technological and political activities has compelled organizations throughout the world to undergo massive and regular transformational changes in order to remain competitive. Available empirical evidence shows that the implementation of these massive transformational changes does not yield the desired results due to the high failure rate (Coetzee and Stanz, 2007; Alvesson and Svenningsson, 2008; Aiken and Keller, 2009; Turner, Hallencreutz and Haley, 2009; Turner, 2011). According to Johnston (2008), Bregman (2009), Imberman (2009), Kohurt (2010) and Agboola and Salawu (2011), the situation is far from improving as organizations continue to record high failure rate in change implementation. This high failure rate indicates how big the challenge is in terms of managing change. Research conducted by Bartunek, Rousseau, Rudolph and De Palma (2006) highlighted the fact that organizational change researchers continue to pay little attention to the human dimension of change, which amongst other human elements and dynamics of transformational changes, includes people's reactions to and experiences of change.

Despite growing consensus that employees' acceptance of change holds the key to the success of transformational change initiatives, managers do not make any meaningful efforts to manage people's emotional reactions and experiences which unfortunately have a profound influence on change implementation in terms of the

support for or opposition to change, which ultimately determines whether the transformational change effort being implemented will be a success or failure. Ignoring people's emotional reactions and experiences is a recipe for disaster insofar as change implementation is concerned. This assertion is based on the fact that organizational goals are achieved through and with people. It is for this reason that Nickols (2010) emphasizes that organizations cannot exist without the people. Therefore, even the transformational change efforts that are implemented to enhance the achievement of organizational goals need people for their success to be ensured and attained. For this reason, brushing aside people's feelings about any transformational change implemented will undoubtedly harden people's reactions to change efforts and as such, people's co-operation and support for change will be negatively affected. As Nickols (2010) puts it, transformational changes taking place within organizations cannot affect organizations to the exclusion of the people.

Considering the above, it is important for managers to note that people are affected by transformational changes on an individual level and as such, people react to how they experience changes on a personal level (Herold and Fedor, 2008). Therefore, if any transformational change efforts are to succeed, managers need to give recognition to and address people's emotional reactions to and experiences of transformational change. Addressing people's emotional reactions and experiences requires that people should be engaged during the transformational change planning and implementation processes. This is necessary in order to ensure that people's negative emotional reactions to, and negative experiences of change are minimized to the lowest level possible (Zolno, 2009; Panao, 2010).

Previous empirical studies have highlighted that transformational change affect people more in a negative than in a positive sense (Van Tonder, 2004a; Worrall and Cooper, 2004), hence they react to transformational change more negatively than positively. Therefore, without people's concerns about transformational change being addressed, negative reactions and experiences will continue to be a threat to the successful implementation of transformational change interventions. Managers need to be mindful of the fact that transformational change efforts are not only driven by people, but they are also experienced by people (Rodda, 2007; Imberman, 2009; Sloyan, 2009). Without people's reactions and experiences being addressed, efforts at implementing, institutionalizing and sustaining transformational change interventions will yield no fruits. Lastly, one critical point needs to be emphasized here, which is that the importance of dealing with the human dimension of transformational change insofar as people's emotional reactions and experiences seems to elude both organizational change researchers, when one considers the limited literature available on the influence of the human factor on change implementation, and organizational managers at change strategic and change implementation levels and also considers managers' bias towards the technical aspects of change to the total neglect of people issues.

1.1 Problem statement

The low success rate in change implementation coupled with limited literature on the human dimension of change as well as lack of technical know-how on the part of managers reflects the magnitude of the challenges facing organizational change scholars and managers within the realm of organizational transformational change management, as reflected in the findings of the empirical study conducted in the Department of Correctional Services of South Africa.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of this paper are:

- To highlight the importance of managers in addressing people's emotional reactions to the experiences of transformational change,
- To establish and highlight emotional reactions and experiences associated with the implementation of transformational change efforts in the Department of Correctional Services of South Africa,
- To emphasize the importance of managers in establishing understanding and addressing people negative emotional reactions and experiences before, during and after the transformational change implementation process, and
- To stress the importance of decisive managerial action in order to ensure that people as individuals are engaged in a process of personal transformation.

1.3 Significance and contributions of the study

The findings of the study will add empirical value to the existing literature on transformational change management, particularly when it comes to the human dimension of transformational change. The outcome of the study will be of great interest to change agents, change strategists, change implementers, change recipients, organizational development practitioners and managers in general in both the public and private sectors in South Africa, who are charged with the enormous responsibility of initiating, implementing, institutionalizing and sustaining organization-wide transformational changes as part of the government's transformation agenda. The study's setting within the offender correctional environment will deepen correctional managers and correctional officials' understanding of transformational change management, particularly when it comes to the facilitation of effective and efficient transformational change at personal level on the part of the offenders.

1.4 Literature on Emotional Reaction to and Experiences of Transformation Change

In dealing with the two notions of people's emotional reactions to and experiences of transformational change, this article moves from the premise that both the organization and change are all about people. And as such, everything that takes place within organizations including change, requires the involvement, support and guidance of people for it to be a success. For people to effectively and meaningfully participate, guide and support transformational change implementation, they need to change their negative mindsets that are underpinned by negative perceptions, beliefs, values, norms, attitudes and emotions. It is for this reason that Van Tonder (2004a) regards personal change as a precursor to organizational change. Personal transformation serves as a vehicle to facilitate organizational transformation, which points to the importance of effectively managing transformational change at both individual and organizational levels.

Imberman (2009) emphasizes that people, as members of organizations, are not passive to organizational change initiatives. Changes affect people as well and as such, if changes are to succeed, people as individuals should be engaged (Zolno, 2009; Panao, 2010). Organizations are made up of people who, as individuals, react to and experience change on a personal level (Kohurt, 2010). It is these different reactions and experiences that determine the success or failure of transformational change efforts. As such, the human element plays a significant role in determining the success or failure of organizational change initiatives (Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Panao, 2010).

It is a fact that organizational goals and objectives are achieved through and with people, namely the employees. Organizational effectiveness and efficiency is ensured through people at individual, team and organizational levels. Going back to the paradigm of an organization as a system made up of inextricably linked parts, it needs to be remembered that employees as human beings form part of this interlinked whole called an organization. The organization, as a system, is made up of two systems, namely the person system and the organization system (Van Tonder, 2006). The person system relates to the human factor, while the organization system refers to the non-human factor, which entails processes, systems, equipment (e.g. technology) and structures.

The non-human elements on their own are meaningless and useless in terms of attaining organizational effectiveness and efficiency. They need the involvement of the human element for the operationalization of activities. There is an ongoing and constant interaction between the human element and the non-human element within the organization. The human element is needed for the operationalization of the non-human element geared towards enhancing organizational effectiveness and efficiency in terms of production or rendering of services. The non-human element, such as processes, systems, structures and technology, are needed to ensure labour effectiveness and efficiency. There can be no touch on the non-human element which does not affect the human element and vice versa.

This further suggests and vindicates the assertion that there can be no attainment of organizational goals without the involvement of people, namely the human element. It is in the same vein that Decker, Wheeler, Johnson & Parsons (2001) emphasize that employees as the most valuable organizational asset, have a strong influence on the operational success of any organization. Employees hold the key to the mastering of organizational activities. They are the embodiment of the soul of the organization (Zimmerman, 1995). Similarly, it can be argued that because organization-wide changes involve changing the non-human elements that people work with in order to attain organizational goals, the human factor in organizations has a critical role to play in terms of ensuring that organizational change interventions become a success. This assertion is based on the fact that changing the non-human element will invariably affect the human element, whether it is in terms of job security (retrenchment or redeployment), work relationships or job status. These in turn create anxiety, fear, doubts, depression and stress for the employees (Van Tonder, 2004a). Given this, it

means that organizational change efforts create challenges for employees, which affect their performance and personal well-being. For this reason, it is clear that the human element stands at the centre of all organizational change initiatives. Employees hold the key to the mastering of organizational change. They are the embodiment of the soul of what the organization is and what it will become (Zimmerman, 1995). Therefore, acknowledging the human dimension of the organization is of great imperative. The experiences of employees during times of organizational change have not been explored widely. It is for that reason that employees' experiences of organizational change initiative in the Department of Correctional Services were strongly the focused on people's emotional reactions and experiences of change. According to Van Tonder (2004b), organizations cannot exist without their employees and no organizational change can or will take place effectively if and when the individual employees are not engaged in change initiatives. The argument advanced by Van Tonder is that the extent to which employees internalize, accept and support organizational change determines how they experience the change.

Acknowledging the human dimension of organizational change through establishing employees' perceptions and experiences of organizational change is necessary in order to ensure that employees, as change recipients, find their stability and security in the culture and direction that the organization is taking in terms of the envisioning change. When employees are helped to find their stability and security, they will be able to support the change as agents of change (Van Tonder, 2004a). However, if attention is not paid to facilitating change at individual level, behavioural resistance as well as systemic resistance will derail and hamper organizational change efforts. The foregoing assertion makes people within organizations the main source of organizational change failures (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia & Irmer, 2007). Subjecting individual employees to change in order to change their negative perceptions and emotions is also echoed by Miller (2004) who emphasizes that due to the fact that organizational change is about people, nothing will significantly change if people, as individuals and as groups, do not change.

The idea that people function better when their needs are addressed is emphasized by one of the organization paradigms, namely the *human relations* paradigm. The human relations paradigm acknowledges the importance of recognizing and addressing the social and psychological needs of employees because if they are not addressed, they manifest themselves in emotions of fear, anxiety, attitudes and expectations (Van Tonder, 2004b). Maslow's hierarchy of needs emphasizes the meeting of people's needs if people are to function optimally (Morgan, King, Weisz & Schopler, 1986). These needs relate to needs such as physiological needs, namely hunger and thirst, safety needs, namely security, stability, order and cordial relations between the employer and employees, as well as among employees themselves, belongingness and love needs, namely affection, affiliation and identification, esteem needs, namely status and prestige and self-actualization need. If the organization fails to meet employees' needs, their morale is negatively affected, which may negatively impact on their job satisfaction which ultimately affects individual employee's job performance. When there is a plunge in job performance at individual employee level, job performance at team and organizational levels also suffers.

Devanna and Tichy (1990) emphasizes that the success of organizational change resides more on individuals rather than organizational dynamics. The success of organizational change depends largely on individual employees changing not only their behaviours, but their attitudes, skills, knowledge, beliefs and perceptions as well. This is necessary in order to ensure that they adopt behaviours and attitudes that are in line with the planned change initiative. Kanter, Stein and Jick (1992) and Van Tonder (2004a) also recognize that focusing on the individuals by taking them on a journey of personal transition will assist in bringing about a state of organizational readiness to change, which will enable effective implementation of organizational change. Wilson (1992) and Wilson (1994) also add that the achievement of organizational change objectives cannot be realized without a significant change in the beliefs, attitudes and emotions displayed by individual employees.

Justifying the importance of addressing people's emotional experiences of change, Clarke (1994) emphasizes that change threatens organizational members in the head, heart and guts. This refers to the fears, doubts, anxiety, and loss of hope, frustrations, depression, stress, etc., that organizational members experience as a result of organizational change initiatives (Van Tonder, 2004b). These emotions call upon change strategists and change implementers to focus more on how individuals within organizations experience their world of organizational change.

The recognition that employees perceive and experience organizational change in different ways is an important point of departure for engaging change purposefully. Individual employees construe change events and processes differently and based on this, organizational members experience change events and processes differently, either positively or negatively, depending on their willingness and ability to adapt to change (which also come in different ways)(Van Tonder, 2004a). Organizational change can evoke diverse emotional experiences which could range from anxiety, loneliness, despair, doubt, fear, frustration, despondency and resignation, to hope, joy, emancipation and

excitement. Some employees may embrace organizational change, regarding it as a liberating experience that provides opportunities for personal and professional growth, while others may resist change and perceive it as a source of discomfort and loss (Van Tonder, 2005). The foregoing reflects that humans response to change at personal or intrapersonal level, resides in the emotion or feeling domain, as well as in the cognitive domain. It is only employees who experience intrapersonal transition.

It was indicated earlier on that organizations currently face changes of unprecedented magnitudes, and yet very little is known about employees' different emotional reactions to and experiences of organizational changes as a result of the different effects of organizational change. According to Briner and Kiefer (2005), there is still limited or weak knowledge base on employee experience and reaction to change. It is important to note that there are empirical studies that have addressed the subject of employee experience of, and employee reactions to, organizational change. Rodda (2007) conducting an empirical study on the examination of employee reactions to organizational change, concludes that the understanding of the psychological and behavioural foundations of employees' reactions to organizational change is critical for managers who want to manage and support employees who are affected by change. As Zerbe, Hartel and Ashkanasy (2010) point out, organizational events such as transformational change do affect employees' emotions and actions which, in turn, affect organizational events, positively or negatively.

In the light of the foregoing, the understanding of employees' emotional reactions to and experiences of organizational change becomes a matter of critical importance. Jick (1993) provides two frameworks for explaining employees' reactions to change. The first framework stipulates that the individual employee's reaction to change is shaped by the individual's perception of the change initiative or process. If the employee perceives the change initiative or process as a risk, the reaction to change will be characterized by such reactions as shock, as a result of perceived threat or denial, defensive retreat due to anger, acknowledgement, which involves mourning with a desire to let go, as well as adaptation and change, whereby the employee begins to experience comfort with change.

Some studies on organizational change suggest that employees' reactions to organizational change are influenced by employees' individual dispositions (Oreg, 2003). Organizational change is experienced emotionally by employees; hence it evokes powerful emotions and reactions. Emotions and reactions are sparked off by the perception of an insecure future, the perception of inadequate working conditions and the perception of inadequate treatment by the organization (Kiefer, 2005). According to Rafferty & Simons (2006), these personal dispositions evoke different kinds and levels of reactions towards organizational change. These individual characteristics such as resilience, which is measured in terms of optimism, self-esteem and perceived control, self-perception, which is defined in terms of locus of control, feeling of self-efficacy, and positive affectivity and risk tolerance. These are all related to employees' acceptance of and coping with organizational change (Wanberg & Banas, 2000; Bareil, Savoie & Meunier, 2007).

Employees' reactions to organizational change are also influenced by the way in which organizational change efforts are implemented. And this leads to variance in employees' reactions to organizational change (Bareil, Savoie & Meunier, 2007). Ursiny and Kay (2007) point out that people respond differently to change. People's first response to change is shock, which is brought about by envisaged loss of something valuable. Shock is followed by depression, anxiety, withdrawal, stagnation, and failure, which are seen as people's reaction to change. Therefore one can conclude that the reaction of employees to organizational change efforts is influenced by a particular organizational change intervention that has touched employees' work and personal lives. It is this impact on employees' personal and work lives, that determines whether an organizational change initiative will be perceived as justified or not. If it is perceived as justified, acceptance is more likely, which is as well influenced by employees' positive perception of organizational support (Self, Armenakis & Schraeder, 2007). This implies that the higher the organizational support as perceived by the employees, the more likely employees will embrace organizational change, vice versa.

2. Methodology

This study utilized a two-pronged research approach, which encompassed a literature reviews and quantitative empirical study. Methodologically, the study applied a mixed approach in that three types of research designs, namely the exploratory design, the survey design, and descriptive design were utilized. They each played a distinct and complementary role in conducting this empirical study. The exploratory approach was used in the literature study phase to gain insight into the research problem with a view to elucidating the research problem. The survey research design was utilized in order to enable the researcher to conduct a quantitative study of the sampled population (Kline, 2004). The descriptive research approach was applied in order to minimize errors and optimize reliability.

2.1 Sample, sampling method and population

At the time of administering the questionnaires, there were approximately 7593 correctional officials working in the seven management areas constituting the Department of Correctional Services in the KwaZulu-Natal Province and 13, 520 sentenced offenders, from which a 13.17% sample for correctional officials and an 8.14% sample for sentenced offenders were drawn for the study. A random, purposive and probability samples of 1000 correctional service officials and 500 offenders were utilized. The sample was selected from a population of correctional officials and offenders in the KwaZulu-Natal region of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS), which was utilized as the case organization.

2.2 Research procedure

The procedure followed in the execution of this empirical study entailed seeking permission to conduct research in correctional centres from the Research Ethics Committee of the Department of Correctional Services at the Head Office. Pilot study conducted for by the administering of the research instruments, and the scoring of responses. The empirical data was collected by means of two survey questionnaires, one for correctional officials and the other for offenders. A 5-point Likert type response scale was utilized in the two questionnaires to measure correctional officials and offenders emotional reactions to and experiences of transformational change. It is important to note that the scale did not make any provision for respondents to provide "neutral", "uncertain", or "undecided" responses.

2.3 Statistical analysis

The completed questionnaires were analyzed by means of the SPSS statistical package. The statistical analysis was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 focused on descriptive statistics with a view to providing proof that the two questionnaires used as measuring instruments were reliable and valid for the purpose of this study. In terms of sample statistics, frequency analysis was utilized to describe the sample obtained, as suggested by Kerlinger (1992). The responses on both questionnaires were subjected to factor analysis according to the procedure suggested by Scheepers (1992) in order to determine the factor structure of the two measuring instruments.

To determine the adequacy and sphericity of the intercorrelation matrix, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity were conducted. A reliability analysis was also conducted on the measuring instruments with the purpose of calculating a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). Phase 2 dealt with inferential statistics through the utilization of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), which was employed to measure the existence of relationships between variables.

2.4 Response rate

Table 3 presents the composition of the sample and response rate in terms of both correctional officials and offenders. It is important to note that the return rate of 71.3% and the frequency rate of 98.2% for valid responses were recorded for correctional officials. For the offenders' sample, the return rate of 58.2% and the frequency rate of 97.6 for valid responses were recorded.

Table 3 Frequency Table of Participating Management Areas/Regional Office of the Obtained Sample

Management Areas	Correctional Officials			Offenders		
	Frequency	%age	Cum. %age	Frequency	%age	Cum. %age
Durban	113	15.3	15.3	79	27.1	27.1
Glencoe	51	7.1	22.4	21	7.0	34.1
Ncome	86	12.0	34.4	71	25.9	60.0
Waterval	144	19.7	54.1	90	29.3	89.3
Kokstad	101	13.8	67.9	30	10.0	99.3
Empangeni	17	2.4	70.3	-	-	-
Pietermaritzburg	196	27.2	97.5	-	-	-
Regional Office	5	0.7	98.2	-	-	-
Valid	700	98.2		284	97.6	

Missing	13	1.8	7	2.4
Total	713	100.0	291	100.0

Source: Author's Fieldwork

2.5 Structural integrity of measuring instruments

Face validity, which is the inspection of the individual items on both questionnaires, as represented by the examples of the items from the two questionnaires given in Tables 1 and 2, reveals high face validity. Content validity, which is the contents of the questionnaire are relevant to the research question dealing with correctional officials and offenders emotional reaction to and experience of the DCS transformational change intervention. Construct validity, which is based on results of face validity and content validity was done. Hence it can be concluded that the two questionnaires utilized in the study measured what they were designed to measure in terms of the emotional reactions and experiences of the DCS transformational change activities.

2.6 Reliability analysis

Two statistical techniques are most commonly used to help assess the appropriateness of data for factorability, namely, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1970) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954). Therefore, in the case of this study, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed using the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett's test for sphericity. The results of the assessment of the suitability of data for factor analysis are captured in Tables 4 (for correctional officials) and 5 (for offenders). From Table 4, it is clear that the data sets in respect of correctional officials complied with the requirements of sampling adequacy and sphericity and could thus be subjected to factor analysis. A result of 0.6 and higher is always required from the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) for it to be acceptable for factor analysis purposes (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2003; Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The KMO MSA value for the experience of DCS change variable in respect of correctional officials was .939, which is highly significant because it is well above 0.6 recommended values.

For the offender variables, it is evident from interrogating Table 5 that the data sets complied with the requirements of sampling adequacy and sphericity. The KMO MSA value obtained for the experience of DCS change variable was .876, which indicates high significance. The KMO value exceeded the recommended cut-off value of 0.6 (Hair et al., 2006). Lastly, the Bartlett's test of sphericity values (that is, Sig. values) should be .05 or smaller. Therefore, it is significant to note that the Bartlett's test values for both correctional officials and offenders reached statistical significance ($p=0.000$), thereby supporting the factorability of the correlation matrices. Therefore, based on the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's sphericity test values, it is concluded that the data gathered were found suitable for factoring.

Table 4. KMO MSA and Bartlett's Sphericity Test Results: Correctional Officials

Factor	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		
		Approx. Chi-square	df	Sig. p-value
Experience of DCS Change	.939	10646.159	630	.000

Note: 1. $p = .000$, 2. KMO MSA > .6

Source: Author's Fieldwork

Table 5. KMO MSA and Bartlett's Sphericity Test Results: Offenders

Factor	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		
		Approx. Chi-square	df	Sig. p-value
Experience of DCS Change	.876	3589.172	630	.000

Source: Author's Fieldwork

Using these KMO MSA and Barlett's sphericity test results, it is further concluded that both questionnaires used in the study had a good content validity because they covered all the major aspects of the content that are relevant. Since the data sets were found to be suitable for factoring, factor analysis was conducted through exploratory factor analysis techniques. The extraction method utilized was the Principal Component Analysis (PCA), and the rotation method used was the Direct Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Tables 6 and 7 give reliability statistics from reliability analysis. The statistics reflects a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .921 from 19 items for the negative emotional reaction and experience of the DCS change and .928 from 15 items for the positive emotional reaction and experience of the DCS change from the perspective of correctional officials. The personal impact was measured from the side of correctional officials only. For the offenders, Table 7 shows a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .912 from 17 for the negative affect; .898 from 13 items for the positive emotions, and .672 from 5 items for the Introspective-anxious affects. From Tables 6 and 7, it is significant to note that the Cronbach alpha coefficients indicate that the two measuring instruments have acceptable reliability and consistency in terms of measuring the emotional reaction and experience of the DCS change that they were designed to measure.

Table 6 Internal Consistencies of Extracted Factors: Correctional Officials

Factor (scale) and Description	No. of Items	Cronbach Alpha (α)
Experience of the DCS Change		
Factor 4.2.1: Negative affect (emotions)	19	.921
Factor 4.2.2: Positive affect (emotions)	15	.928

Note: All relevant factors presented with an eigenvalue ≥ 1 . The variance accounted for by Factors 4.2.1 to 4.2.2 was 47.016 %.

Source: Own Construction

Table 7 Internal Consistencies of Extracted Factors: Offenders

Factor (scale) and Description	No. of Items	Cronbach Alpha (α)
Experience of the DCS Change		
Factor 3.2.1: Negative affect	17	.912
Factor 3.2.2: Positive affect	13	.898
Factor 3.2.3: Introspective-anxious affect	5	.672

Note: All relevant factors presented with an eigenvalue ≥ 1 . The variance accounted for by Factors 3.2.1 to 3.2.3 was 43.9%.

Source: Own Construction

3. Data Analysis and Discussion of Findings

3.1 Emotional reactions to and experience of transformational change in the Department of Correctional Services

People's emotional reactions to, and experiences of the DCS transformational change were viewed from the perspective of both correctional officials and offenders, as the two important internal stakeholders within the Department of Correctional Services. The discussion of correctional officials and offenders emotional reactions and experiences commence with the correctional officials' perspectives.

3.2 Correctional officials' reaction to and experience of the DCS change

The results from the final structural model for correctional officials reveal that in terms of the emotional experience of the DCS change, correctional officials exhibit positive and negative emotional experience of the DCS change (see Table 8 below).

Table 8 Standardised Solution: Indicators of Experience of DCS Change: Correctional Officials

<i>F5 = Negative Effect</i>			<i>F6 = Positive Effect</i>		
Item	Standardised Coefficient	R ² - Value	Item	Standardised Coefficient	R ² - Value

S4.2.2 = V30	.689	.475	S4.2.1 = V29	.619	.383
S4.2.3 = V31	.717	.515	S4.2.9 = V34	.674	.454
S4.2.4 = V32	.617	.381	S4.2.11 = V35	.750	.562
S4.2.5 = V33	.683	.466	S4.2.12 = V36	.817	.668
S4.2.13 = V37	.730	.533	S4.2.14 = V38	.652	.424
S4.2.15 = V39	.722	.521	S4.2.16 = V40	.769	.592
S4.2.17 = V41	.404	.163	S4.2.19 = V42	.551	.304
S4.2.20 = V43	.715	.512	S4.2.22 = V45	.802	.643
S4.2.21 = V44	.514	.265	S4.2.28 = V50	.729	.532
S4.2.24 = V47	.843	.711	S4.2.32 = V54	.744	.554
S4.2.25 = V48	.770	.593	S4.2.34 = V55	.766	.587
S4.2.27 = V49	.724	.525	S4.2.38 = V57	.756	.572
S4.2.29 = V51	.608	.370	S4.2.39 = V58	.800	.641
S4.2.30 = V52	.668	.447			
S4.2.31 = V53	.782	.611			
S4.2.35 = V56	.500	.250			

Source: Author's Fieldwork

This perceived positive and negative emotional experience of the DCS change is also reinforced by the coefficients reflected in the table columns, which point to the existence of moderately strong and markedly strong relationship between the factors and their items. For example, for the negative effect factor, item correlation coefficients range between .404 and .843; while the R^2 values vary between 16% (.163) and 71% (.711) true variance. For the positive effect factor, correlation coefficients vary from .551 to .817, while the R^2 values range between 30% (.304) and 66% (.668) true variance. These coefficients reinforce the perception that there is indeed a moderately, highly and very highly strong relationship between the DCS change and the emotional experiences of correctional officials.

The negative emotional experiences of the DCS change by correctional officials range from being angry, sad, confused, tired, miserable, furious, bewildered, fearful and resentful to being depressed, afraid, nervous, weary, puzzled, bitter, and hostile. These negative emotions point to the negative impact that the DCS change has exerted on correctional officials as employees of the Department of Correctional Services. Despite this negative impact, the study has also revealed that the DCS change has also had a positive impact on correctional officials emotionally. Positive emotions such as being at ease, alive, excited, happy, calm, pleased, sober, energetic, peaceful, interested, proud, inspired and strong were also experienced by correctional officials during the process of implementing the DCS change. The above findings indicate that correctional officials experience the DCS change initiative from both negative and positive angle. Hence, the DCS change has a strong impact on correctional officials. The experience of the DCS change by offenders is dealt with below.

3.3 Offenders' reaction to and experience of the DCS change

The results from the final structural model for offenders reveal that in terms of the experience of the DCS change, offenders exhibit three kinds of emotions, namely positive, negative and introspective-anxious emotions/feelings (see Table 9 below).

Table 9 Standardised Solution: Indicators of Experience of DCS Change: Offenders

<i>F1 = Negative Effect</i>			<i>F2 = Positive Effect</i>			<i>F3 = Introspective-Anxious Effect</i>		
Item	Standardised Coefficients	R^2 - Value	Item	Standardised Coefficients	R^2 - Value	Item	Standardised Coefficient	R^2 - Value
S3.2.2 = V29	.592	.350	S3.2.1 = V28	.584	.341	S3.2.6 = V31	.547	.299
S3.2.3 = V30	.596	.356	S3.2.9 = V34	.647	.419	S3.2.7 = V32	.535	.286
S3.2.13 = V37	.560	.313	S3.2.11 = V35	.598	.357	S3.2.8 = V33	.500	.250
S3.2.15 = V39	.605	.367	S3.2.12 = V36	.684	.468			
S3.2.17 = V41	.592	.351	S3.2.14 = V38	.602	.363			
S3.2.20 = V42	.620	.384	S3.2.16 = V40	.621	.386			
S3.2.24 = V44	.720	.518	S3.2.22 = V43	.696	.485			
S3.2.25 = V45	.727	.529	S3.2.28 = V48	.648	.419			

S3.2.26 = V46	.450	.202	S3.2.32 = V52	.673	.453
S3.2.27 = V47	.661	.436	S3.2.34 = V53	.574	.330
S3.2.29 = V49	.572	.327	S3.2.38 = V55	.695	.483
S3.2.30 = V50	.631	.398	S3.2.39 = V56	.707	.500
S3.2.31 = V51	.565	.319			
S3.2.35 = V54	.516	.266			
S3.2.40 = V57	.518	.268			

Source: Author's Fieldwork

These perceived positive, negative and introspective-anxious feelings which underlie offenders' emotional experience of the DCS change are reinforced by the coefficients reflected in the table columns, which point to the existence of moderately strong and markedly strong relationship between the three latent variables (factors) and their items.

The correlation coefficients for the items that make up the negative emotions' factor range between .450 and .727, and the R^2 values vary between 20% (.202) and 52% (.529) true variance. For the positive emotions' factor, item correlation coefficients vary from .574 to .707, and the R^2 values range between 33% (.330) and 50% (.500) true variance. For the introspective-anxious emotions' factor, item correlation coefficients range between .500 and .547 and the R^2 values vary between 25% (.250) and 29% (.299). The correlation coefficients reinforce the perception that there is indeed a moderately and highly strong relationship between the DCS change and the emotional experiences of offenders.

The negative emotions exhibited by offenders range from being angry, sad, miserable, furious, bewildered and fearful to being depressed, afraid, thoughtful, nervous, weary, puzzled, bitter, hostile, and jittery. These negative emotions point to the fact that offenders have experienced negative feelings as a result of the DCS change. Despite these negative emotions, the study has also revealed that there are offenders who have emotionally reacted positively to the DCS change. Offenders have experienced such positive emotions as being at ease, alive, excited, happy, calm, pleased, sober, energetic, peaceful, interested, proud, inspired and strong. The introspective-anxious emotions experienced by offenders range from being serious and thinking a lot to being anxious.

The above findings indicate that offenders as well, experienced the DCS change negatively and positively. However, in addition to these two dimensions of emotional experience of change covered in terms of the literatures reviewed (Decker, Wheeler, Johnson and Parsons, 2001; Walston and Chadwick, 2003; Van Tonder, 2004b, 2004d; Lines, 2005; Svensen, Neset and Eriksen, 2007), another dimension, namely the dimension of introspective-anxious emotions emerged. This indicates that offenders also experienced the DCS transformational change in an introspective-anxious sense. This is a surprise finding, as this third dimension was not covered in the previous literatures.

Based on the above empirical findings, one can emphasize that the DCS change evoked reaction which was characterized by negative, positive and introspective-anxious emotions. In terms of the findings, negative emotional reaction was characterized by emotions such as being angry, sad, miserable, furious, bewildered, and fearful to being depressed, afraid, nervous, weary, puzzled, bitter, hostile, and jittery. Positive emotional reaction was underpinned by emotions such as being at ease, alive, excited, happy, calm, pleased, sober, energetic, peaceful, interested, proud, inspired, and strong. Introspective-anxious emotional reaction featured emotions such as being serious, thinking a lot and being anxious. The above-mentioned emotional reactions towards the DCS transformational change constitute the second most critical human dynamic of transformational change that needs to be managed effectively if effective implementation of transformational change initiatives is to be achieved.

As a result of these difference in emotions, correctional officials and offenders as individuals experienced the DCS change differently. These different emotional experiences suggest that the DCS change impacted differently at personal level, either negatively, positively and introspective-anxious emotion. It is important to note that the empirical results also point to a statistically and practically significant relationship between correctional officials and offenders experiences of the DCS change and their perceived status of the DCS change. This finding suggests that there is a strong sense of relatedness of correctional officials and offenders experiences of the DCS change to their perceived status of the DCS change. The finding on officials and offenders experiences of the DCS change confirms earlier hypothesized arguments that people's experiences of change (be it past or current change experiences) do determine the direction of the change (success or failure), based on the support for or opposition to the change. Opposition to the change as a result of negative emotional reactions to, and negative experiences of the change does breed resistance to the change, which becomes another important human element of transformational change that requires proper management if transformational change initiatives are to successfully implemented.

The findings on correctional officials and offenders experience of the DCS change have revealed some similarities and differences between the two subjects of the study in terms of how they have experienced the DCS change effort. One striking similarity, which is worth noting, is that both groups concur that the DCS change has put them through negative and positive emotional experiences. This is in line with earlier arguments and research findings by Decker, Wheeler, Johnson and Parsons (2001); Lundberg and Young (2001); Szamosi and Duxbury (2002); and Van Tonder (2004d). These authors have highlighted that organizational change has impact employees at individual level, leading to positive and negative emotions. It is for this reason that Szamosi and Duxbury (2002) indicate that organizational change is a phenomenon that intrigues, excites, scares, mystifies, and challenges people as individuals or groups in all organizations.

Van Tonder (2004b) explains that all change, of whatever nature, evokes strong emotional responses from most people. These emotional responses range from joy, excitement and exaltation to shock, anger, dejection and depression. Employees' responses by means of the above emotions come about as a result of the suppression of employees' version of organizational change, in favour of managerial version (Bryant, 2006). Understanding employees' responses to transformational change initiatives becomes necessary for purposes of ensuring success in transformational change implementation (Sloyan, 2009). Employees' response to organizational change is described in terms of employees' reactions, as well as their resistance to organizational change.

It is interesting to note that Vithessonthi (2007) claims that people's emotional reaction to change are influenced by their perceptions of the change, but the findings of this study have partly vindicated and refuted this view. This argument is based on the fact that much of the correctional officials' and offenders' positive emotional reactions can be linked to their positive perceptions of the DCS transformational change, while the same cannot be said of correctional officials' and offenders' negative emotional reactions or offenders' introspective-anxious emotional reaction. These emotional reactions cannot be traced back to established perceptions of the DCS change, as having been shaped by the said perceptions. With regards the negative and introspective-anxious emotional reactions, it is important to note that there is correspondence between these emotions and the manner in which correctional officials and offenders have experienced the DCS change. This vindicates earlier findings that people's emotional reactions to the change are shaped by their experiences of the same change effort (Refferty & Griffin, 2006; Ursiny & Kay, 2007; Vithessonthi, 2007). The foregoing differences in terms of the empirical findings vis-à-vis the established theory regarding the relatedness between people's perceptions and experiences of change on the one hand, and their emotional reactions to the change on the other, suggest that it is possible to perceive change in a certain manner, but react to it emotionally in a totally different manner based on one's experience of the change.

These differences remain a possibility given that people can perceive a change effort positively because they regard it as being desirable and necessary (Macri, Tagliaventi & Bertolotti, 2002; Van Tonder, 2004b); while the experience of such a change effort can be something different due to the management of the change process. For example, in the case of the DCS transformational change, both correctional officials and offenders have perceived the DCS change positively; but due to the experience of the change to which they were subjected, referred to both positive and negative emotions. Offenders perceived the DCS transformational change process as poorly managed and this has partly contributed to their negative and introspective-anxious emotional reactions to the DCS change.

The foregoing assertion suggests that people's reactions to change are also influenced by the way in which change efforts are implemented. And this leads to variance in employees' reactions to organizational change (Bareil, Savoie & Meunier, 2007). When people perceive the implementation of organizational change as fair, then, their reactions to organizational change become more positive. Similarly, when organizational change is perceived to be unfairly initiated and implemented, people's reactions may become more negative (Caldwell, Herold & Fedor, 2004). Consequently, an argument can be advanced that people's reactions to change are shaped by their perceptions of the change effort. These perceptions are influenced by the availability or non-availability of information about the change effort to the people, as well as being comfortable with or fearful of the change (Vithessonthi, 2007). Managers, as implementers of change initiatives, must therefore continuously and systematically monitor people's reactions to change in relation to their perceptions of change during the implementation of any change initiative.

From the above, one may conclude that the reaction of people to change efforts is influenced by how a particular change intervention has touched employees' work and personal lives. It is this impact on people's personal and work lives that determine whether a change initiative will be reacted to positively or negatively. If it is perceived as justified, positive emotional reaction and ultimate acceptance are more likely. This is influenced by people's positive perception of organizational support (Self, Armenakis & Schraeder, 2007). This means that the higher organizational support is perceived by the employees, the more likely that people will perceive change as more justified. But if the change effort is

perceived as unjustified, people will react negatively towards it and ultimately oppose it and develop resistance to it. Therefore, it is significant to note that people's reactions to transformational change become the critical factor for the success of transformational change initiatives (McGonigle, 2008). This perspective is also supported by Imberman (2009) who emphasizes that people's emotional reactions are a significant driver of any transformational change effort. This is further endorsed by Sloyan (2009) who stresses the importance of managers understanding of how people react to transformational change initiatives. This understanding of people's reactions to transformational change is seen as a prerequisite for ensuring the effective implementation of transformational change efforts. Hence it can be stated that people's experience of change is the second most critical human dynamic (after perception of change) of transformational change, which needs the careful attention of managers, if success in the implementation of transformational change efforts is to be realized.

3.4 Implications for Organisations

In the light of the above findings, one may conclude that negative experiences of transformational change evoke negative emotional reactions which, in turn, lead to opposition and resistance to transformational change. This is supported by Stensaker and Meyer (2011) who point out that people's experiences with change influences their reactions to change. This implies that negative emotional reactions can derail change. The fact that people experience negative emotions means that they have not adapted to change and yet, according to Thomas and Hardy (2011) individual adaptation to change is critical to both individual survival and organizational survival.

On the other hand, positive experiences of transformational change induce positive emotional reactions that lead to the support for change. The support for change emanating from positive emotional reaction to the change suggests that positive emotional reaction can facilitate the implementation of transformational change efforts. This implies that managerial intervention and action is important in order to ensure that the impact of negative emotions on the change implementation process is minimized through lessening or diminishing negative emotions, while at the same time ensuring that positive emotions are reinforced. In addition, the findings indicate that correctional officials and offenders experienced the DCS change both negatively and positively, thereby pointing to the emotional impact that transformational change exerts on employees as individuals. Moreover, the experiences of the DCS change activities point to the fact that people are not untouched spectators when organizational change efforts are implemented. People within organizations experience change both positively or negatively and it is through these different change experiences that people as organizational members develop support for positive experiences or opposition to negative experiences.

More than that, irrespective of people's position or status in organizations, they are affected by change. Hence, for the fact that they are affected by the change differently, they end up experiencing the change differently, thereby leading to different emotional reactions, as emphasized by Van Tonder (2004a). It is these different emotional experiences of the change that shape the direction of the change. Therefore, these findings imply that positive emotional reactions are facilitators of the change process, while negative emotional reactions hinder the change implementation process. Therefore, one can state that the effective implementation of organizational change efforts requires a thorough understanding of how organizational members as individuals experience a particular organizational change effort.

Additionally, organizations are systems made up of two inextricably linked parts, namely, the human part or system or factor and the non-human part or system or factor. The non-human factor needs the involvement of the human element for its operationalization, thereby suggesting an ongoing and constant interaction between the human element and the non-human element. Therefore, there can be no touch on the non-human element which does not affect the human element. Changing the non-human element will invariably affect the human element. This perspective is also emphasized by Barclay (2009) who points out that transformational change initiatives encompass three intertwined components, namely organizational processes, systems and people. The findings also imply that there can be no organizational change that takes place without affecting the human element, namely people within the organization. Hence, it goes without saying that people inside the organization will be affected positively or negatively by the change. Therefore, a thorough understanding of organizational members' emotions can only be attained through managerial intervention, which is why these findings suggest that the understanding of people's experiences of a change initiative in terms of the different emotions that they experience is a matter of critical importance for all managers who want to ensure successful implementation of organizational change efforts. This further reveals the importance of assisting people to deal with their negative emotions constructively once those in power have understood the emotions that people are going through. This calls for managerial intervention and action (Burke Warner, 2002; Van Tonder, 2004a; Van Rooyen, 2007). The foregoing underlines the important role that managerial intervention and action can play in channeling people's

negative emotions timeously and constructively such that resistance to change is minimized.

Finally, it can be argued that the results of the study highlighted the importance of mitigating the impact of people's negative emotional reactions and experiences on the transformational change process through managerial intervention in order to ensure that employees cope emotionally with the change. The importance of mitigating and addressing people's negative emotions and reinforcing the positive emotions cannot be overemphasized as it points to the importance of guiding people through the change by decisive managerial action.

4. Research Limitations

The following are the limitations of this study:

- Time constraints was one of the limitation of the study, which is why the study was also restricted to only one of the six regions constituting the Department of Correctional Services in the Republic of South Africa, namely the KwaZulu-Natal Region. Even in KwaZulu-Natal, not all correctional centres/institutions were included as part of the sample for the study. This would surely affect the generalization of the findings, though the sample was considered adequate and representative within the context of the KwaZulu-Natal Region.
- Limited resources made it impossible for the researchers to conduct a comprehensive empirical study which included other regions of the Department of Correctional services. Due to this constraint, the target population utilized for the study was quite small, considering the size of the Department of Correctional Services as an organization. Incorporating a broader sample could have been advantageous from the perspective of sample representativity and generalization of findings.
- Another limitation of the study relates to responses given by the research participants in terms of their responses to the various questionnaire items. The respondents may not have given their true views and perspectives on their perception and experience of the DCS change due to various reasons, including the fact that anything that is said to be official is sometimes treated with skepticism. This may have affected reliability.
- Another limitation was that the questionnaire for the offenders was written in English. Considering the fact that a majority of the offenders in the KwaZulu-Natal Region are IsiZulu speakers, who may likely misunderstand the English language that was used in the questionnaire items. This may have possibly affected their responses to questionnaire items. It is as well likely that some respondents from both samples might have misinterpreted and misconstrued certain questionnaire items while completing the questionnaires.
- Another limitation relates to bias because of the fact that one of the researchers is a senior manager of the Department of Correctional Services in KwaZulu-Natal. Therefore, the correctional officials, as research participants, might have consciously or subconsciously concealed their true views and perspectives regarding their perceptions and experiences of the DCS change efforts, for fear of being viewed as generally anti-transformation or specifically anti-DCS change. This may affect the reliability of their responses.

5. Conclusion

In their efforts to effectively deal with the challenge of the high failure rate in the implementation of transformational change initiatives, managers should address the issue of the negative emotional impact of transformational change on employees. In the case of the Department of Correctional Services, managers at change implementation level should assist correctional officials and offenders to cope with their negative emotions associated with their emotional reactions to and experiences of transformational change. As indicated by authors such as Van Tonder (2004b) and Dahl (2009, 2010), organizational change initiatives have a personal psychological and emotional impact based on the fact that they instill uncertainty, fear, shock, anger, anxiety, depression, stress and trauma in people, thereby impacting negatively on the health of employees.

What these findings suggest is that negative emotional reactions to and experiences of change has negative consequences in terms of employee health, employee job satisfaction and performance, change implementation, and organizational performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. It is for this reason that it becomes important for managers to intervene in order to mitigate the personal emotional and psychological impact of organizational change. On the other hand, positive emotions have positive consequences for the organization in terms of employee health, employee job satisfaction and performance, change implementation as well as organizational performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. The foregoing necessitate that the managerial responsibility of managing organizational change initiatives should also extend to the realm of managing the emotional impact of organizational change efforts on

the people (Nickols, 2010; Dahl, 2011). Managing the emotional and psychological impact of change implies that managers should help people through the change process by managing people's emotions (positive and negative) not only to minimize personal emotional impact by addressing people's needs associated with their negative emotions, but also promote effective facilitation of change through reinforcing positive emotions.

References

- Agboola, A.A. & Salawu, R.O. (2011). Managing deviant behaviour and resistance to change. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(1), 235-242.
- Aiken, C. & Keller, S. (2009). The irrational side of change management. *Organization Practice*. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 24 April 2012.
- Allen, J., Jimmieson, N.L., Bordia, P., & Immer, B.E. (2007). Uncertainty during organisational change: Managing perceptions through communication. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(2), 187.
- Alvesson, M. & Svenningsson, S. (2008). *Forundringnarbete I organisationer, Libes*. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 16 July 2011.
- Armenakis, A. & Harris, S. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9 (2), 127-142.
- Balogun, J. & Hope Hailey, V. (2004). Exploring strategic change. 2nd ed. London: Prentice Hall.
- Barclay, C.M. (2011). *The critical role of management support in OCM initiatives – A tale of two projects*. SAP Business Transformation Services. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 30 June 2012.
- Bareil, C., Savoie, A., & Meunier, S. (2007). Patterns of discomfort with organisational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(1), 13.
- Bartlett, M.S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various B approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 16(Series B), 296-298.
- Bartunek, J.M., Rousseau, D.M., Rudolph, J.W., & DePalma, J.A. (2006). On the receiving end: Sensemaking, emotion, and assessments of an organisational change initiated by others. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 42, 182-206.
- Bregman, P. (2009). *How to counter resistance to change*. Harvard Business Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 08 August 2012.
- Brinier, R.B. & Kiefer, T. (2005). Research into the Experience of Emotion at Work: Definitely Older, But are we any Wiser? In N.M. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel, & W. Zerbe (Eds.), *The effect of Affect in Organizational Settings - Research on Emotion in Organizations*, Vol. 1, Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.
- Bryant, M. (2006). Talking about change: Understanding employee responses through qualitative research. *Management Decision*, 44(2), 246.
- Burke, Warner, W. (2002). *Organization change. Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Caldwell, S.D., Herold, D.M., & Fedor, D.B. (2004). Toward an understanding of the relationships among organizational change, individual differences, and changes in person-environment fit: A cross-level study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 868-882.
- Choi, M., & Ruona, W. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10 (1): 46-73.
- Coetzee, C.J.H. & Stanz, K.J. (2007). "Barriers-to-change" in a governmental service delivery type organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 33 (2), 76-82
- Clarke, L. (1994). *The essence of change*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Dahl, M.S. (2009). *The cancer of organizational change*. Paper presented at the Summer Conference, 17-19 June 2009. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 06 July 2010.
- Dahl, M.S. (2010). *Organizational change and employee stress*. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com>. on 06 July 2010.
- Dahl, M.S. (2011). Organizational change and employee stress. *Management Science*, 57 (2), 240-256.
- Decker, D., Wheeler, G.E., Johnson, J., & Parsons, R.J. (2001). Effect of organisational change on the individual employee. *The Health Care Manager*, 19(4), 1.
- Devanna, M & Tichy, N. (1990). Creating the competitive organisation of the 21st Century: the boundaryless corporation. *Human Resource Management* 29(4), 455-471.
- George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2001). Towards a process model of individual change in organizations, *Human Relations*, 54(4), pp. 419-444.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W. C. (2003). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.), India: Pearson Education.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Herold, D.M. & Fedor, D.B. (2008). *Change the way you lead change: Leadership strategies that really work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Imberman, M.D. (2009). Organizational change and organizational justice: Assessing the impact on organizational commitment, change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour, and attitude toward future change. PhD Dissertation. *ProQuest Dissertations and*

- Theses, 2011/09/08, Alliant International University, Los Angeles, California.
- Jick, T. (1993). *Managing change: Concepts and cases*. Burr Ridge: Irwin.
- Johnston, G. (2008). *Change management – Solutions to the high failure rate. Change scares people*. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 09 May 2012.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T.M. (1999). Managerial coping with organisational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (1), 107-122.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-415.
- Karp, T. & Helgo, T.I.T. (2008). From change management to change leadership: Embracing chaotic change in public service organizations. *Journal of Change Management*, 8(1), 85.
- Kerlinger, F. (1992). *Foundations of behavioural research*. Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Kiefer, T. (2005). Feeling bad: antecedents and consequences of negative emotions in ongoing change. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 26(8), 875.
- Kiefer, T. and R.B. Briner (2006). 'Emotions at work: Implications for International Business and Management' in P.R. Jackson and M. Shams (eds) *International Business and Management: Developments in Work and Organizational Psychology 20 - Implications for International Business*. Elsevier.
- Kline, R. B. (2004). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. 2nd ed. New York: Guildford.
- Kohurt, A.M. (2010). *Significant workplace change: Perspectives of survivors*. D.Ed Dissertation. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois.
- Lines, R. (2005). The structure and function of attitudes towards organizational change. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(1), 8-32.
- Liu, Y. (2010). *When change leadership impacts commitment to change and when it does n't. A multi-dimensional investigation*. PhD Dissertation. Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Lotich, P. (2011). *Why do organizational change efforts often fail?* Thriving Small Business. Retrieved from <http://www.project-management-com.info/douglas-mcgregor-human-side-of-enterprise/> on 23 September 2011.
- Lundberg, C.C. & Young, C.A. (2001). A note on emotions and consultancy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 14 (6), 530-538.
- Macri, D.M., Tagliaventi, M.R., & Bertolotti, F. (2002). A grounded theory for resistance to change in a small organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(3), 292-310.
- McGonigle, P.M. (2008). The what, why and how of resistance. *SAP America*. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 12 July 2011.
- Miller, D. (2004). Building sustainable change capability. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 36 (1), 9-12.
- Morgan, C.T., King, R.A., Weisz, J.R. & Schopler, J. (1986). *Introduction to psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Nickols, F. (2010). Change management 101 A Primer. Dated 29/09/2010. Retrived from: <http://home/att.net/~nickols/change.htm> on 26 May 2011.
- Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: developing an individual difference measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 680-693.
- Panao, A. (2010). Mastering the deadly art of change. *The Japan HR Society*. Retrieved from: <http://www.japanic.com/japan-inc-blog> on 16 June 2012.
- Plant, R. (1987). *Managing change and making it stick*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing Co.
- Rafferty, A.E. & Simons, R.H. (2006). An examination of the antecedents of readiness for fine-tuning and corporate transformation changes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(3), 325-350.
- Refferty, A.E. & Griffin, M.A. (2006). Perceptions of organisational change: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, September, 91(5), 1154.
- Rodda, J. (2007). A multilevel examination of employee reactions to organizational change. *PhD Dissertation*. DePaul University, Chicago.
- Scheepers, J.M. (1992). *Toetskonstruksie: Theorie en praktyk (Test construction: Theory and practice)*. Johannesburg: RAU-drukpers.
- Self, D.R., Armenakis, A.A., & Schraeder, M. (2007). Organisational change content, process, and context: A simultaneous analysis of employee reactions. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(2), 211.
- Sloyan, R.M. (2009). Trust, sensemaking and individual responses to organizational change. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Benedictine University.
- Smollan, R.K. (2012). Chapter 6 Emotional Responses to the Injustice of Organizational Change: A Qualitative Study, in Neal M. Ashkanasy, Charmine E.J. Härtel, Wilfred J. Zerbe (ed.) *Experiencing and Managing Emotions in the Workplace (Research on Emotion in Organizations, Volume 8)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 175-202
- Stensaker, I.G. & Meyer, C.B. (2011). "Change experience and employee reactions: developing capabilities for change". *Personnel Review*, 41(1), 106-124.
- Svensen, E., Neset, G., & Eriksen, H.R. (2007). Factors associated with a positive attitude towards change among employees during the early phase of a downsizing process. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 153-159.
- Szamosi, L.T. & Duxbury, L. (2002). Development of a measure to assess organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15 (2), 184-201.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. (5th ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomas, R. & Hardy, C. (2011). Reframing resistance to organizational change. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27, 322-331.

- Turner, D. (2011a). *The paradox of change management*. Turner Change Management Inc. Dated 30 July 2011. Retrieved from: <http://www.google.com> on 16 July 2011.
- Turner, D-M., Hallencreutz, J. & Haley, H. (2009). Leveraging the value of an organizational change management methodology. 9th International Conference on Knowledge, Culture and Change in Boston. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 9 (9), 1-34.
- Ursiny, T. & Kay, B.A. (2007). *The top performer' guide to change*. Napierville: Sourcebooks, Inc.
- Vakola, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organisational change. What is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations*, 27 (2), 160-174.
- Van Rooyen, J. (2007). Change Management: Models and mindsets. *People Dynamics*, 25 (1), 6.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2004a). *Organisational change: Theory and practice*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2004b). Organisational Development – Purposefully engaging change, Part I. *Management Today*, 20(10)/Yearbook 2005, 51-53, 57.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2004c). The march of time and the “evolution” of change. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 30(3), 41-52.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2004d). “Organisational transformation”: Wavering on the edge of ambiguity. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 30(3), 53-64.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2005). Complex, chaotic and catastrophic: The advent of nonlinear change. *5th International Conference on Knowledge, culture and change in Organisations*, Rhodes, Greece, 19-22 July.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2006). Change risk and ignorance: Attempting to cross chasms in small steps. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(3), 1-11.
- Van Tonder, C.L. (2009). Organization identity as managerial concern. In N. Delener, L. Fuxman, F. Victor Lu, A. Putnova & L.E. Rivera-Solis (Eds.), *Readings book: Eleventh International Conference of the Global Business and Technology Association(GBATA)*, 1171-1177.
- Vithessonthi, C. (2007). Perceptions affecting employee reactions to change: Evidence from privatisation in Thailand. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 12(1), 248-255.
- Wanberg, C.R. & Banas, J.T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 132-142.
- Walston, S.L. & Chadwick, C. (2003). Perceptions and misperceptions of major organisational changes in hospitals: Do change efforts fail because of inconsistent organisational perceptions of restructuring and reengineering? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 26 (14), 1581.
- Wharton Executive Education. (2011). Harnessing fire: Managing emotions for successful organizational change. Wharton@work. *E-Newsletter for the Aresty Institute of Executive Education*.
- Wilson, D.C. (1992). *A strategy of change: Concepts and controversies in the management of change*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, T. (1994). *A manual for change*. Aldershor.
- Worrall, L. & Cooper, C.L. (2004). Managers, hierarchies and attitudes: A study of UK managers. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 19 (1), 41-68.
- Zerbe, W. J., Härtel, C. E. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2010). *Emotions and Organizational Dynamism*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group/JAI.
- Zimmerman, J.H. (1995). The principles of managing change. *HR Focus*, -72(2), 15-16.
- Zolno, S. (2009). *Who's ready for whole system change? Whole field assessment and the change readiness checklist*. Pfeiffer Annual: Training. John Wiley & sons.