

## **Organizational Change and Employees' Commitment. (A study of Sun seed Feed Limited in Kaduna State).**

**Ezem Matthew Ibekwe**

Department of Business Administration

Novena University

Ogume, Delta State, Nigeria.

### **Abstract**

---

*The study focused on organizational change and employees' commitment. The population of study was 1,400 and the sample size was 311. Taro Yamane formula tool was used to draw the sample size. A skilfully structured questionnaire was used to draw responses from the respondents and only 300 out of the number retrieved were finally found worthy for analysis, Spearman rank Correlation Coefficient tool and regression analysis along with Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) statistics tools were used to analyse the data to derive solution to the research work. The findings revealed a significant positive relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment, a significant positive relationship between employees' commitment and personal valence, a significant positive relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment. It was recommended, among others, that managers should accommodate valence in organizational behaviour, manufacturing industries should accommodate workplace valence to gain employees' commitment and embrace the importance of change communication in an organization. The study concluded that companies should endeavour to provide career planning for their young employees as a means of creating change readiness for them to achieve a goal and retain them for very long time, this in turn will enhance employees' commitment to organizational goals.*

---

**Keywords:** Organizational Change, Change Agents, Employees' Commitment, Personal Valence and Change Readiness.

### **Introduction**

Business organizations usually perceive themselves within surroundings confronted with forces that necessitated change. Any organization or firm that wishes to achieve its objectives and withstand the future challenges of business global practices must be willing to readily embrace change. Organizations today are experiencing incremental innovation arising from technological advancement with a view to satisfying the numerous needs and wants of end users.

Most manufacturing companies now spend huge amounts on research and development in their organizations, by keeping in view new techniques that managers should adopt to tackle change management within and outside of their environment because business activities now are globalize, and every organization strive to maintain the loyalty of their customers, train their employees, introduce and adopt new methods of high production, so from here the concept of organizational change or change management starts.

However, organizations in Nigeria need to adapt to their changing environment if they must remain competitive and managers must learn and implement new techniques, efficient delivery of product and services, advanced technologies, good customer outreach else they and their organization may be left behind. According to Schwartz (2003), managers should prepare to re-evaluate their entire organization as competition increases and change in customer's demand. Organizations need to make use of new advancement in technology so as to meet the changing need of the environment.

The management of any organization must constantly think in terms of proactive planned change to cope with the changes revolving around technology, social, political, economic and even the competitive environment (Trahan, Burke and Koontz 2005). When the activities of organization either managerial or administrative, organization structure, the use of technologies, the human resource policies, Organizational Culture, the quality of the product and services provided, employee's attitudes towards customers, are continuously destroying the reputation of the organization; the question now is how will change be implemented in the organization in this present scenario? So when the expert/Specialist decides about all necessary approach to be carried out for change to take place in the organization it leads to the concept of organizational change or change management.

There is always a high percentage of risk associated with change management, but its success largely depends on the strategies adopted by managers in the introduction and implementation of the change needed. For this change to be successful, elements such as communication, team building, change in control systems, incentives, leadership development, organization structure, employees' commitment, readiness for change, personal valence, perception of training, perception of change communication etc must be thoroughly accessed, planned and implemented. According to Adebajo (2006), for change to be successfully implemented, managers should be assigned the duty of outlining and identifying problems and to be in charge of the implementation/recommendations to be adopted.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Change has become important and unavoidable in the business world. Organizations are realizing the need to remain competitive which makes organizations have no choice but to change systems to ensure survival. However, some of these changes initiated in Sunseed Feed Limited have been met with strong resistance by employees of the organizations. Sunseed Feed Limited embarked on a restructuring exercise in 2017. The structural change entailed cutting down of many managerial positions and the layoff of 90% staff. After a few months, a good number of the staff were recalled and given new condition of service in the various positions that were advertised internally. Media reports during that time suggested that the problem arose when some senior managers felt that the restructuring exercise was unfair and there was fear that they would lose their jobs. The in-house personnel who applied for the new positions were not considered because most experts and top-level managers were foreigners. Topmanagement also offered voluntary retrenchment packages to employees above 50 years. This brought about poor productivity and reduction of employees' commitment at Sunseed Feed Limited. The workers representatives believed that qualified employees were not given the chance to be interviewed for the positions that were advertised. The workers' representatives refused to accept the new structure and argued that it was never discussed and signed. Top management forged ahead with the change process but employees still resisted this change as they saw it as impracticable and expensive. Another major change process which occurred was that Sunseed feed wanted to operate as an independent manufacturing company which is originally owned by 7up bottling company. This also caused changes within the structure of the organization. Butsometimes, the most constructive change takes place because of opportunities, (Bateman and Zeithaml 2005). Recognition of a performance gap often provides the impetus for change, as companies strive to improve their performance to expected levels. This sort of gap is also where many low-level managers find opportunities.

The negative results in resistance to change are irrational behavior, remorse, stress etc can result in failure to achieve the organizational set goals and objectives. This study will look into these issues to answer questions and be able to assist managers on the various ways they can use to manage change better in future without disrupting positive productivity and employees' commitment.

### **Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between organizational change and how it affects employees' commitment.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The specific objectives of the study were:

- a. To ascertain the relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment.
- b. To examine the relationship between personal valence and employees' commitment.
- c. To determine the relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment.

## Research Questions

- a. What is the relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment?
- b. What is the relationship between personal valence and employees' commitment?
- c. What is the relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment?

## Research Hypotheses

- a. There is no significant relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment.
- b. There is no significant relationship between personal valence and employees' commitment.
- c. There is no significant relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment.

## Significance of the Study

Many studies have shown that changes introduced during organizational reforms or downsizing negatively affects employees' relations with the organization and promotes employee loyalty and organizational commitment (Niehoff et al., 2001). Responses to organizational change are diverse, and while some are essential drivers of the change process, others may seriously hamper the success of change initiatives. Most research into employees' responses to organizational change initiatives has focused on attitudinal responses, resulting in a dichotomous classification of responses to change as either change readiness or resistance to change (Chreim, 2006). Visagie and Steyn (2011) argued that research seeks to broaden this somewhat narrow focus on change responses by proposing a differentiated conceptualization of employees' responses to planned organizational change. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to take a further step to deeply investigating this phenomenon through the relevant literature, shedding more light into the employee commitment and intentions to organizational change processes. By so doing it will help create awareness on how managers in the manufacturing sector introduce changes into their operations in line with changes in the external environment.

This study will in addition, provide much needed information on the management of change which management in manufacturing companies will find quite useful in order to remain competitive. It will help establish the fact that it is not just enough for it to introduce change, but that certain factors have to be taken into consideration to ensure its successful implementation. The finding of this study will provide a background for future research in related areas of study.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Conceptual Review

#### Concept of Organizational Change

A number of scholars have identified employee commitment as an essential prerequisite to the successful implantation of organizational change (Bellou 2007; Darwish 2000; Lau & Woodmen 1995; Vakola & Nikolaou 2005; Yousef 2000).

Research suggests that failure of an organizational change initiatives can generally be attributed to negative employee attitudes towards the change (Bellou 2007; Coetsee 1999; Durmaz 2007). Unless adequately managed, organizational change initiatives result in feelings of fear and uncertainty (Bovey & Hede 2001), leading to increased stress, reduced levels of trust between employees and management, and declining levels of organizational commitment (Coetsee 1999; Schweiger & Denisi 1991). Change managers tend to rely on the commitment of their employee when implementing organizational change (Bennet & Durkin 200 I), but levels of organizational commitment, may, in fact, decrease in response to the change initiatives (Lau, Tse & Zhou 2002). A decrease in levels of organizational commitment during processes of change could lead to increased levels of absenteeism and higher turnover rates (Cotton & Tuttle 2000), further hampering the success of the change initiative.

In 2008, a South African telecommunications company (herein referred to as Company X) embarked on a long-term organizational change initiative, characterized by a series of mergers, acquisitions and outsourcing activities. The commencement of these changes initiated widespread apprehension and uncertainty among employees of the company. According to research conducted by Company X's employee union, voluntary turnover at the company increased dramatically following the implementation of the change initiative. This suggests a possible decline in levels of employee commitment at Company X, which might be the result of negative employee responses to the change process implemented in the company.

Increase in global competition, information and technology breakthrough, calls for greater corporate ethics are forcing many companies to change the way they do business. Employees want satisfactory work environments, customers are demanding greater value for their money and investors want more integrity in financial disclosures. Companies no longer have a choice they must change in order to survive. Unfortunately, it is not easy to successfully implement change in organization. It is therefore, important for current and future managers to learn how they can successfully implement organizational change, (Salami 2011).

Organizational change is the term used to describe the transformation process that a company goes through in response to a strategic reorientation, restructure, Technology change in management, merger or acquisition or the development of new goals and objectives for the company (Hendry, 2004). The realignment of resources and the redeployment of capital can bring many challenges during transformation process and organizational change management seeks to address this by adopting best practice standards to assist with the integration of new company vision.

According to Wheatley (1999), organizational change is not just change for the sake of change itself. The major precursor for organizational change is some form of exogenous force such as external events. Cuts in a company's funding, the streamline of operations due to a merger are common examples of the magnitude of an event that creates organizational change and development (Galpin, 2000). Companies that are nearing the end of the product life cycle make organizational changes in response to exiting a market or reorienting resources to new existing business operations. Dessler (1998) in Salami (2011) opined that change is a redesigning the organizational structure, that is changing the departmentalization, co-ordination, span of control, reporting relationships or centralization of decision making. Change efforts should seek to also alter the way things are done to promote efficiency and effectiveness in order to remain competitive. The challenges encountered by organizational change have a ripple effect on the entire organization. When the business unit that comprises a company are fully integrated, a change or restructure in one can have a profound domino effect on another, Burke & Bill (2006). Trying to increase productivity whilst experiencing a reduction in resources is a prime example of how shortfalls can create stress for company employers. Effectively managing this process is an art that has created a new area of expertise that has become known as change management.

According to Ihunda C.C. (2005), organizations are perhaps the most important inventions of the modern society. Essentially, every activity of significance is carried out through organization. Organizations virtually dominate human existence to the extent that individuals can only achieve substantial influence only by attaining power positions in organizations.

### **Organizational Change and Employees Commitment**

According to Richard et al (2009), organizational change captures organizational commitment plus the plethora of internal performance outcomes normally associated with more efficient or effective operations. Organizational change can impact the psychological, emotional and physical states of the companies' employees. Many people experience comfort zones and develop barriers during their daily lives. According to Strebel (2003), a change in company operation can challenge and stress people value and central core beliefs. Dealing with behavioural and cultural changes are part of the organizational change process and an important consideration for change management professionals.

Employee commitment (attitudes) may be referred to as hypothetical constructs that represent an individual's degree of like or dislike for an item (Bagherian, Baheman, Asnarulkhadi & Shamsuddin 2009). Attitudes towards organizational change may therefore refer to the employees' positive or negative evaluative judgements of the change. These attitudes may range from strong positive attitudes to strong negative ones. Change may be received with happiness and excitement, or fear and anger. Some employees may approach organizational change as an opportunity for growth and improvement, while others may associate it with instability and risk (Cochran, Bromley & Swando 2002). These negative reactions towards change occur because change generally causes increased pressure, stress and uncertainty (Jones, Watson, Hohman, Bordia, Gallois & Callan 2008). Positive attitudes towards organizational change are critical to the success of change initiatives, as they increase employee cooperation during the change process and prevent resistant behaviour such as hostility and fear (Miller, Johnson & Grau 1994; Vakola & Nikolaou 2005).

Employees' commitment (attitude) towards organizational change can be classified as cognitive, effective and behavioural or intentional (Piderit 2000). Affective responses to change reflect how employee feels about the change, while cognitive responses to change reflect the employees' thoughts about the change. Behavioural or intentional responses to change result from the thoughts and judgements (cognitions) employee have about the change and the feelings and emotions (affects) associated with the change.

Companies that are going through extensive organizational changes employ the services of higher specialized personnel who can assist with the integration process (Buchel, 2004). Personnel who operate in this area are seen as translating a company's vision, communicating, integrating and re-educating individuals to align with the new goals and objectives of the company. This can include advising management where rigid operational structures need to be adapted to better serve the needs of the companies and employees alike. Change management is evolving as the business landscape changes in response to changing customer preferences, developments, tastes and new and improved processes and technologies.

### **Types of Organizational Change**

There are various types of organizational change. However, all change have been broadly categorized into two types, namely **reactive** and **proactive** (Hendry, 2004). Reactive and proactive change can involve technological, structure/procedural (administrative), and/or human components. Changes can also be distinguished based on the degree to which they are innovative.

**Innovative Change:** All innovation is change, but not all change is innovation. Despite the fact that many tend to equate the two concepts, it is important to differentiate them. Change, as noted by Henderson and Tuckman (2005) involves any modification to an existing organizational practice. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2005) in Salami (2011) unfamiliarity and hence greater uncertainty, make fear of change a problem with innovative change. These type of changes (radically innovative change) are the most difficult to implement and they tend to be the most threatening to managerial confidence and employee job security (Weick and Quinn (1999) in Salami (2011). This is because they are new to the industry and can tear the fabric of an organizations culture. Resistance to change tends to increase as change go from adaptive to innovative and radically innovative. Innovation occurs when an organization is one of the first users of an idea. The first airline to produce scheduled service in space will be innovation, as was the first hospital to perform a heart transplant and Henry-Ford's use of the assembly line for the mass production of automobiles. Because innovation provided more excitement, more challenge, and more uncertainty than most change, management of innovation requires special care. Thus, nurturing support for innovation and managing the change process systematically is crucial (Dove, 2001). Business organizations are like armies engaging their opponents in battle, because as armies engage in battle to take over no-man's land, so firms engaged the rivals to acquire new market trends, Galpin (2000).

**Reactive Versus Proactive Change:** Reactive change occurs when the forces driving change provide so much pressure that an organization must change (Hendry, 2004). The failure to existing equipment or systems, for example, is a powerful impetus for change. So too are government interventions. Proactive change occurs when an organization concludes that a change is desirable (as opposed to necessary) (Strebel, 2003). Generally, proactive change is more orderly and more efficient because it is planned.

### **Measures of Organizational Change**

Visage C.M., and Steyn C. (2011), identified some dimensional measures of organizational change, these are: change readiness, personal valence, organizational valence, perception of change communication and perception of training for change.

### **Change Readiness and Organizational Commitment:**

Resistance to change have been described as opposite of change readiness, and the primary behavioural or intentional responses to change (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder 1993; Armenakis, Harris & Field I 999; Armenakis & Harris 2002; Bernerth 2004). As a precursor to attitude of resistance towards or support for the change effort, change readiness has been identified as one of the best approach towards employees' commitment and support for change. Resistance to change has been streamlined in various ways such as high level of employees' turnover, an increase in grievances, low efficiency, restriction of output, unwillingness to work and aggression towards management (Benebroek Gravenhorst 2003).

This led us to the first hypothesis of this research, which states; Hypothesis I: There is no significant relationship between change readiness and employees commitment.

The effect of change readiness emanates from the thoughts and judgements that employees have about the change (cognition) and the feelings the change is expected to bring in the organization. For instance, readiness for change increases when employee feel that the change is needed (need for change), justified and appropriate.

Managers of business organization are advised to sought employees' participation so that the expected change can be effective. When a manager involves employees in planning changes and development, he is obtaining their commitment and indirectly ensuring the survival or success of the planned change and development. In some instance, they create their own sanction against those who are not co-operating and see it as personal challenges to succeed.

### **Personal Valence and Organizational Commitment:**

Employees are also less likely to resist change when they feel that some value will accrue to them as a result of the change. (Armenakis et al., 1993, 1999; Dirks, Cummings & Pierce 1996), distinction should be made between perceptions that the change is personally beneficial and perceptions that the change will benefit the organization (organizational valence). Employees who believe that the change will benefit both themselves and the organizations are more likely to support the change, whereas employees who do not believe any benefits will result from the change will resist the change effort (Jansen & Michael 2010).

Resistance to change is also less likely when employee believe that they are able to cope with the change (Armenakis et al. 1993, 1999) and have the skills and abilities to execute the tasks and activities that are associated with the implementation of the intended change (change confidence) (Holt, Armenakis, Field & Harris 2007). As suggested by Bandura and Adams (2000), the stronger an employees' change confidence is, the more active his or her coping efforts are. Employees whose confidence level is low, or whose coping efforts cease, are more likely to resist organizational change. Our second hypothesis therefore reads: Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between personal valence and employee commitment.

### **Perceptions of Change Communication and Employees' Commitment:**

Change communication and training are essential pre-requisites to fostering healthy attitudes towards the change process. Need for change and personal and organizational value can be improved through proper and effective communication of the change process. Organizational change initiatives often fail as a result of poorly managed communication, which results in rumors, resistance to change and exaggeration of the negative aspects of the change (Elving & Bennebroek Gravenhorst 2009). By communicating the change and its associated outcomes, managers are able to enhance personal and organizational valence for the change (Yazici 2002).

Through communication, the success and triumphs associated with the change are relayed to employee, fuelling change confidence (Reichers, Wanous & Austin 1997) and enhancing employee trust in management (Swanson & Power 2001). Similarly, all failures and mistakes associated with the change should be communicated to employees, as this serves to restore management credibility and trust (Wanous, Reichers & Austin 2000). Since trust is a "physiological state comprising the intentions to accept vulnerability based on positive exceptions of intention or behaviour of another" (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer 1998: 124), it creates willingness among employee to engage in risk-taking (Mayer & Davis 1999), which is often required during times of change because change processes in organizations involve both an element of risk and vulnerability, employees who trust management are more likely to engage confidently with the risk associated with organizational change and may, as a result, display higher levels of change efficacy or confidence. Our next hypothesis therefore states: Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment.

### **Theoretical Review**

Each model of change represents a different ideology with its own assumptions about the nature of human beings and social/business organizations. For example, can people change easily, or do they have fairly rigid identities? Most models address the question of determinism: is change beyond the capacity of people to manage and shape? The assumptions made about change are also assumptions about the nature of reality and people. However, below are two models used by the researcher to buttress this study.

## Life Cycle Model

These models share the assumptions with evolutionary models in terms of adaptation and systems approach. They differ in being less objective, focusing on the importance of human beings in the change process, and viewing changes that occur within the life cycles of people as well as those of the organizations they create. Life-cycle or developmental model emphasizes systematic individual change.

**Assumptions:** Life-cycle models evolved from studies of child development and focus on stages of organizational growth, maturity and decline (Levy and Merry, 1986). Some scholars view life-cycle and developmental models as a branch of evolutionary models that focus on human development theories rather broad biological theories (Garud and Van de Ven 2001). Within these models, change is typically seen as part of a stage and is progressive and rational (Miller and Friesen, 1980). Organizations are born, and then they grow, mature, go through stages of revival, and eventually decline (Goodman 1982). Change does not occur because people see the necessity of even want change; it occurs because it is natural progression that cannot be stopped or altered (Miller and Friesen, 1980; Morgan, 1986). Developmental models focus on stages that are less predetermined than those in life-cycle models.

Change occurs as individuals within the organization adapt to its life cycle. Management is much more central than in evolutionary models and assists members of the organization to grow through training and motivational techniques (Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1996). The environment is ambiguous and threatening within this model. To adjust to this environment, processes include training and development, communication, and other structures that allow growth (Boleman and Deal, 1991; Miller and Friesen, 1980). The outcome within this change process is new organizational identity which is strongly emphasized in these models as a reason that people resist change (Garud and Van de Ven 2001).

Identification with the organization and personalization of work is also reference. The major metaphor is the teacher or guide. Change is the result of staff development and leaders who bring people along to organizational maturity. Life-cycle models are related to, but different from learning models, learning is more adaptive, habitual, and regulated by nature (Burners, 1996). Theories that focus more on learning and unlearning habits would fit within the life-cycle category. Some recent models of emotional intelligence and adaptability to change also fall within the life-cycle model (Collins, 1998). For example, certain abilities make one more able to or open to change, such as sensitivity to the motivations and perspectives of others (often termed emotional intelligence). Change occurs both within the stage (first order) and the crises point (second order). Life-cycle models characterize certain types of changes as typical within particular parts of the cycle. For example, change in process is typical in the maturation phase, while change in structure is common within the centralization process. These patterns are captured in Kim Cameron's work (1991).

Cameron (1991) tries to integrate the findings of ten life-cycle models into metamodel. Within his model are four stages: entrepreneurship, collectivity, formalization and control, and elaboration of structure. As in other models, the first stage is a time of little coordination, extensive ideas, and marshalling resources. As the organization passes into the collectivity stage, there is greater sense of shared mission and strong commitment while innovation continues. However, during the formalization and control stage, rules and stable structures are put in place, innovation is rare, and procedures and efficiency are the foci. As the organization enters the elaboration-of-structure stage, it begins to go through a series of renewals through decentralization, expansion, or other adaptation. The distinctive characteristic of this life-cycle model is that change is described as common place across different stages-enactment selection, retention happens among all employees within all life-cycles, but with some distinctions in the process (Garud and Van de Ven 2001).

The human resource tradition in companies reflects the life-cycle model as well (Bolman and Deal, 1991). Developmental theory examine human motivation, individual and group interaction, retraining and development as central to organizational process and change. Although human resources theories enjoy a long tradition, Bolman and Deal popularized this approach to analysing organizations with their notion of the human resource lens. Seen through the human resources lens, organizational change is difficult for individuals because they have to change their current approach, which is tied to their identity and strengths. In order to help assuage this fear leaders need to make the change understandable and train people to operate differently. Change will not occur successfully unless all people are prepared for it. This model shifts emphasis from the leaders or a few internal characteristics to activities throughout the organization.

Each individual plays a critical role in adjusting to the life cycle. Activities focus on individual development, overcoming fear of change, training and development. Leaders analyse the need for training, assess the institutional culture, and monitor the environment and life cycle.

**Benefits and Criticism:**The benefit of these models is that they focus on a previous missing aspect of change; the fact that organizations proceed through different phases. Earlier models treated organizations as differing in type according to sector, size, and so forth, but not in terms of development.

### **Evolutionary Theory/Models:**

There are two main types of evolutionary models: social evolutionary models and biological models. Many individual models have developed within this tradition: adaptation, resource dependence, self-organization, contingency and system theory, strategic choice, punctuated equilibrium, and population ecology.

**Major Assumptions:**The earliest ideas on biological investigations of change focused on change as a slow stream of mutations, gradually shaped by evolutionary theories reflected in disciplines such as political science and sociology. The main assumption underlying all these theories is that change is dependent on circumstances, situational variables, and the environment faced by each organization (Morgan, 1986). Social system is diversified, interdependent, complex systems evolves over time naturally (Morgan, 1986). But evolution is basically deterministic, and people have only a minor impact on the nature and direction of the change process (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1985). These models focus on the inability of organizations to plan for and respond to change, and their tendency to instead "manage" change as it occurs. The emphasis is on slow process, rather than discrete events or activities (Kieser, 1989). Change happens because the environment demands change for survival. Some models suggest that adaptation can be proactive and anticipatory having no ability to influence adaptability to managers having significant ability to be proactive, anticipating changes in the environment (March, 1994a).

The earliest examples of evolutionary models are modified theories of natural selection applied to organizational change. Later, unique models developed, such as the resource-dependence model. Within resource-dependence models, leaders make choices to adapt to their environment. The organization and its environment have an interdependent relationship, and the analytical focus is on transactions that occur as part of this relationship. This model differs from natural selection in its focus on leaders as active agents able to respond to and change the environment (Goodman, 1989). Some models of strategy are also reflected within the evolutionary tradition, focusing on the effect of the environment. For example, in the strategic choice approach, managers can choose which environments they operate within, scanning, predicting changes and steering the course of the organization (Cameron, 1991). One notion that has developed from this theory is the diversification—that is, the idea that generalist organizations perform better under certain environmental conditions because they have "diverse" customers, products and services, and thus are less likely to feel the impact of changes in one part of the market. This type of adaptation can only be seen when viewed at the population level; hence the term population ecology. A recent revival of evolutionary models of change applies chaos theory to change, as popularized by Margaret Wheatly in her book *Leadership and the new science: discovering order in a chaotic world* (1999). Change is seen as inherent biological systems; all organizations are constantly changing. The emphasis, as in earlier open-systems models, is on being aware of solutions inherent in the system through feedback loops, resiliency; and self-organizing, allowing structures to emerge within the system.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Population of the Study**

A population is an aggregate or complete set of items that share at least one property in common, which is a subject of statistical analysis (Thirkettle, 2001). The general population of this study as at the time this research was carried out was made up of a workforce of 1400 employees. This information was derived from Sunseed Feed Limited, Annual report, (2018).

### **Sampling and Sampling Techniques**

Sampling involves selecting a representative number from a given population where it is believed that a common feature exists among the elements of a given population Baridam, (2001:5 I).

Out of the thirty-seven (37) registered manufacturing companies operating in Kaduna State, Sunseed Feed Limited, Kaduna was selected. The researcher has decided to use probability sampling method of stratified sampling method to analyse the data collected in this research.

The sample size used for this study was determined at 5% level significance using Tarn Yamane' s Formula (TYF).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

$n$

--

$$1 + N(e)^2$$

Where  $n$  = sample size sought

$N$  = population

$e$  = level of significance

The sample sought is:

$$1400 \ n =$$

$$1 + 400(0.05)^2$$

$$1400 \ n =$$

$$1 + 400 (0.0025)$$

$n$

$$1400$$

$$n = \frac{1400}{4.5} = 311$$

$$4.5$$

Therefore, the sample size that was used in this study constitutes 311 employees. The sampling procedure used in selecting the 311 samples (employees) from the population of workforce is the simple random sampling procedure.

### Data Analysis Techniques

The researcher utilized a five point likert summated scale to show the respondent's level of agreement with the questions asked in the questionnaires. The levels are: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Correlation: The Spearman correlation coefficient is used to measure the degree of relationship between the two sets of ranked observations. In other words, the term refers to the strength of a relationship between two variables or the dependent of one variable upon another. A strong or high correlation means that the two or more variables have a strong relationship with one another. While on the other hand, a weak or low correlation means that the variables are hardly related.

Correlation coefficients can range from -1.00 to+ 1.00. When the value of the coefficient is -1.00 it represents a perfect negative correlation, while on the other hand, when it is +1.00 it represents a perfect positive correlation. When the value is 0.00, it signifies that there is no relationship between the variables tested.

The justification for choosing the Spearman rank Correlation Coefficient tool and regression analysis for this research work is that it appropriately measures the independent and dependent variables of our instruct in our conceptual framework of this research. That is, the relationship between change readiness, personal valence, perception of change communication and perception of training for change with that of employees' commitment, whether they are positively related or negatively related. Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical tools is used to analyse the data to derive solution to the research work. **Presentation of Analysis of Data**

## Presentation of Data

The analysis of responses from the distributed questionnaire was examined in this section, 3 I I sets of validated Questionnaire was sent out to the various respondents, 309 were successfully retrieved but 300 was subsequently found to be appropriate for the purpose of analysis representing 95%.

### Table 1 Profile of the Respondents

#### SIN Variables Frequency Percentage(%) Cumulative

Percentage (%) Gender Male 168 56 Female 132 44 Total 300 100 Age Range Below 30

140

46.7

46.7 31-40 100 33.3 80 Above 40 60 20 100 Total 300 100 Marital Status Single 175 58.3 58.3 Married 125 41.7 100 Total 300 100 Educational Qualification O/level

145

48.3

48.3 Diploma 45 15 63.3 Degree PG

98

12

32.7

4

96

100.0 Total 300 100 Department Human resource 22 7.3 7.3 Production 115 38.3 45.6 Marketing 30 10 55.6 Raw material 45 15 70.6 Finance 48 16 86.6 Transport 40 13.4 100 Total 300 100

Table I shows the profile of the several respondents, it was revealed that 168 of the respondents were males representing 56%, of the respondents while the females' respondents were 132 representing 44% of the sampled population.

On the age range of the respondents, it was revealed that 140 of the respondents representing 46.7% of those sampled were below 30 years of age, 100 other respondents representing 33.3% fell in within the age range of 31 - 40, lastly, 60 respondents representing 20% of the sample used were above 40 years. The marital composition of the sample shows that 175 of the respondents being 58.3% of the sampled population used were single, while 125 being 41.7% were married.

The educational qualification revealed that 145 of the respondents being 48.3% were O/Level holders; 45 being 15% were diploma holders; 98% being 32.7% respondents were degree holders and lastly, 12 representing a mere 4% were post graduate holders.

The departmental composition shows that 22 of the respondents were in Human resource department, 115 in Production, 30 in Marketing, 45 in Raw material, 48 in Finance, while 40 of the respondents were in Transport department.

### Analysis of Other Research Data

This section is intended to subject the sample response obtained from the field survey to further analyses in other to answer questions relating to the research question, using correlation and regression statistical method, in there to ascertain the desirability of the questionnaire divided into five separate sub-scales. Change readiness, Personal valence, Perception of change communication and Perception of training for change are the independent variables while employee's commitment represents the dependent variable for the purpose of regressing the four earlier mentioned sub- scales respectively.

**Research Question One: What is the relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment?****Table 2 Change readiness and Employees' Commitment****SIN 5 43 2 1 Mean Std.****Dev.**

9 Organizational changes improve our company's overall efficiency

88 144 39 29 - 4.16 0.78

10 The senior managers of our company encourage members of staff to embrace organizational changes

146 39 41 48 26 3.75 0.93

11 The managers of our company are interested in making the change effort a success

89 155 19 27 10 3.94 0.79

12 Members of staff seem to embrace support for organizational change efforts

94 117 49 20 20 4.09 0.98

A total of 232 of the respondents agree that Organizational changes improve their company's overall efficiency, 39 show undecided, and 29 show disagree. On the question 10, senior managers of our company encourage members and staff to embrace organizational changes" 185 show agree, 41 show undecided, while 74 disagree.

On question 11, 244 respondents agree that the managers of the company are interested in making the change effort a success, 19 of the respondents show undecided, and 37 disagree. On question 12, 211 members of the staff seem to embrace organizational change efforts, 49 show undecided, while 40 respondents show disagree. Correlation among the variables of change readiness is represented as X1 and the questionnaire items such as; Organizations Efficiency, Managers Encouragement, Managers Commitment, Members that seem to embrace change is explained respectively, as presented thus:

**Table 3 Correlation among the Variables of Change Readiness**

X1<sub>1</sub>X1<sub>2</sub>X1<sub>3</sub>X1<sub>4</sub>

X1<sub>1</sub> |

X1<sub>2</sub> .699\*\* |

X1<sub>3</sub> .804\*\* .627\*\* |

X1<sub>4</sub> .596\*\* .932\*\* .658\*\* |

The correlation coefficient for Change readiness as presented in table 3 shows that all the indicators of X1 (Change readiness) have an overwhelming positive correlation among variables, which confirm that they are a good measure of Change readiness. Specifically, X1<sub>1</sub> which is the first variable correlated positively with X1<sub>2</sub> (r.699\*\*,0.01), X1<sub>2</sub> also correlated positively with X1<sub>3</sub> (r.804\*\*,0.01), and also did the same with X1<sub>4</sub> (r.0.596\*\*, 0.01).

The second variable been X1<sub>2</sub> correlated positively with X1<sub>3</sub> (r = .627\*\*,0.01) also positively with X1<sub>4</sub> (r = .932\*\*,0.01). It also revealed that X1<sub>3</sub> been the third variable is correlated positively with X1<sub>4</sub> (r = .658\*\*,0.01).

**Table 4 Coefficients a Change Readiness and Employees' Commitment**

Model Unstandardized

Coefficients

Standardized

Coefficient

T

Si B Std. Error Beta

(constant)

Change -20.555 .774 -26.557 .000

readiness .707 .034 .944 49.476 .000 Dependent Variable: Employees' Commitment

The regression analysis result presented in table 4 above confirms that Change readiness has a positive relationship with Employee commitment; given the Beta value ( $\beta = .944$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ).

**Table 5 Model Summary of Change Readiness and Employees' Commitment**

Model R R square Adjusted R

Square

Std. Error of

the Estimate

Durbin-

Watson

1 .944a .891 .891 1.47856 2.01

**a. Predictors: (Constant), Change readiness**

Table 5 reveals the extent to which Change readiness accounted for change in Employee commitment as indicated by the adjusted R<sup>2</sup>, which shows that 89.1% (.891) of the change in employees' commitment is brought about by Change readiness. **Research Question two: To what extent is personal valence related to employees' commitment?**

**Table 6 Personal Valence and Employees' Commitment****SIN Personal Valence 5 4 3 2 1 Mean Std.**

**Dev.** 13 The implementation of this change indicated

financial benefits on my way

48 146 41 55 10 3.75 0.93

14 Many of the personal relationships I have

developed will be disrupted by this change

59 145 39 47 10 3.94 0.79

15 I have nothing to gain when this change is

implemented

39 145 39 37 40 3.94 0.77

16 My future employment with this organization is in

jeopardy as a result of the intended change.

94 117 - 40 49 4.09 0.98

From table 6 above 194 respondents agree that implementation of this change indicates financial benefits on their way, 41 are undecided, while 65 disagree. Again 204 respondent agree that this change will disrupt many of the personal relationships they have developed, 39 respondents are undecided, while 57 disagree.

184 respondents agree that they have nothing to gain when this changes is implemented, 39 respondents are undecided, while 77 disagree. 211 respondents agree that other employment with the organization is in jeopardy as a result of intended change, while 89 of the respondents disagree.

Correlations of Personal Valence variables is represented as X2 while the correlations among the questionnaire items such as; Financial benefit, Disrupt personal relationship, Personal gain, Future Employment which are significant at 0.01 is explained as X21, X22, X23, X24 respectively.

**Table 7 Correlation among the Variables of Personal valence**

**X21 X22 X23 X24 X21 1 X22 .791\*\*1 X23 .730\*\* .930\*\*1 X24 .875\*\* .824\*\* .878\*\*1**

Table 7 indicated an overwhelming positivity for the correlation coefficients of indicators of X2 (Personal Valence), indicate that they are a good measure of Personal Valence. The findings indicated that X21 which is the first variable correlated positively with X22 ( $r = .791^{**}, 0.01$ ) also correlated with X23 ( $r = .730^{**}, 0.01$ ) and did same also with X24 ( $r = .875^{**}, 0.01$ ).

X22 which is also the second variable maintains a positive correlation with X23 ( $r = .930^{**}, 0.01$ ) and also did same with X24 ( $r = .824^{**}, 0.01$ ). X23 being the third variable is positively correlated with X2. ( $r = .878^{**}, 0.01$ ).

**Table 8**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Regression analysis for Personal Valence and Employees' Commitment

Model Unstandardized

Coefficients

Standardized

Coefficient

T

Sig. B Std. Error Beta

(constant)

Personal 1.778 327 55.43 .000

Valence .823 .017 .9452 .000

49.75

9

**Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment**

Table 8 shows the regression analysis result for Personal Valence, it indicates that Personal Valence and Employee commitment are positively related given the beta value as exhibited in the regression table ( $\beta = .945$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ).

**Table 9 Model Summary of Personal Valence and Employees' Commitment**

Model R R square Adjusted R

Square

Std. Error of

the Estimate

Durbin-

Watson

**1 .945a .892 .892 1.47107 2.01****a. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Valence**

Table 9 shows the extent to which Personal Valence accounted for change in Employee commitment as revealed by adjusted R<sup>2</sup>, which shows that 89.2% (.892) of the change in Employees' commitment is brought about by Personal Valence.

**Research Question Three: To what extent is perception of change communication related to employees' commitment?**

**Table 10 Perception of Change Communication and Employees' Commitment****SIN Personal Valence** 5 4 3 2 1 **Mean Std.****Dev.**

17 The information received about the changes in my organization gives me complete satisfaction

148 104 39 9 - 3.16 0.88

18 The process of accessing the necessary information about changes in the organization is well known to me

116 89 21 48 26 3.25 0.73

19 The need for change is clarified by the information transmitted about the changes in the organization

89 145 39 7 20 3.94 0.79

20 There is the belief that opportunities still exist for growth and with the change communication

124 97 39 40 IO 4.11 0.92 Table 10 shows that 252 respondents agree that the information they receive about the change in the organization gives them complete satisfaction, 9 disagree while 39 are undecided. Again 205 respondents agree that they know how to access information about changes in the organization, 72 disagree while 21 are undecided.

234 respondents agree that the need for change is clarified by the information transmitted about the changes in the organization, 24 disagree, while 39 are undecided. Similarly, 221 respondents agree that opportunities still exist for growth and with the change communication, 50 disagree, while 39 are undecided.

Perception of change communication is represented as X3 while the questionnaire items such as; Satisfied with information, Information assessment, Information transmitted, Opportunity for growth are shown and explained by X31, X32, X33, and X34 respectively.

**Table 11 Correlation among the variables of Perception of Change Communication.****X31 X32 X33 X34****X31 1****X32 .843\*\*1****X33 .796\*\* .799\*\*1****X34 .796\*\* .855\*\* .691\*\*1**

Table 11 above, reveals the result of the inter-item correlation for Perception of change communication and the results show an overwhelming positive correlation among the items for Perception of change communication. Specifically, X31 which is the first variable correlated positively with X32 ( $r = .843^{**}$ , 0.0 I) and also correlated with X33 ( $r = .796^{**}$ , 0.01), and also with

X34 ( $r = .796^{**}$ , 0.0 I).

X32 being the second variable maintained a positively correlation with X33 ( $r = .799^{**}$ , 0.01) and did the same with X34 ( $r = .855^{**}$ , 0.01).

**Table 12 Commitment**

Coefficients a Perceptions of Change Communication and Employees'

Model Unstandardized

Coefficients

Standardized

Coefficient

T

Si B Std. Error Beta

(constant)

Perceptions of

Change

1.878

.853

.241

.013

.969

7.793

67.305

.000

.000

**Communication Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment** Table 12 shows that Perception of change communication has a significant relationship with employees' commitment which agrees with the result of Beta value ( $\beta = .969$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ).

**Table 13 Commitment**

Model Summary Perceptions of Change Communication and Employees'

Model R R square Adjusted R

Square

Std. Error of

the Estimate

Durbin-

Watson

1 .968a .938 .938 1.11507 2.01

**a. Predictors: (Constant), Employees' Commitment**

The adjusted R<sup>2</sup>, 93.8% (0.938) findings showing on the model summary table (13) shows the extent of change in employees' commitment which is accounted for by Perception of change communication.

## Hypothesis Testing

This section subjected the earlier stated hypotheses in chapter one test, to ascertain the desirability or otherwise, using regression analysis method. The four variables of organizational change namely: Change readiness; Personal Valence; Perception of change communication; Perception of training for change; were used as the independent variable, while Employee commitment acted as the dependent variable for the purpose of regressing the other four variables respectively aimed at validating or rejecting the hypothesis.

**Decision Rule** The decision rule is that when the probability (P) values is greater (>) than the critical values of significance, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is accepted; but when otherwise, that is, the probability values is less (<) than the critical value of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. The significance level is set at 0.05 (5%). This is in agreement with the opinion of Gujarati & Porter (2009).

**Hypothesis One (H<sub>01</sub>): There is no significant positive relationship between change readiness and employees' commitment.**

The coefficient table 4 above shows the simple model that expresses how Change readiness influences employees to be committed and to improve in performance. The model is shown mathematically as follows;

$Y = a + bx$  where  $y$  is employee commitment and  $x$  is Change readiness,  $a$  is a constant factor and  $b$  is the value of coefficient. From table 4 therefore, **Employees' commitment = -20.555 + 0.707 Change readiness**. This means that for every 100% change in employee's commitment, Change readiness contributed 70.7%. Table 4 above shows the regression analysis for change readiness and employees' commitment on hypothesis one. The table reveals that the critical values of significance calculated (.000) is less (<) than the probability (p) value of committing a type one error (0.05), hence, the null hypotheses is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted.

**Hypothesis Two (H<sub>02</sub>): There is no significant relationship between personal valence and employees' commitment.**

The coefficient table 8 above shows the simple model that expresses how good Personal valence helps employees to be committed and improve in performance in their organization. The model is shown mathematically as follows;

$Y = a + bx$  where  $y$  is employee commitment and  $x$  is Personal Valence,  $a$  is a constant factor and  $b$  is the value of coefficient. In summary, **Employees' commitment = 1.778 + 0.823 Personal Valence**. This means that for every 100% change in employee's commitment, good Personal valence contributed 82.3%.

Table 8 shows that the exact level of significance (.000) is less than the probability of committing a type one error (0.05). There is the need therefore to reject the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship and accepting the alternative that stated otherwise.

**Hypothesis Three (H<sub>03</sub>): There is no significant relationship between perception of change communication and employees' commitment.**

The coefficient table 12 above shows the simple model that expresses how Perception of change communication of employees helps them to be committed to the firm. The model is shown mathematically as follows;

$Y = a + bx$  where  $y$  is employee commitment and  $x$  is Perception of change communication,  $a$  is a constant factor and  $b$  is the value of coefficient. From this table therefore, **Employees' commitment = 1.878 + 0.853 Perception of change communication**. This means that for every 100% change in employee's commitment, Perception of change communication contributed 85.3%.

On hypothesis three is shown the model summary in the table 13 above, while table 12 shows that the exact level of significance (.000) is less than the probability of committing a type one error (0.05). There is the need therefore to reject the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship and accepting the alternative that stated otherwise.

## Discussion of Findings

### Change Readiness and Employees' Commitment

Table 4 above shows that the regression analysis result for Change readiness exhibited a positive relationship with employee's commitment, given the Beta value ( $\beta = .944$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). More so, the Model summary (table 5) shows that 89.1% (.891) of the change in employee commitment is brought about by Change readiness. However, the result of the tested hypothesis in table 5 indicates that there is significant positive relationship between Change readiness and employee's commitment. The above finding is in accordance with the assertion of Curtis et al., (2009) that Change readiness boost employee's moral, productivity and stimulate employees to remain committed to their organization. The implication of this finding is that lack of employee Change readiness could lead to lack of morale, productivity and problems with employee turnover.

### Personal Valence and Employees' Commitment

Table 8 shows that the regression analysis result for Personal Valence exhibited a positive relationship with employee's commitment, given the Beta values ( $\beta = .945$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). More so, the result in the model summary in table 9 shows that 89.2% (.892) of the change in Employee commitment is brought about by Personal Valence. However, the result of the tested hypothesis in table 9 indicated that there is significant positive relationship between employee's commitment and Personal Valence.

The above finding is in agreement with Cheng-Hua et al., (2009) when he emphasized that commitment and good Personal Valence are related, adding that voluntary turnover is typically the result because there is a desirability to move between jobs when there is no favourable or good Personal Valence for employees. The implication of the finding is that organizations that do not provide favourable working condition for their employees will witness employee dissatisfaction and turnover as a result of employees not being committed to their job.

### Perception of Change Communication and Employees' Commitment

Table 12 above shows that the regression analysis result for Perception of change communication shows a significant positive relationship with employee's commitment, given the Beta value ( $\beta = .969$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). More so, the result in the model summary in table 13 shows that 85% of the change in innovation is explained by diversity in educational background. However, the result of the tested hypothesis in table 13 indicates that there is significant positive relationship between Employee commitment and Perception of Change communication.

This finding is in alignment with Choi and Dickson (2010) and Poulston (2008) that there are certain links between the reasons why employees commit themselves to a company and level of Employee's commitment.

The implication of this finding is that organizations that do not train and develop their employees will lose their commitment.

## Conclusion

In today's competitive world every organization is facing new challenges regarding qualitative service and creating committed workforce. No organization can perform at peak levels unless each employee is committed to the organization's objectives.

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that there is significant positive relationship between Change readiness and employee's commitment. Companies that provide career planning for their young employees are actually creating Change readiness for them to work towards a goal, as well as providing an incentive to retain these employees for a very long time. Hence employees committed to organizational goals are enhanced.

The study also indicates that there is significant positive relationship between employee's commitment and Personal Valence. Commitment and good Personal Valence are related, voluntary turnover is typically the result because there is a desirability to move between jobs when there is no favourable or good Personal Valence for employees.

Perception of change communication shows a significant positive relationship with employee's commitment. Training has a poor reputation in the hospitality industry, and companies need to find a training program that not only works for them, but also enhances the quality of employees they produce.

## Contribution to Knowledge

The study contributed to knowledge in that it further strengthens previous research findings in the area of Change readiness and employee's commitment, employee's commitment and Personal, Valence, communication with employee's commitment, all these will be of great assistance to future researchers and manufacturing industries.

## REFERENCES

- Adebanjo, D. (2006). "Corporate Restructuring: Managing the change problem form within *"Leadership and Organization Development*, Journal Vol. 12 No 2 P.357-359
- Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G. & Feild, H.S. (1999). 'Making change permanent: A model of institutionalising change interventions', In Woodman, R.W. & Pasmore, W.A. (eds), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol 12. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G. & Mossholder, K.W. (1993). 'Creating readiness for organizational change', *Human Relations*, 46: 681-702.
- Bateman, S. and Carl P. Zeithaml (2005). *Management Function and Strategy Homewood*, 11: Irwin.
- Bandura, A. & Adams, E. (2000). 'Analysis of self-efficacy theory of 'behavioural change'', *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 1(4): 287-310.
- Bagherian, R., Bahaman, A.S., Asnarulkhadi, A.S. & Shamsuddin, A. (2009). 'Social exchange approach to people's participations in watershed management programs in Iran', *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 34(3):428-411.
- Baridam, D.M.(2001): *Research Methods in Administrative Sciences*.(3rd d). Port Harcourt: Shedrack Publishers.
- Bellon, V. (2007). 'Psychological contract assessment after a major organizational change: The case of mergers and acquisitions', *Employee Relations*, 29(0):68-88.
- Bennebroek G.K.M.(2003). A different view on resistance to change. Paper presented at the Power Dynamics and Organizational Change IV Symposium at the 11th EAWOP Conference in Lisbon, Portugal, 14-17 May 2003.
- Bennet, H. & Durkin, M. (2001). 'The effects of organizational change on employee psychological attachment', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(2): 126-147.
- Bolman, Lee G. and Deal, T.E. (1991). "Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi- frame, multi-sector analysis", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 30, o 4, pp. 509-534.
- Bovey, W. & Hede, A. (2001). 'Resistance to organizational change: The role of cognitive and affective processes. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 22(1): 372-382.
- Buchel, M. (2004). *Accelerating change, Training and Development* Vol. 50 No 4 p.248-251.
- Burke, W.W. and Trahan B.(2006). *Travelling Through Transitions, Training & Development Journal* Vol. 50, No 4 p.237-241.
- Burnes, B.(1996). *Managing change: A strategic approach to organizational dynamics*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Catherine R. Curtis, Randall S. Upchurch & Denver E. Severt (2009), Employee Motivation and Organizational Commitment: A Comparison of Tipped and Nontipped Restaurant Employees. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 10:3, 253-269, Chiang, C.F. (2010). 'Perceived organizational change in the hotel industry: An implication for change schema', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 29: 157-167.
- Cheng-Hua, T., Shyh-Jer, C., & Shih-Chien, F. (2009). Employment modes, high-performance work practices, and organizational performance in the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50, 413-430.
- Choi, Y. & Dickson, D. (2010). A case study into the benefits of management training programs: impacts on hotel employee turnover and satisfaction level. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9, 103-116.
- Chreim, S. (2006). "Postscript to change: Survivors' retrospective views of organizational changes, *Personal Review*, 35(3): 315-335.

- Cochran, J.K., Bromley, M.L. & Swanda, M.J. (2002). "Sheriffs deputies' receptivity to organizational change", *Policing*, 25: 507-529.
- Coetsee, L.(1999). 'From resistance to commitment', *Public Administration Quarterly*, 23: 204- 222.
- Collins, D. (1998). *Organizational Change: Sociological Perspectives* (London: Routledge).
- Cotton, J.L. & Tuttle, J.M. (1986). 'Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1): 55-70.
- Dessler, G.(1998). *Management: Leading people and organizations in the 21st century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dove, R.(2001). "*The principles of change*". *Automotive Manufacturing and Production* March, 12th.
- Elving, W., & Bennebroek, G. K. (2009). Information, communication and uncertainty during organizational change: The role of commitment and trust. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Sheraton New York, New York
- City. [Online] Available from: [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p12967\\_index.htm](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p12967_index.htm)
- Gaertner, K.N., and Nollen, S.D. (2001). "Career experience, *perceptions of employment practices and psychological commitment to the organization*" *Human Relations* Vol. 42 pp. 975-91.
- Hahn, M. (2007). Measuring Corporate Effectiveness. Retrieved from <http://www.en.articlesgratuits.com/on> 12-10-2014.
- Galpin, T. (2000). *Connecting culture in organizational change*, HR magazine, 41, p. 85-90. Garud, R. and Van De Ven, (2001). *A strategic change process*, in Pettigrew, H; Thomas, Hand Whiuingon, R. (eds) *Handbook of strategic and management*, London Sage Publications.
- Goodman, P.S. (1982). *Change in organiza6ons: New perspectives on theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gujarati, DN. and Porter, D.C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics*. 5th Edition, McGraw Hill Inc. New York. Hague, S. (2005). Job satisfaction and job involvement of the mid level industrial managers, *Dhaka University Journal of Psychology*, 19(1):33-42.
- Henderson L. and Tuckman J. (2005). Developing Teams During profound organization change supervision. *Journal of Organizational Development* Vol. 8 No 2 p. 354-358.
- Hendry, C. (2004). Creating whole Organization Change Through Learning Theory. *Human Relations Journal* Vol. 49, No 2 p. 621-639.
- Holt, D.T., Armenakis, A.A., Feilcl, H.S. & Harris, S.G. (2007). 'Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale', *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 43(2): 232-255.
- Hrebiniak, L.G. and Joyce, W.F. (1989). Organizational Adaptation: Strategic choice and Environmental Determinism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 336-349. Ihunda, C.C. (2005). *Environmental influence manager's Leadership style* (A study of public corporations in Rivers state.) *International Research Journal for development* January-April 2005 ISSN 1595-0719 vol. 7 No 1. Institute of Strategic management, (Nigeria), strategist News Letter vol. 2, No I. (2005).
- Jansen, KJ & Michael, JR. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of change-based momentum: A longitudinal study, University of Virginia: Darden School of Business Available at: .../Antecedents%20and%20consequences%20of%20change%20AMJ.doc
- Jones. L. Watson, B., Hobman, E., Bordia, P., Gallons, C. & Callan, VJ (2008). "Employee perceptions of organizational change: impart of hierarchical level", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 29(4):294-316.
- Kieser, A. (1989). "Organizational Institutional, and Societal Evolution: Medieval crafts Guilds and the Genesis of Formal Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 540 -564.
- Kim Cameron and Sarah J. Freeman (1999), "Cultural Congruence, Strength and Type: Relationships to Effectiveness". *Research in Organizational Development*, 5: 23-58.
- Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. (2005). "Organizational Behaviour", 6th ed, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lau, CM., Tse, D.K. & Zhou, N. (2002). 'Institutional forces and organizational culture in China: Effects on change schemas, firm commitment and job satisfaction', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(3): 533-550.

- Levy, A. & Merry, U. (1986). *Organisational transformation: Approaches, strategies, theories*. New York, NY Praeger.
- Mayer, R.C. & Davis, J.H. (1999). 'The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 123-136.
- Miller, D., & Frisese, P. (1980). Archetypes of Organizational transition. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 268-299.
- Miller, V.D., Johnson, J.R. & Garn, J. (1994). "Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change", *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 22:59-80. Morgan, G. (1986), *Images of organization*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Niehoff B.P., Moorman, R.H., Blakely G, Fuller J (2001). *The influence of empowerment on Employee loyalty in a downsizing environment*. *Group organ. manage.* 26(1):93-113.
- Piderit, S.K. (2000). 'Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change', *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4): 783- 794.
- Poulston, J. (2008). Hospitality workplace problems and poor training: a close relationship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 412-427.
- Rajagopalan, N. & Spreitzer, GM. (1996). Toward a theory of strategic change: A multi-lens perspective and integrated framework. *Academy of management review*, 22 (I), 48-79.
- Reichers, A.E., Wanous, J.P. & Austin, J.T. (1997). 'Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change', *Academy of Management Executive*, 11: 48-59.
- Richard, P.J., Devinney, T.M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3): 718- 804.
- Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S. & Camerer, C. (1998). 'Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust', *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 393-405.
- Salami C.G.E. (2011). *Management and Organization Behavior*. "Understanding and leading people and organizations in the 21st century.
- Schwartz. A.E. (2003). *"Egypt Guidelines for Managing Change"*. *Supervisor Management Review* Vol. 12 No Sp. 204-312.
- Stebel, P. (2003). *Why do Employees Resist Change?* *Harvard Business Review*, No 74, Pp. 86- 92.
- Swanson, V. & Power, K. (2001). 'Employees' perceptions of organizational restructuring: The role of social support', *Work and Stress*, 15(2): 161-178.
- Tai, W. T., (2006)., *Effects of Training Framing, General Self-efficacy and Training Motivation on Trainees' Training Effectiveness*, Emerald Group Publishers, 35( I), pp. 51-65.
- Thirkettle, G.I. (2001), *Business Statistics and statistical Method ELBS*, (1 6th Edition), UK.
- Trahant, W.W. Burke & Koontz (2005). *"Twelve Principles of Organizational Transformation"*. *Management Review* September, No 49 pp. 149-156.
- Vakola, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). 'Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees, stress and commitment?', *Employee Relations*, 27(2): 160-174.
- Visagie C.M., and Steyn C. (2011). *Organizational commitment and responses to planned organizational change*. An exploratory study. *Southern African Business Review* Volume 15 Number 3. Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E., & Austin, J.T. (2000). 'Cynicism about organizational change: Measurement, antecedents and correlates', *Group and Organization Management*, 25: 132- 153.
- Weber, P.S. & Weber, J.E. (2011), 'Changes in employee perceptions during organizational change', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22(6): 291-300.
- Weick, K.E., & Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.
- Wheatley, MJ (1999). *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about organizations from an Orderly Universe*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Yazici, H.J. (2002). 'The role of communication in organizational change: An empirical investigation', *Information and Management*, 39: 539-552.