

# **EMPLOYEES RESISTANCE TOWARDS ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE**

**Ass. Prof. Amrita Jain , Md Irfan Alam**

***MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION***

**School of Business**

**Galgotias University**



## **ABSTRACT**

While carrying out this study I came across number of factors which are usually considered when deciding when and what level of change should be introduced in any organisation, as a result, if these changes are not properly handled in the organisational system, it causes resistance from the people who are expected to effect these changes i.e., the employees, hence, the reasons why employee resist changes being introduced in an organisation. While carrying out this study, I gone through various articles and websites to understand the proper foundation and perspectives of change, resistance to change and how better management can benefit these changes in their organisation if they want the continued success of their organisation. I have collected the data through primary and secondary sources. The major findings for this study indicate that employee resist changes because of poor communication of the required change, lack of proper motivation and encouragement to effect such changes and the inhuman nature of the changes being introduced by the management. Conclusion from this study is that the employees were not properly communicated as the changes were being introduced, and the management did not put the hazardous nature of the job into conclusion before introducing such changes. It is therefore recommended that employees should be informed about the nature of the changes being introduced in the organisation and proper due process should be followed as well as adequate motivation and inventive packages.

It is very important to study and to know as well that why employees resist change in an organization, so that the organization can look into that and manage and implement the change accordingly. Through this study, the organization will be clearer on the concept of change in their organization and what should be the

perspective that should be there to implement those changes in an organization.

## **Background**

Organizations perceive change as very important for its survival and prosperity in today's most competitive environment and new business challenges. They make change initiative to keep up the pace with changing environment and new challenging competition. The success and performance superiority of organizations are very much dependent on its ability to align its internal arrangement with the demand of external world. While studying the change literature, the concept of change and its differentiation/types seem very ambiguous and it was very difficult to understand the overall picture of change from the scattered literature. As different authors have defined change, based on their differentiation, in different manners, e.g., Schien defined change as it can be natural evolutionary, planned and unplanned change, Leavitt expanded the technical-social (technical & social change) framework, by adding structural change (Leavitt, 1965). I will try to present somewhat clear and complete picture of organizational change based upon the literature and empirical study, which according to my point of view is very important for understanding change and its major problem i.e., employee's resistance to change (the main area of this study). My empirical study is based on a firm operating in a developing economy, which was under severe pressure from external environment and internal problems, and made it very important for its survival to introduce a major change program. Change as an important factor has been discussed by different authors as, 'change is the only constant' and very important for the firm. But managing change is very challenging & complex and great amount of care should be taken while making change. One of major problems/threats to organizational change is employees' resistance and has usually very unpleasant and negative implications for organization. The firm understudy proposed a change program but it was severely resisted by its employees and the change brought very negative results, opposite to its demands. Looking at the possible solutions discussed in the literature of change management, every measure has been applied by the experienced management of the firm to overcome resistance, but failed.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to understand goal conflict between firm and individuals and how it contributes to employees' resistance to change as a major potential cause/antecedent. Different authors have discussed the importance of causes/antecedents of employees' resistance to change to know the right problem and develop strategies to overcome it. According to Mintzberg, the cure might

actually prove to be just more of the cause. After understanding the causes/antecedents of employees' resistance to change in the literature, I have got an opportunity to add another potential but major cause of resistance, that is, goal conflict between firm and employees. Different theories have been discussed which provide sound basis for understanding and also providing solutions to decrease the negative effects and intensity of the goal conflict. It will enable us to provide management with recommendations for possible solutions to employees' resistance in the firm understudy. My empirical study helps us understand, how 'change' increases the magnitude and intensity of goal conflict and how it contributes towards employees' resistance to change. Finally, two theories will be used to suggest the best solutions to reduce the intensity and harmonize the goal conflict between firm and employees and hence overcome employees' resistance.

### **Theory**

The theories are about organizational change and resistance, principal agent theory, goal theory and Stakeholders' theory. The theory of organizational change and resistance help us understand the concept of change and resistance. Principal agent theory, neoclassical, neo-Keynesian, and managerial theory explain the conflict between organization and its employees' goals and interests. Stakeholder theory and principal agent theory has been studied and matched with the situation of the firm understudy to provide solutions/measures and suggest recommendations for reducing and harmonizing goal conflict, to overcoming resistance to change.

### **Analysis**

First a literature study is carried out to completely understand and present change and the resulting resistance and its causes. Using this literature, the practical change program in our empirical case will be presented. Another major potential cause/antecedent of employees' resistance will be presented i.e., goal conflict between firm and employees which has not been properly discussed in the literature and or has not been given importance. The situation of goal conflict

will be discussed in our empirical case to understand practically, how ‘change’ increases the magnitude of goal conflict, so as it become difficult for both parties to accept each other’s goals, which result in employees’ resistance to change. The empirical analysis is made from interviews/discussions and carried out on two levels; employees’ level and firm level, also past observations during the change period are used. Initially I analyse individual’s own role, interests, goals, needs, basis of satisfaction, and how the change program affected these. Secondly the firm’s own interests, needs, goals, and objectives were considered, to know how much important is the change program for the firm. The factor of goal/interest conflicts were systemized and analysed in relation to these two levels of analysis and then discussed in connection to the literature. The principal agent theory and stakeholders’ theory will be used to understand the notion of goal conflict between firm and its employees, and also to provide appropriate measures to reduce the intensity of goal conflict between firm and employees to overcome resistance. These findings were combined and matched with this empirical case to provide recommendations/solutions.

### **Summary**

While starting my thesis, I studied lot of literature on organizational change, and found that the concept of change and its types have been discussed by different authors in a manner that is very difficult to understand. Every author/researcher discusses his/her own concept regarding organizational change and have differentiated it as per their own study. I have tried to categorize different types of organizational change and present somewhat complete and clear picture of ‘what is change’ for which the existing literature has been used as a basis. After discussing the broad topic of this study, methodologies have been explained. On the basis of categorization of change, I have tried to understand and present the practical change program carried out in my empirical case.

Employees’ resistance, the basic topic of this study, is one of the major problems/threats to successful change program. In our empirical case, employees’ resistance failed an important and well-intended change program.

The first step after discovering employee's resistance led us to the exploration of causes of resistance which have been thought by different authors as very important for overcoming it.

The study of different causes/antecedents discussed by several authors has given us the opportunity to add another important potential cause of resistance, that is, goal conflict between firm and employees. It should be noted that even in normal situation, goal conflict exists between firm and its employees, but the magnitude and intensity of this conflict is very low and so it is hidden, we call this 'goal difference', and both parties accept each other's goals. In a strategic and major change program, firms alter their goals (e.g., cost minimization, innovative products, etc), which result in shifting and increasing their focus towards new goals. The shift in focus and increased commitment of firm towards attaining its new goals, increase the magnitude and intensity of goal conflict and it became very difficult for both parties to accept each other's goals. The firm's increased concentration and self-centred focus on its goals affects employees' personal goals, and it became very difficult for employees to achieve their own goals and satisfy their needs. In our empirical case, change in the firm altered its goals toward profit maximization which was very important for its survival in that critical situation. The firm's primary goal of survival was followed by new support goals which are quality control, productivity increase, cost minimization, and innovation & product development; to better achieve its primary goal. These firm's goals constrained employees from satisfying their own needs and achieving their own goals which is important for their own survival. It becomes very difficult for both parties to accept each other's goal which resulted in intensive goal conflict between them, and caused severe employees' resistance.

While studying this goal conflict, different supporting theories has been found which explain this concept and some also provides solutions to resolve goal conflict it to a favourable degree.

According to the principal agent theory, individuals (employees) as agents strive to maximize their utility while firm (owner) as principal strives for maximizing its profitability. The behaviour of firm as profit maximiser, and employees as utility maximiser can also be supported by neoclassical, neo-Keynesian, and managerial theories of firm. While studying our empirical case we analysed the behaviour of the firm and its employees after introducing the change program, and found that this firm was interested in maximizing its profit which was very important for its survival. The only possible ways to achieve these goals at that time by the firm was to utilize its employees efficiently and effectively, and to pay them according to their contributions in the firm's profit, demanding more of their efforts and time. On the other hand, employees (major part of employees were poor labours) are interested in maximizing their own utility by getting more salaries, investing less efforts and time, good working environment, and better facilities. These efforts by employees were believed as very important for their own survival. The demands of firm's new goals

constrained employees from achieving their own personal goals, which increased the magnitude of goal conflict between firm and its individuals followed by severe resistance from employees. Both parties (the firm and its employees) started extreme level of efforts for achieving their own conflicting goals, and their struggle has cancelled the effect of each other and both parties faced failure in achieving their goals.

The surprising and interesting thing I found here is that this goal conflict cannot be resolved or harmonized with the help of different ways/solutions proposed in the literature of change and resistance which were also applied by this firm and failed. Firms are required to take some other measures to deal with resistance due to intensive goal conflict. In this regard agency theory and stakeholders' theory has been used to provide solutions/measures to decrease the intensity and harmonize this goal conflict, and make it possible for both parties (firm & employees) to accept each other goals.

Agency theory proposes different solutions to align employee's goals with the firm's goals, to allow them work on a common ground and achieve the firm (principal) goals. These solutions are;

- a) establishing appropriate incentives for the agents to motivate them towards the principal's goals,
- b) Efficiently monitoring and observing agents' behaviour,
- c) Evaluating or monitoring the outcomes of the behaviour, i.e., shifting some risk of the firm towards employees, and
- d) Making efficient contracting with the employees.

Although these solutions are very important and effective in aligning employees' goal with the firm's goals, but I found that these solutions are more biased towards the firm's interest, and may de-motivate and increase employees' dissatisfaction, as employees are made to suffer by compromising on their personal goals and interests. According to Perrow, agency theory is unrealistically one sided because of its neglect and potential exploitation of workers i.e., agents. The next problem in agency theory is that it assumes efficient markets and doesn't consider the external forces and its irregularities.

Stakeholders' theory provides somewhat more realistic and justified solution to resolve goal conflict between firm and employees. It considers an imperfect and real market situation, and suggest accordingly. The aim is that firm should not only exist to satisfy its own needs but also the needs of those working for it, and the needs of society. Stakeholders' theory suggests maintaining a satisfactory balance with and between all its stakeholders' divergent and conflicting goals/interests. Despite its important insights, the stakeholder

theory has also some problems. The three most obvious and important are;

- a) Its inability to provide standards for assigning relative weights to the interests of the various constituencies,
- b) It does not incorporate the idea of optimal contracting, and
- c) Its failure to contain within itself some clear-cut steps for the firms to follow, and we believe that it is because of its long-term approach.

The measures suggested by agency theory and stakeholders' theory, are very important for the firm to reduce the intensity of goal conflict, but as we can see both stakeholder and agency theory has their related flaws/problems and no individual theory can solve this problem. After analysing the literature of change management, agency theory and stakeholders' theory, with addition to the empirical case of this firm, I am able to provide better solutions (based on these theories) that will better harmonize goal conflict and will make it possible for both parties to achieve their own goals and thus overcome employees' resistance.

Keywords: Organizational Change, Employees resistance, Goal conflict, Goal theory, Agency theory, stakeholders theory.

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

If we look at the literature on organizational change, different authors and researchers have defined and differentiated 'change' in organization differently. We can classify these diverse and different 'point of view' in four categories. This categorization is very important to clearly understand change, as, in the literature, change has been discussed by different authors in parts and according to their own study. The purpose is to describe, according to the best of our knowledge, an overall picture of 'what is change' making the existing literature as a base.

#### 1.1.1 CATEGORIES OF CHANGE

- **Change on the basis of its causes:**

**Internal and external forces:** External forces are due to its general environment (international, economic, socio cultural, and political legal dimensions) and task environment (competition, customers, suppliers, regulators and strategic allies) which make change, called exogenous change. The internal forces are



proceeding from within and derived internally (culture, organizational strategy) and are sometimes reflection of external environment. Internal forces create change which is called endogenous change.

**As measurement/solution** to complex problems in organization e.g., change for controlling high operating losses, theft, corruption, and safety threats in the working environment of organization.

(Macri et al, 2002; Burnes, 2004; Kanter et al, 1992 p.211; Woodward Nancy, 2007; Trader, 2002),

- **Change on the basis of its implementation or adaptation:**

**Adaptive & proactive:** Adaptive change is more directed towards changes and management on day-to-day organizational transactions. When an organization change some of its core attributes to fit environmental contingency. On the other hand, in *proactive change* the organization changes to secure from future threats and potential problems.

**Planned & Unplanned:** In planned change, the direction of change is controllable. It is mostly group based, consensual, and relatively slow in nature. In this change we believe we can stabilize some ways of working. Lewin's three steps model (unfreeze, Move, Refreeze) is a good example of planned change. *Unplanned* changes are those which occur independently of the system's intentions, but to which it has to respond (e.g., an unexpected change in demand, a machine breakdown or faulty supply).

(Correa and Slack 1996) (Schein, 2002; Fernandez, 2007; Burnes, 2004),

- **Change on the basis of its extent, and speed i.e., time it takes to be done**

**Incremental & Radical:** Incremental change is hardly noticed and slow in nature, but can lead to transformation over a long period of time (long march approach) (Kanter, Stein and Jick 1992), it is also called first order change. Incremental change is geared to achieving changes in culture and behaviour (Burnes 2004). *Radical* change is also called second order and transformation change. It is sometime the result of mergers, acquisitions and disposals. Different authors discuss it as bold stroke approach towards change (Rosabeth Moss et al. 1993).

**Continuous & Episodic:** Continuous changes are those changes, which are ongoing, evolving, and cumulative in nature (Orlikowski, 1996). Episodic



changes tend to be infrequent, discontinuous and. It occurs as organization moves away from equilibrium stage, or change as a result of misalignment or environmental encroachment (Miller, 1994).

(Woodward Nancy, 2007; Weick and Quinn 1999, Perkins et al. 2007),

• **Change on the basis of its effect on different functions, units/divisions, & tasks**

**Technological:** Change in actions measurement, introduction of advance computer systems, machinery & tools, and improved communication system. Technology is concerned with design and layout of production facilities, type and mix of machines and equipment, product mix, flow of data and sharing of information, inventing new materials, automation, using computer software and hardware, monitoring and control of production processes, maintenance and simulation of operations and facilities and others. Technology change has been derived as a two-stage process. In the first stage, the firm is found to make a decision to adopt a new advanced manufacturing technology. This is followed by adjustment of the labour force in the second stage. Much technical advancement has been found as labour-saving innovations enabling companies to eliminate less skilled positions. This has also led to a shift in labour composition in favour of more highly educated workers (Garg and Singh 2006).

**Structural:** There are six elements of structures: work specialization, chain of command, span of control, authority and responsibility, centralization and decentralization, and departmentalization. Changing structure in a company includes alteration in any authority relationships, coordination mechanisms, degree of centralization, job design, or similar other structural variables. Process reengineering, restructuring, downsizing and empowering have resulted in more decentralization, wider spans of control, reduced work specialization, and cross functional teams. These structural components have given employees the authoritative flexibility and ease to implement process improvements (Robbins, 2001). Drucker (1990) has stated, “Structure is a means for attaining the objectives and goals of an organization. Any change in structure must start with objectives and strategy”.

**Cultural change:** Many companies describe structure and system change under the label of ‘culture’ (Kanter et al. 1992). Organizational culture denotes a system of shared meaning within an organization that determines to a large degree, how employees behave. New systems or patterns of values, symbols, rituals, myths, belief, norms, social forms, and practices have evolved over time in the industry. Organizations around the world are experiencing changes in the culture, and the trend is towards even more changes as countries continue to undergo changes in the cultural composition of their general populations (Erez and

Somech, 1996; Hambrick, et al, 1998; Wenting and Palma, 2000).

**Infrastructural:** Change in the physical infrastructure of organization, e.g. relocation of departments or expansion of building,

**Strategic:** Change that is driven by “strategy” and “environmental forces” and is tied closely to the organization ability to achieve its goal. For example, Merger, acquisition, downsizing, joint venture and to an extent the impact of environmental forces like governmental, societal, technological or political changes are decisive which an organization has to bear and incorporate in its strategic output. Also, firms often change goals and tactics, sometimes these plans are a variation on a common theme that is specified in the organizational mission statement.

Change is necessary and inevitable. The quality movement, continuous improvement, action learning organizations, advanced technology, competition, new consumer media, new distribution methodologies, etc., all alters the landscape of the familiar environment. With each new day, customer and financial markets, the environment, and almost everything else about our business is no longer the same. Managing in such tenuous landscapes is often confusing and managing any change initiative while the ground swell is sometimes overwhelming. Sustaining competitive advantage or parity is increasingly complex compared to the effect organizational change has on its people.

Managers must understand the escalating effects change (strategic, technological and/or structural) has on the organization and its many parts, including individuals.

Unfortunately, as change is inevitable, so is the tendency for workers to feel the change as an indictment of their performance or an unnecessary whim of their management. Employees quickly move to blame management for the loss of comfortable roles and tasks, seniority, income and, sometimes, jobs rather than take up the challenge of change.

Senior and Fleming (2006) provide a picture of the future and how it will affect people and their willingness to change. They predict there will be a structural change with less layers of management and a reduction of the numbers of people working together. There will be a stronger pressure for individuals to work harder and longer. The working pattern is also assumed to change. It will be normal to have more than one place of employment and a greater number of people will work from home. The workforce characteristics will also change with the rate of birth decreasing and the number of old people increasing, leading to a rise in the

average age of people working. The workforce skills will also change with a higher requirement for workers to learn new skills during their career due to changing technologies and a more competitive environment. The workers will also have more employment choices, with an increasing rate of self-employment and working abilities in small organizations. Due to an ageing population, pension schemes will also be necessary. (Senior & Fleming, 2006)

The organizations of today operate under increasing demands for change. The market has radically changed due to globalization, strong competition, technical development and a customer-driven market. This high pace of change means that the organization must change behaviour and manage to rapidly adapt to shifts in the market (Norrgrén, F., Hart H., 1996 in Nonås, 2005). At the same time, Beer and Nohria (2000) have shown that currently, many change projects and development programs produce unsatisfactory results. To increase the ability to change, the change competence must increase. Change competence is described as the ability to manage change in the environment and to be able to form a continuous renewal of this process. Change competence is also about choosing a change strategy that matches the organization and its member's experience of change processes. Another aspect, presented by Wendell and Bell Jr. (1999), is that even though organizations face many challenges and threats today – threats to effectiveness, efficiency and challenges from turbulent environments

– increased competition and changing customer demands are of great interest and importance in keeping organizations healthy and viable. To manage a turbulent situation,

Svanberg (2007) points out the importance of leadership during the change process. Svanberg means that leader's task during change processes is to convey the vision and the goal with the change. Svanberg (2007) claims that people in general can work very hard and suffer a lot, but to do so they have to know why they should do it and what the goal is. He also stipulates that as a leader, it is important to carry through with a change and be patient; the results will not come immediately. Leaders interest in how the culture influences the ability to learn and change within an organization has increased. Organizational learning, development and planned change cannot be understood without considering culture as a primary source of resistance to change (Schein, 1992). The culture has a big impact on a process of change, while the culture is always “the winner” over the strategy. A changed strategy will not automatically lead to a wished change if the culture has not changed in the same way. (Svanberg, 2007) The leader cannot perform organizational changes by using only formal structure and systems as principal instruments. The leaders also have to pay attention to the organizational culture and provide a new basis for cohesion. (Hirschhorn, 2000)

Even though most theorists agree that organizational change is a topic that is central and important within organization studies, there are a lot of different opinions concerning how to manage organizational change and how to study it. Even if some theories can appear to be opposites, they should be seen as complementary to one another. Each approach provides a different but partial understanding of organizational change and by coordinating insight from different approaches, the understanding of organizational change will be richer than adapting only one given approach provided by itself (Poole and Van de Ven, 2005). The above-described situation and future of organizational change management and the reality in most multinational organizations.

Workers at all levels of an organization, be they CEOs, middle managers, or entry-level staff, recognize that change is inevitable. However, the successful implementation of organizational change in response to changes in an organization's external environment can be one of the greatest challenges top-level leaders faces. Regardless of how far seeing and meticulously planned organizational change may be, it will not be effectively implemented unless it is communicated to an organization's staff in such a way that resistance is overcome, fears are assuaged, confusion is minimized, and invited by all affected individuals is secured.

The organisation understudy is Airtel Networks Limited, this organisation is of peculiar interest because of the series of changes in management, structure, and decision-making being introduced into the organisation between June – October 2011. Changes in management as a result of transition in ownership from Zain Africa an Arabian owned mobile telecommunication's company to Airtel Networks Limited an Indian owned telecommunications company. The process through which these major changes were introduced to the employees caused a major resistance and consequently the organisation had to revisit the anticipated changes.

Kurt Lewin (as cited in Evans, Ward, & Rugaas, 2000) was one of the first to develop a model of behavioural change in his 1951 book, *Field Theory in Social Sciences*. Lewin described three stages as being necessary in the implementation of a change in a person's behaviour. The first of these is unfreezing, the stage during which a person becomes ready to learn or acquire a new behaviour, perhaps by recognizing the ineffectiveness of a current behaviour or by learning about the benefits that would accrue if the new behaviour were implemented. The second stage is the change itself, which will involve a trial period during which the person familiarizes him or herself

with the new behaviour. Finally, the refreezing stage occurs as the new behaviour becomes habitual or ingrained with the individual.

Against this background, this study intends to analyse the main courses of employee resistance towards organisational changes in major corporations.

## **1.2. RESISTENCE TO CHANGE**

The basic topic of this study is employees' resistance to change. The purpose of this chapter is to understand employees' resistance and all of its major causes and subsequent solutions / measures discussed in the literature. The study of these causes and solution/measures has provided us an opportunity to add another major potential cause of resistance to change i.e., Goal conflict between employees and firm. This potential antecedent of employees' resistance to change has also been discussed in our empirical case.

### **1.2.1. WHAT IS RESISTANCE?**

Resistance is the resultant employee's reaction of opposition to organizational change (Keen, 1981; Folger & Skarlicki 1999). It has been studied as a prime reason why most change does not succeed or get implemented (Egan & Fjermestad, 2005). As employee's resistance has certain implications for management, also employees play an important role in the success of firm's change that is why; it is a very important factor to be considered during organizational change program. In a study of 288 companies who shared lessons and best practices in change management, Tim Creasey found that the top obstacle to change was employee resistance at all levels (Haslam et al, 2004). Two types of resistance may stem when in an organizational change, the attitudinal and behavioural resistance (Sandy Kristin, 2000). The extent of employee's resistance ranges from lack of interest, negative perception & attitude, and strong opposing views, to; overt blocking behaviour, violent strikes, and boycotts (Coetsee, 1999).

### **1.2.2. EARLY RESEARCH ON EMPLOYEES' RESISTANCE**

The notion of resistance to change is credited to Kurt Lewin who discussed it first in 1940's. His early work focused on the aspects of individual behaviour that must be addressed in order to bring about effective organizational change (Kurt 1945). The first research regarding resistance to change titled "Overcoming Resistance to Change" is based on a study conducted by Lester Coach and John R. P. French in 1948 at Harwood Manufacturing Co. in Virginia. Their research was generally on the importance of employee participation in decision making. They claim that their "preliminary theory was that resistance to change is a combination of an individual reaction to frustration with strong group-induced forces" (p.521). Coch and French argued that participation was the primary method to overcome resistance to change (Coch and French, 1948).

### **1.2.3. CAUSES /ANTECEDENTS OF EMPLOYEES' RESISTANCE**

The study of causes/antecedents in the literature of employees' resistance is very important as it plays significant role in proposing solutions and implementation of different measures to overcome resistance and its resulting problems. As discussed by Mintzberg, "the cure might actually prove to be just more of the cause" (Mintzberg 1998 p. 324). In addition, to make successful organizational change, lots of work has been done by different authors and researchers to find the major causes of employee's resistance and to perfectly deal with the symptoms of resistance. This will lead organizations to solve the right problem which is causing resistance to change.

One or some of the below causes can lead the change to severe resistance from employees. The consequences of employees' resistance are very important to be mentioned here, to reveal the miseries of resistance for organization and the change program. The consequences of employee's resistance to change range

from; slowdown of the change (and thus increase in cost) (Bryant, 2006), less productivity (outcome), employee's corruption, high employees' turnover, disturbance & trouble in change program, failure of change program, and in extreme situation it can even lead the organization to destabilization & breakdown (Coetsee, 1999; Coch and French, 1948). Organizations may face the above problems in change due to employees' resistance. It should not be denied that resistance to change might be a valuable employees' passion that can be channelled more constructively (Dent Eric and Goldberg Susan 1999). It may help in improving the change plan by utilizing rather than just overcoming (Waddell and Sohal Amrik 1998). However, the contention of this study is that, beyond a certain initial level, the employees' resistance results more destructively as mentioned above.

The first step after discovering employee's resistance led us to the exploration of causes of employee's resistance to change which has been thought by different authors as very important for overcoming it.

After studying the different causes of employees' resistance to change, as, discussed by different authors. We have been able to divide these causes in different categories, based on the nature of resistance causes.

The four categories of different causes of resistance are;

- **Psychological:** - Employees negative perception, frustration, anxiety, preference towards status quo, cognitive comfort, fear, past failure, Cynicism or mistrust in top management/owner (Kreitner, 1992; Dubrin & Ireland, 1993) (Val and Fuentes 2003)
- **Materialistic:** - Loss of pay, comfort, status, and threat to job security (Dent & Goldberg 1999),
- **Employees' constant capabilities:** - Employee's skills (existing), knowledge, & expertise getting obsolete i.e., capabilities gap, embedded routines (Lawrence, 1986) (Val and Fuentes 2003).
- **Employees concern for firm:** - Faults & weaknesses in change program i.e. change is not good for the firm or employees and management have



difference/conflict of perceptions about change program and its effects (Dubrin & Ireland, 1993).

Here we add and or highlight another important antecedent of employee's resistance to change, i.e., goal conflict between firm (owner) and employees, where the goals of the firms are materialistic and individual's (employees) goals are based on the function of their utility maximization which is more concerned with their self-satisfaction.

### **Potential causes of Employees' Resistance to change**

While studying different causes of employees' resistance to change discussed in the literature, we felt the need to discuss another important potential causes/antecedent which seems very important, that is, goal conflict between individuals and firm (owner). Conflict between employees and firm can be said as, of two types, procedural conflict and goal conflict. Where procedural conflict is the conflict of approaches i.e. work procedures for performing the same task, and goal conflict is the conflict between the goals of firm and employees as separate entities. The causes of resistance from literature and this potential cause (i.e., goal conflict) will be analysed and explained in reference to causes of resistance in the firm understudy.

In a strategic and major change program, firms alter their goals (e.g., cost minimization, innovative products, etc), which result in shifting and increasing their focus towards new goals. Where we define these goals as the targets of the firm to achieve, and the procedures/ways to achieve these goals are called means. Goals can be divided into primary and support/secondary goals, which almost depends upon the firm's priority and needs towards that goal e.g., cost minimization can be said as primary goal if it is the top most goal of the firm, rather it will be called support goals if it is to achieve another major goal. The increased commitment of firm towards attaining its new goals leads the differences of firm goals and employees' goals towards conflict. Also, in some change programs, firms may not change its goals but increase its activities and

focus/concentration on achieving these goals. The firm's increased concentration and one-sided focus on its goals affects employees' personal goals, and it became very difficult for employees to achieve their own goals and satisfy their own needs. This creates a situation of goal conflict between firm (owner) and individuals (employees). In literature, goal conflict is defined as the degree to which individuals feel that firm's goals are incompatible and conflicting with their own goals and needs, and make it difficult to achieve them (Locke et al., 1994; Slocum et al., 2002). Where, individuals (employees) personal goals are immediate regulator of their actions. The resultant employees' resistance can thus inhibit the achievement of both goals.

Change may also modify/amend the procedures for attaining the goals of the firm (its activities, approaches, style, and working procedures), to make it more beneficial and compatible with its needs. The new work procedures imposed by the firm may not be preferred by employees, and they may favour their own style of working, which creates a situation we called 'procedural conflict'.

### **1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Airtel Networks Limited was confronted by strong resistance when it attempted to introduce major structural changes by its employees. The management of the organisation attempted to introduce various measures of changes that the employees were not used to as a result of change in management structure and ownership. The problem stem from whether the method used to introduce the changes proposed were the best alternative possible.

The problems to investigate are thereby presented in the form of questions, which this study will seek to find answers to.

- i) What are the main reasons for the introduction of these changes?
- ii) Were the management staff totally in support of these changes?
- iii) Did the employees understand the significance of these changes?

- iv) Did the management follow the required due process in the introduction of these changes?
- v) Were the employees properly motivated and compensated while these changes were being introduced?

## **1.4 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The objective of this project work is to investigate the root cause of employee resistance towards organizational changes and to emphasize the best method through which change can be introduced in an organization.

Other objectives this research work poised to achieve are:

1. To understand how goal conflict between organisations and employees contribute towards employee's resistance to change as a major cause.
2. To explore how to harmonize or reduce the intensity of goal conflict between organization and employees, to overcome employee's resistance.
3. To provide best possible means through which both employers and employees could introduce and manage change effectively to the benefit of both parties.

## **1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

It is intended that at the end of this research work;

1. Both the organization and employees will be able to properly understand the usefulness of having unison of interest in the organization;
2. The management will understand the usefulness of reducing to the barest minimum disagreements that arise as a result of changes being introduced in the organization.

3. Also, it is intended that management will be able to provide a framework that they can use to manage employee's resistance towards any future changes being introduced in the organisation.

## **1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This thesis will be restricted to investigations carried out in Airtel Networks Limited, a major multinational telecommunication limited.

Secondly, the study will be restricted to two major stakeholders in the organization: the management and the employees and why there is always resistance when some amounts of changes are being introduced in the organization.

Obvious constraint the researcher experienced during the study was as regards the materials to be consulted for the compilation of such research. The data were not easy to get, especially with respect to interviews, records and inertia attitude of people with the fear of getting exposed. However, this does not mean that the data obtained is not sufficient to provide a reasonable solution to this problem, it is most adequate and has been judiciously used.

## **1.7 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS**

1. Employee Resistance: Resistance is the resultant employees' reaction of opposition to organizational
2. Organizational Changes: Is a framework for managing the effect of new business processes, changes in organizational structure or cultural changes within an enterprise.
3. Goal Conflict: Is a situation in which a person has a private or personal interest sufficient to appear to influence the objective exercise of his or her official duties.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter deals with careful and exhaustive investigation of all the ascertainable evidence of the information collected on the appraisal of the strategies for employee resistance and organisational change. However, this chapter is mainly concerned with methods of collecting data and the techniques used in sampling and analysis.

#### **2.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

Research means a systematic, objective and scientific method of investigation of a subject matter or a given problem in order to collect pertinent and timely information for management decision making.

#### **2.3 SOURCES OF DATA COLLECTION**

Both secondary and primary data were collected, which helped to have an understanding of the view of management and staff of Airtel Networks Limited in respect of the company's reasons for wanting to introduce change, the reasons why the employees are resisting the intended change, policies and procedures which the researcher felt were of paramount importance to the study.

The method employed enables the researcher to look for new ideas on how to introduce and manage change in an organization. Consequently, the writer is of the opinion that this method is in consonance with academic standard and is, therefore a reliable method.

## **2.4 AREA OF STUDY**

For the purpose of this study, the area of study that will be embarked is the Airtel Networks Limited. Here questionnaires will be administered to all customer service representatives and personal interviews will be conducted with some of the managers to understand the managerial view of the change process.

## **2.5 POPULATION OF STUDY**

The population of this study has been drawn from employees of Airtel Networks Limited. Population here means the total number of a group, whether geographical area or specialized group, a population is any group of people or objects, which constitute the study, the target population for this research work is 1000, consisting the following;

- i. Employees of this organization totalling 950 whiles
- ii. Management staff of the organization in the operation totalling 50

## **2.6 SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES**

A sample of one hundred (150) respondents has been taken from the population, the reason for this sample size is because of convenience in data analysis. The researcher used the simple random sampling technique to select one hundred (150) respondents from the population. This sample was randomly picked in order to give all members of the largest population equal chance of being represented. In addition, fifty (50) questionnaires were distributed to management staff to gain their own view on the subject matter, the essence of distributing questionnaires to all of them is to gain an unbiased opinion from them since they were the one that initiated the change in the first place.

## **2.7 ADMINISTRATION OF INSTRUMENT FOR DATA COLLECTION**

The instruments that were used for collection of data include personal interviews with employees and some management staff of the organization, questionnaires were also administered.

Data will be administered and collected mainly through personal interviews and questionnaires. The personal interviews will consist of questions that requires on the spot clarifications by the interviewee.

The questionnaire has been adopted as the main data collection instrument because it provides the basis for standardized (impersonal) responses which the interview does not always guarantee. Secondly, it provides the respondents the flexibility and convenience of answering the questions when they are not tied down with other commitments. This will enable the researcher the benefit of getting as many respondents to participate in the survey as it is sufficient to generate meaningful results.

Whenever possible, few interview sessions will be conducted with respondents who are well disposed to it. For this sole purpose, few interview questions were designed. However, this will serve strictly informal purpose for subsequent research recommendation.

## **2.8 ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES ADMINISTERED TO EMPLOYEES**

Table 2.8.1 What is your company's main goal/objective?



| Options  | Responses | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| To ensure adequate and reliable supply of quality products and service | 30        | 30%        |
| To maximize profit   | 23        | 23%        |
| To provide excellent customer service                                  | 42        | 42%        |
| To render social services to people                                    | 5         | 05%        |
| Total  | 100       | 100%       |

With reference to table above, 30% of the respondents were of the view that, the objectives of the company is to ensure adequate and reliable supply of quality products and services to her customers.23% of the respondents indicated that the objectives are to maximize profit, while 42% of the respondents also indicated that, the object of the company is to provide excellent customer services which is the main aim of the department, the remaining5% of the respondents are of the view that, the company's objective is to render social services to the people.

Table 2.8.2 As the customer care division of Airtel, what are your company's customer care visions?

| Options                                  | Responses | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| To acquire more customers at all cost    | 25        | 25%        |
| To provide quality services at all times | 15        | 15%        |
| To be the most loved brand by 2025       | 60        | 60%        |
| Others specify                           | -         | -          |
| Total                                    | 100       | 100 %      |

25% of the respondents indicated that the customer care vision is to acquire more customers at all cost, 15% of the respondents were of the opinion that providing quality services at all times is the company's vision while 60% of the respondents, indicated

that the customer care vision is to be the most loved brand by 2025, making a total of hundred (100) respondents.

Table 2.8.3 Are you satisfied with the change management process taking place in the organization?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 30        | 30%        |
| No      | 70        | 70%        |
| Total   | 100       | 100%       |

In this table above, it could be seen that 30% of the respondent support the management's organisational change process while 70% of the respondents were vehemently in support of the change process taking place in the organisation at this point in time, this suffice to the fact that majority of the staff are resisting the change being introduced in the organisation and most especially the way the change is being introduced.

Table 2.8.4: What is the main reason for employee resistance to the intended change?

| Options                                    | Responses | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Increase in working hours?                 | 15        | 15 %       |
| Intended reduction in employees' salaries  | 15        | 15 %       |
| Proposed 50% down seizing by the employers | 20        | 20%        |
| Proposed sack of pregnant women            | 10        | 10%        |
| All of the above                           | 40        | 40 %       |
| Total                                      | 100       | 100 %      |

With reference to Table above, 15% of the respondents indicated that, the reason for the resistance to the intended change is because of a planned increase in working hours from 6hours to 9hours, another 15% of the respondents were of the opinion that it was due to the fact that their monthly salary was to be reduced by 60% (29,900). 20%

support the resistance because the new management proposed a 50% down seizing of the entire workforce in this present economic condition, that last option was all of the above and this was supported by majority of the employees (40%), meaning all of the above reasons are part of the reasons why the employees resisted the intended change.

Table 2.8.5: How effective are the change strategies applied?

| Options       | Responses | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Effective     | 16        | 16 %       |
| Not effective | 84        | 84 %       |
| Total         | 100       | 100 %      |

Table above indicates that 16% of the total respondents show that, the change strategies applied are effective, while 84% of the remaining respondents indicated that the strategies being used to implement the change is highly ineffective, making a total of 100%.

Table 2.8.6: What is the impact of the organizational change in the organization?

| Options   | Responses | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| High      | -         | -          |
| Low       | 10        | 10%        |
| No impact | 90        | 90%        |
| Total     | 100       | 100%       |

Table above shows the impact of the organisational changes as indicated above is not high at all, 10% of the respondents thinks it is low while 90% were of the opinion that the impact is not felt at all.

Table 2.8.7: Do you view the change being introduced by Airtel Network Limited to be appropriate?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 5         | 05%        |
| No      | 95        | 95%        |
| Total   | 100       | 100%       |

Table above shows that only 5% of the employees believed that the change is appropriate while 95% of the respondent passionately disagree with the usefulness of the change being introduced.

Table 2.8.8: Is the company making enough profit to cater for the needs of the employees to the extent that the intended change is not necessary?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 100       | 100 %      |
| No      | -         | -          |
| Total   | 100       | 100 %      |

Table above shows that 100% of the respondent agreed to the fact that the company is making enough profit to nullify the intended change.

Table 2.8.9: Are there measures taking to cater for the occupational hazards of the job?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | -         | -          |
| No      | 100       | 100 %      |
| Total   | 100       | 100 %      |

Table above shows that despite the hazards of the job, the new management still planned to introduce some change without putting into consideration the occupational and health hazards. None of the respondent believed that sufficient measures have been taking to cater for these hazards, while 100% support the fact that no measures were put in place to cater for the hazards.

Table 2.8.10: How efficient is the insurance plan being put in place by the organisation?

| Options       | Responses | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Effective     | 40        | 40 %       |
| Not Effective | 60        | 60 %       |
| Cannot say    | -         | -          |
| Total         | 100       | 100 %      |

The table above shows that 40% of the respondents support the fact that that the health and insurance plan provided by the company is efficient while 60% support the fact that it is not effective.

## ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ADMINISTERED TO MANAGEMENT STAFF OF THE COMPANY

The management of any organization is pivotal to the successful implementation of the company's visions, missions and objectives. As such, the researcher deemed it fit to administer some questions to the management staff of this organization and the following are the results of the analysis.

Their views are intended to support or disagree with the findings from analysis of the employees. Forty (40) of them were randomly interviewed and their views have been presented, tabulated and analysed, as shown below.

Table 2.8.11: How long have you been a supervisor/manager of this organization?

| Options     | Responses | Percentage |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 0 - 5 years | 25        | 60 %       |
| 3 - 5 years | 5         | 30 %       |
| 6 and above | 5         | 10 %       |
| Total       | 40        | 100 %      |

Table shows that managers in the company are 60%, while those who have been supervisors/managers are 30% and 10% having been there for over 6years.

Table 2.8.12: Are you involved in the change process being introduced?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 40        | 100%       |
| No      | —         | -          |
| Total   | 40        | 100%       |

Table indicates that all the respondents show that they are involved in change management process and this is because they are all management staff.

Table 2.8.13: How effective are the changes being introduced in the organization?

| Options       | Responses | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Effective     | 15        | 37.5 %     |
| Not Effective | 25        | 62.6 %     |
| Total         | 40        | 100 %      |

In Table above, fifteen (15) of the respondents indicated that the changes being introduced in Airtel Networks Limited are not effective, while the twenty-five (25) of the respondents show that the change management being introduced by management of Airtel Networks Limited are effective; which implies the strategies are effective in their own view.

Table 2.8.14: Are the organizational change strategies applied by Airtel Networks Limited appropriate?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 31        | 77.5%      |
| No      | 9         | 22.5%      |
| Total   | 40        | 100%       |

In table above, thirty-one (31) of forty (40) respondents indicate that the marketing strategies applied by Airtel Networks Limited are appropriate. While nine of them say they are not appropriate.



Table 2.8.15: Appraise the quality of product and services being offered by the company since the change was introduced?

| Options       | Responses | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Effective     | 20        | 30 %       |
| Not Effective | 20        | 70 %       |
| Total         | 40        | 100 %      |

Table explains that out of the management staff that responded to the questionnaires, 30% are of the opinion that as a result of the change being introduced, the quality of products and services has been effective while 70% of the respondent believed that the quality of products and services have reduced since the change was introduced.

Table 2.8.16: Do you feel the employees were justified for revolting against the intended change management process?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 30        | 40 %       |
| No      | 10        | 60 %       |
| Total   | 40        | 100 %      |

Table shows that 40% of the respondents indicated that the change introduced was justified while 60% believed that it was not justified.

Table 2.8.17: Do you feel the company has put in place to cater for the hazards that could surface as a result of the change being introduced?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 35        | 87 %       |
| No      | 5         | 12.5 %     |
| Total   | 40        | 100 %      |

In table above, 87% of the respondents indicate that the company has put enough in place to cater for the hazards while 12.5% believed that they have not.

Table 2.8.18: Do you support the laying off of pregnant women in your organisation as one of the bases for the employee resistance?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 35        | 87 %       |
| No      | 5         | 12.5 %     |
| Total   | 400       | 100 %      |

In Table above, 87.5% of the respondent indicated that they support the laying off of pregnant women as they believe it slows down production and productivity, while 12.5% of the respondents indicated that they do not support such strategy.

Table 2.8.19: Is there enough notice given to the employees before the intended change was introduced?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 40        | 100 %      |
| No      | -         | -          |
| Total   | 40        | 100 %      |

With reference to Table above, the respondents indicate that the employees were given ample notice before the change was implemented.

Table 2.8.20: Do you believe that the change being introduced is for the overall organisational good?

| Options | Responses | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 35        | 87%        |
| No      | 5         | 12.5%      |
| Total   | 40        | 100%       |

From the table above, 87.5% of the respondent indicated that they believe the change being introduced is for the best interest of the company, while 12.5% of the respondents indicated that they do not believe it is for the organisational good.

## CHAPTER THREE LIMITATION

### 3.1 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The major limitation of this study is, of course the short period of time. Although lot of efforts has been done to study maximum literature regarding our problem area but due to short of time, we may have not covered the complete literature, also this short period of time made our access limited to few employees (workers, middle managers, and supervisors), management and owners of the firm for collecting primary data. Due to huge numbers of labour, it was not possible to talk with all employees, but few senior labour and supervisors with middle managers have been interviewed. Also, there was very limited and reserved discussion with the owner of firm due to their time scarcity, but we have been able to discuss the issue with the top managers more openly to collect information. We got some problems in gaining access to some of the important literature, which was although covered by studying the same work in some other's large number of articles/literature (e.g., the work of Eric Rhenman on stakeholder model and theory).

### 3.2 FURTHER STUDY

As employees' resistance has positive as well as negative effects on organizational change, further work can be done to find out the factors that creates/increase the positive effects of employees' resistance.

The empirical case of this study is a firm operating in a developing economy; further study can be done in a firm operating in a developed economy. This firm is a partnership firm and the structure is authoritative, another empirical case of a different kind of firm can be taken.

The goal conflict between firm and its employees can be analysed for other problems in a firm, e.g., how it contributes towards other problems in a firm. Moreover, we can also analyse the positive aspects of goal conflict.

### **3.3 QUESTIONS OF INTERVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

The interviews and discussion were done with the firm top managers and middle managers & supervisors of the firm. The name of the firm and its products name have been desired by the firm to remain confidential. The top managers and owner are considered as one party i.e., principals and middle managers and supervisors are considered as another party i.e., agents. Where the change implementers were the top managers and owners, and change recipients were middle managers, supervisors, and all labour. As personally being employed for one and a half year, frequent and frank discussions and interviews have been done with top managers and middle managers including supervisors and some senior employees, to get to know clearly from them about everything related to change in the firm. Most of the interviews were semi-structured and informal so as to get unbiased opinions of all the participants and deeply understand the situation. The more specific questions of the interviews are as follows: -

1. First of all, questions were asked regarding the firm need for change to get to know the reason which made the firm change?
2. What was the importance of this change program? And how it was valuable for the firm to get out of this problematic situation?
3. How and what has been affected and changed by this change program? What has been really changed?
4. How the change program affected employees of the firm, and how much it benefited the firm.

5. The solution provided in the literature of change management, has been discussed with the firm (change implementers) to know if they applied this solution or not.
6. What are your personal goals/interests (asked from different employees), how important are these goals and how was these affected the change program?
7. Why the change program is so important for the firm, and why it introduced new goals?
8. What were the reasons of the failure of this change?
9. Why and how the employees resisted this change?
10. What are the different suppliers, customers, and creditors of this firm?
11. What is the direct effect of local and federal government on the firm business?
12. How the suppliers and creditors are managed by the firm? And what is their importance for the firm, are there any alternative suppliers and creditors?
13. How customers are management by the firm, what are there expected demands from the firm? How much they are important for the firm, and how much is the firm important for them?
14. Specific questions were then asked regarding the functions of new machinery and tool, target-based work, CCTV cameras, the change in pay structure, revised remuneration system, benefits, gratuity etc, and automatic attendance and time schedule recorder.
15. Discussions on the problems of change and the measures taken by the firm has been discussed (how much it succeeds and how it failed?). Discussion with

supervisors and middle managers has been done to know clearly how the employees suffered from change, and how best the firm to do to help both parties.

16. The solutions provided by agency theory, stakeholders theory, and our personal recommendations have been discussed with the firm and employees, to know how they would react to these solutions and what they really want.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 CONCLUSION**

From the study the following can be concluded:

1. The Organisational Change Management programmes in Airtel Networks Limited have been greatly unsuccessful.
2. The change management programme was not adequately communicated as such most employees do not have a good understanding of the processes.
3. Employees' attitude is a key factor in ensuring these change programmes are successful
4. The company did not put in place adequate measures to cater for the occupational hazards of the anticipated change.
5. Some of the management staff were not in full support of the method through which the change was introduced into the organisation.
6. The resistance by the employee invariably led to the decline in the quality of products and services being introduced by the organisation.
7. The main reason for the change which was to increase the quality of services offered to customers were forfeited because employees were not adequately motivated to effect such changes.

## 4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Every organisation that seeks to achieve its purpose should properly review its change management methodologies when contemplating introducing certain changes. The researcher therefore recommends the following based on our findings:

1. Adequate preparation must be made to cater for every form of resistance from the part of the employees without leading to violence.
2. For any organizational change process within Airtel Networks Limited, group and individual goals should be set up to facilitate motivation for the leader and equally important is that these goals are coherent with each other for everyone to pull in the right direction.
3. There should be a continuous exchange of information about progress, problems, ideas and solutions so that a support team, tentatively the Roll-out team, can quickly provide the subsidiaries with necessary resources.
4. There is need for necessary recognition in the organisation, this will go a long way in boosting the morale of the employees and also give them a sense of belonging and appreciation. Early after that the decision to implement a change program has been communicated to everyone in the organisation the employees should be made aware that a reorganization might be necessary for the business to continue to survive and for it to be able to meet her needs.
5. There is also a need for a policy for documentation. By mapping out the need for further documentation and areas where redundant documents are created the organization can increase the efficiency at the same time as cost savings are possible. Making a policy for documentation and overlooking the process should be one of the primary tasks for the organisation. One document that needs to be created is a function



description describing the pros and cons with the change program, what it can do, how it works, how it solves the problem and what can be offered the customers.

6. The organisation must focus on early training, retaining and motivation to manage resistance.
7. Also, there should be an avenue to transfer the knowledge from the experienced employees to those who are facing new tasks and challenges through the change it is important to include different methods.
8. Finally, a risk analysis must be carried out to point out the areas to which extra precaution should be taken. The most critical risk to be aware of is the risk of the employees not knowing where to find documents. To avoid this, the documents need to be made easy to find and the employees must be informed of where to find the information necessary.

## REFERENCES

- Albanese, R., M. T. Dacin & I. C. Harris (1997) Agents as stewards. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 609-611.
- Archie, B. C. & N. Juha (1997) Understanding Stakeholder Thinking: Themes from a Finnish Conference. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 6, 46-  
.
- Bales, F. R. (1958) Task roles and social roles in problem-solving groups, *Readings in social psychology*, New York p. 437-47
- Barnard, Chester (1938) Functions of the Executive. *Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press*.
- Besser Terry I. (1995) Rewards and organizational goal achievement: a case Study of Toyota motor manufacturing in Kentucky, *Journal of Management Studies* 32:3 0022-2380
- Bolman, L. & T. Deal. 1991. Reframing Organizations. In *Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. The Jossey-Bass Management Series.
- Boonstra, J.J. (2004) *Dynamics of Organizational Change and Learning*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, p 127.
- Burnes, B. (2004). Emergent change and planned change - competitors or allies?: The case of XYZ construction. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 24(9), 886-902.
- Bryant, M. (2006). Talking about change: Understanding employee responses through qualitative research. *Management Decision*, 44(2), 246-258.
- Carroll, A. B.: 1989, Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management. *SouthWestern, Cincinnati, OH*.
- Caldwell, C. & R. Karri. 2005. Organizational Governance and Ethical Systems: A Covenantal Approach to Building Trust. 249-259

- Chawla Anuradha & Kelloway E. Kevin (2004) Predicting openness and commitment to change. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal* Vol. 25 No. 6, pp.485-498
- Coch, L. and French, J.R.P. (1948), "Overcoming resistance to change", *Human Relations*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 512-32.
- Coetsee Leon (1999) From resistance to commitment. *Southern public administration education foundation*.
- Correa, H. L. & N. Slack (1996) Framework to analyse flexibility and unplanned change in manufacturing systems. *Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 9, 57-64.
- Dent Eric, B., & Goldberg Susan, G. (1999). Challenging "resistance to change". *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35(1), 25-41.
- Drucker P. F. (1990), *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Dubrin, A. J., & Ireland, R. D. (1993) *Management and organization* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.
- Edward, G. (1969) The Definition of Organizational Goals. *British Journal of Sociology*, 20, 277-294.
- Egan, R. W., & Fjermestad, J. (2005). Change and Resistance Help for the Practitioner of Change. *System Sciences, 2005. HICSS '05. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Hawaii International Conference on*, 219c-219c.
- Eisenhardt Kathleen, M. (1985) Control: Organizational and Economic Approaches. *Management Science*, 31, 134-150.
- Erez M. and Somech A. (1996), Effects of culture and group-based motivation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1513-1537.
- FAMA, E. F. (1980). Agency problems and the theory of the firm, *Journal of Political Economy*, 88, 375-90.
- Fernandez, S., & Pitts David, W. (2007). Under What Conditions Do Public Managers Favor and Pursue Organizational Change? *American Review of Public Administration*, 37(3), 324-324.

- Folger R. & Skarlicki D.P. (1999) Unfairness and resistance to change: hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 35-50.
- Fossum, Lynn. *Understanding Organizational Change: Converting Theory into Practice*. Boston, MA. USA: Course Technology Crisp, 1989.
- Freeman, E. & J. Liedtka (1997) Stakeholder capitalism and the value chain. *European Management Journal*, 15, 286-296.
- Garg, R. K. & T. P. Singh. 2006. Management of Change - A Comprehensive Review. 45-60.
- Gaertner, K.N. (1989) Winning and losing: understanding managers' reactions to strategic change. *Human Relations*, 6, pp. 527-46.
- Goldstein, Howard (1986) Social learning and change. *Tavistock Publications New York & London*. p.v.
- Grossman S.J. & Hart O. D. (1983), An Analysis of the Principal-Agent Problem *Econometrica*, Vol. 51, No. 1. pp. 7-45.
- Grusky Oscar (1959), Organizational goals and the behavior of informal leaders *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 65, No. 1. pp. 59-67.
- Guth, W.D. and MacMillan, I.C. (1986) Strategy implementation versus middle manager self-interest. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(4), pp. 313—27.
- Hill Charles, W. L. & M. Jones Thomas (1992) Stakeholder-Agency Theory. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 29, 131-155.
- Hambrick D. C., Canney D. S., Snell S. A., and Snow C. C. (1988) When groups consists of multiple nationalities: Towards a new understanding of the implications, *Organizational Studies*, 19, 181-205.
- Hill Charles, W. L. & M. Jones Thomas (1992) Stakeholder-Agency Theory. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 29, 131-155.
- James, G. M. (1962) The Business Firm as a Political Coalition. *The Journal of Politics*, 24, 662-678.

- Jawahar, I. M. & L. M. Gary (2001) Toward a Descriptive Stakeholder Theory: An Organizational Life Cycle Approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 397-414.
- Jensen, M. C. & W. H. Meckling (1976) Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305-360.
- Kanter, R., B. Stein & T. Jick. 1992. The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It. The Free Press New York.
- Kathleen, M. E. (1988) Agency- and Institutional-Theory Explanations: The Case of Retail Sales Compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 488-511.
- Keen, P. G. W. (1981). Information System and Organizational Change. *Communications of the ACM*, 24(1), 24-34.
- Korsgaard, M.A., Schweiger, D. and Sapienza, H. (1995) Building commitment, attachment and trust in strategic decision-making teams: the role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), pp. 60-84.
- Kotter, J. P. & L. A. Schlesinger (1979) Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 106-115.
- Kreitner, R. (1992). *Management* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kurt, L. (1945) The Research Center for Group Dynamics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Sociometry*, 8, 126-136.
- Lawrence, P. R. (1986). How to deal with resistance to change. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(2), 199-200.
- Leavitt, H.J. (1965) Applying organizational change in industry: Structural, technological and humanistic approaches. *Handbook of Organizations*, J.G. March, Ed. Rand McNally, Chicago, ILL.
- Lines Rune (2004) Influence of participation in strategic change: resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement, *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 193-215,

- Mabin & Forgeson (2001) Harnessing resistance: using the theory of constraints to assist change management, *Journal of European Industrial Training* 25/2/3/4 [2001] 168±191
- Macri Diego, M., Tagliaventi Maria, R., & Bertolotti, F. (2002). A grounded theory for resistance to change in a small organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(3), 292-310.
- Marguerite, S. (2002) A Stakeholder Model of Organizational Leadership. *Organization Science*, 13, 209-220.
- MGMT625 VU, (2003) Change Management, Lecture Notes, *Virtual University of Pakistan*.
- Mintzberg. H, Ahlstrand. B, Lampel. J (1998), Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour through the Wilds of Strategic Mangament, *The Free Press, New York*. p. 324
- Mohr Lawrence B. (1973) The Concept of Organizational Goal *the American Political Science Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2. (Jun., 1973), pp. 470-481.
- Ortiz Martinez, E. & D. Crowther (2008) Is disclosure the right way to comply with stakeholders? The Shell case. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 17, 1323.
- Perkins, D. D., K. D. Bess, D. G. Cooper, D. L. Jones, T. Armstead & P. W. Speer (2007) Community organizational learning: Case studies illustrating a three-dimensional model of levels and orders of change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 303328
- Perrow, C. (1986) Complex Organization, *New York, Random House*.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. *External Control of Organizations : A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Palo Alto, CA, USA: Stanford University Press, 2003. p.36
- Rees, Ray (1985) The theory of principal and agent Part I, *Bulletin of Economic Research* 37:1, 0307-3378.
- Ronald, K. M., R. A. Bradley & J. W. Donna (1997) Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 853-886.
- Robbins S. P. (2001), *Organizational Behaviour*, Edition 9th, Pearson Education, India.

- Rosabeth Moss, K., A. S. Barry, D. J. Todd & W. Rosemary (1993) The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It. *Contemporary Sociology: An International Journal of Reviews*, 22, 718-719.
- Sandy Kristin, P. (2000). Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783-794.
- Segerstrom C. Suzanne & Nes, Lise Solberg. (2006) When goals conflict but people prosper: The case of dispositional optimism. *Journal of Research in Personality* 40 (2006) 675–693
- Segerstrom, S. C. & L. Solberg Nes (2006) When goals conflict but people prosper: The case of dispositional optimism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 675-693.
- Selden S.C., Brewer Gene A., Brudney Jeffrey L. (1999) The Role of City Managers: Are they Principals, Agents, or Both? *The American Review of Public Administration* 29; 124;
- Schein H. Edgar (2002), Models and Tools for stability and Change in Human System, *Society for Organizational Learning & MIT*.
- Shankman Neil, A. (1999) Reframing the debate between agency and stakeholder theories of the firm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 19, 319-334.
- Spicer, A. (2006). Book Review: Resistance for Change. *Organization (London)*, 13(3), 455-458.
- Steadman, M. E., T. W. Zimmerer & R. F. Green (1995) Pressures from Stakeholders Hit Japanese Companies. *Long Range Planning*, 28, 3-29- 37.
- Trader-Leigh Karyn, E. (2002) Case study: Identifying resistance in managing change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15, 138-155.
- Woodward Nancy, H. (2007). To Make Changes, Manage Them. *HRMagazine*, 52(5), 62-67.

- Waddell, D. & S. Sohal Amrik (1998) Resistance: a constructive tool for change management. *Management Decision*, 36, 543-543.
- Warner, W. K. & A. E. Havens (1968) Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, 539-556.
- Weick, K. E. & R. E. Quinn (1999) Organizational Change & Development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.
- Wenting and Palma (2000), Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(1), 35-60.
- Ullrich, J. P. & J. P. i (2007) Revisiting the principal-agent theory of agency: comments on the firm-level and cross-national embeddedness theses. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 75-81.
- Val, M. P. d. & C. M. Fuentes (2003) Resistance to change: a literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision*, 41, 148-155.
- Van De Ven & Poole (1995) Explaining Development & Change in Organizations *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 20.



## APPENDIX

### INSTRUCTION:

Attempt all questions by ticking ( ) the appropriate answer and comment where necessary.

### SECTION A: BIO-DATA

#### 1. Age

- (a) 10-30 years ( )
- (b) 30-60 years ( )
- (c) 60 and Above ( )

#### 2. Educational Qualification

- (a) Ph.D. ( )
- (b) Second Degree ( )
- (c) First Degree ( )
- (d) OND ( )
- (e) Secondary School Certification ( )
- (f) Others (specify) .....

#### 3. Marital Status

- (a) Married ( )
- (b) Single ( )

#### 4. Gender

- (a) Male ( )
- (b) Female ( )

**SECTION B:****Question administered to employees of Airtel Networks Limited**

1. What is your company's main goal/objectives

- a. To ensure adequate and reliable supply of quality products and service ( )
- b. To maximize profit ( )
- c. To provide excellent customer service ( )
- d. To render social services to people ( )

2. As the customer care division of Airtel, what are your company's customer care vision of the company?

- a. To acquire more customers at all cost ( )
- b. To provide quality services at all times ( )
- c. To be the most loved brand by 2015 ( )
- d. Others specify ( )

3. Are you satisfied with the change management process taking place in the organization?

- (a) Yes ( )
- (b) No ( )

4. What is the main reason for employee resistance to the intended change?

- a. Increase in working hours? ( )
- b. Intended reduction in employees' salaries ( )
- c. Proposed 50% down seizing by the employers ( )
- d. Proposed sack of pregnant women
- e. All of the above ( )

5. How effective are the change strategies applied?

- a. Effective ( )
- b. Not Effective ( )

6. What is the impact of the organizational change in the organization?

- a. High ( )
- b. Low ( )
- c. No impact ( )

7. Do you view the change being introduced by Airtel Network Limited to be appropriate?

- a. Yes ( )
- b. No ( )

8. Is the company making enough profit to cater for the needs of the employees to the extent that the intended change is not necessary?

- a. Yes ( )
- b. No ( )

9. Are there measures taking to cater for the occupational hazards of the job?

- a. Yes ( )
- b. No ( )

10. How efficient is the insurance plan being put in place by the organisation?

- a. Effective ( )
- b. Not Effective ( )

## **SECTION C:**

**Question Addressed to Management Staff of Airtel Networks Limited**

1. How long have you been a manager of this organization?

a. 0-2years ( ) b. 3-5 years ( ) c. 5 and above ( )

2. Are you involved in the change process being introduced?

a. Yes ( ) b. No ( )

3. How effective are the change being introduced in the organization?

a. Very effective ( ) b. Effective ( )

4. Are the organizational change strategies applied by Airtel Networks? Limited appropriate?

a. Yes ( ) b. No ( )

5. Appraise the quality of product and services being offered by the company since the change was introduced?

a. Superior ( ) b. Inferior ( ) c. None of the above ( )

6. Do you feel the employees were justified for revolting against the intended change management process?

a. Effective ( ) b. Not Effective ( )

