
**ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT AS RESILIENT SEEKING BEHAVIOUR
OF THE FIRM**

Dr. Continue Anddison Eketu* and Dr. (Mrs.) Christine Adaobi Nwuche

Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt.

*Email Address: keturesearch@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Organizations as social systems bear entropic characteristic, which is the tendency to wear off and die, over time. However, this paper examined organizational change management as a conscious tendency to negate possible entropy in organizations. The paper contends that organizational change management is a resilience seeking behavior to ensure survival and effectiveness. It identifies resistance to change as the most critical challenge in organizational change management. Resistance occurs because every human cluster is a political arena where individuals self-serving seek to superintend over others interest in the distribution of both advantages and disadvantages. The paper reviewed the extent literature on change management, and contend that a management culture that will evoke high employee engagement, involvement, pro-social behavior, commitment and ethically, to reduce unconstructive resistance should be enthroned in the firm.

KEYWORDS: Change Management, Change Resistance, Change Models, Change Agent, Resilient Seeking Behaviour and Organizational Entropy.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational processes and the need to survive and be effective in the pursuit of set goals have made change necessary in organizations. Change is a conscious renewal process of an organization to increase or sustain its relevance to its stakes. Such renewal tendencies may be triggered from within or outside the organization, either as a threat or an opportunity, particularly when it is externally triggered. Eketu (2009); Daff (2005) and Kazmi (2006) tend to agree that organizational change is necessary because, the only certainty is uncertainty, and organizations need to improve in their know-how and know-what to further enhance their adaptive capacities.

However, as necessary as change is in organization, resistance is nearly almost a certainty in every change management programme. Resistance occur most often as merely political tendencies as a self serving individual's political behaviours (Burnes, 2004; and carnal, 2008). Managers thus, are

confronted with such conflicts arising as inhibitions to smooth change management process in organizations. Resistance arising from self-serving behavior may be occasioned when the change imposes threat to certain key stakes in the organization. The tendency to resist such threat constitutes inhibition to the change implementation. The inhibition may be overt and covert depending on the power position of who is resisting the change.

In this paper, the organizational change management is discussed as a resilience seeking behavior. The need for change is seen as synonymous to the need for continuous existence and growth. Also, resistance to change is seen as internal entropic tendency of individuals with the organization to progress in the self-serving, expressed in the philosophy of ethics as psychological hedonism. For organizations to develop through effective change management, resistance must be eliminated or reduced at least. This paper suggests the use of lobbying to influence major stakes, and also the enthronement of enabling culture to evoke employment passion for the organization

The Nature and Concept of Change

Change is generally a response to some significant threat or opportunity occurring inside or outside of the organization. Golembiewski (1995) defines organizational change as “a state of transition between the current state and a future one, towards which the organization is directed”. It covers changes that appear in work processes (that may be understood as a set of work tasks fulfilled in order to reach a clear purpose) and within their subsystems, Golembiewski (1995). Organizational change may easily be compared to, or even considered as an innovation. The innovation may be defined as a technology, a product or a practice “used by the members of an organization for the first time, regardless of whether it has already been used by other organizations or not”. According to Daft (1983) changes within an organization take place both in response to business and economic events and to processes of managerial perception, choice and actions. Managers in this sense see events taking place that signal the need for change.

Change management is viewed as ‘the process of continually renewing an organization’s direction, structure, and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of external and internal customers’ (Moran and Brightman, 2000). According to Burnes (2004) change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Therefore, there should be no doubt regarding the importance to any organization of its ability to identify where it needs to be in the future, and how to manage the changes required getting there. The early approaches and theories to organizational change management suggest that organizations cannot be effective or improve performance if they are constantly changing (Rieley and Clarkson, 2001). They argue that people need routines to be effective and able to improve performance (Luecke, 2003). However, it is now argued that it is of vital importance to organizations that people are able to undergo continuous change (Burnes, 2004; Rieley

and Clarkson, 2001). Burnes (2004) believes that change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Therefore, there should be no doubt regarding its importance to any organization, its ability to identify where it needs to be in the future, and how to manage the changes required in getting there.

Essentially, the drive to manage change and shift away from the status quo is a resilient seeking behavior to resist entropy. However, elements or forces within the organizational domain which seek to impeded the organizational resistance to entropy are in such circumstance entropic elements to be dealt with. This paper presents a theoretical reflection on change models, reasons for change, intervention approaches, and resistance management. It identifies resistance forces as entropic elements.

Reasons for Change

1. **Technological Advancements:** Both manufacturing and service organizations are increasingly using technology as a means to improve productivity and market competitiveness. This highly technical process attempts to integrate product design with product planning, control, and operations. Office automation consists of a host of computerized technologies that are used to obtain, store, analyse, retrieve, and communicate information.

2. **Market Changes:** The emergence of a global economy is forcing Indian companies to change the way they do business. Companies are having to forge new partnerships with their suppliers in order to deliver higher quality products at lower prices.

Social and Political Pressures: These forces are created by social and political events. Personal values affect employees' needs, priorities, and motivation; managers thus may need to adjust their managerial style or approach to fit changing employee values. Although it is difficult for organizations to predict changes in political forces, many organisations hire lobbyists and consultants to help them detect and respond to social and political changes.

Models of Change Management

The Planned Approach to Organizational Change — Kurt Lewin's Model of Change:

Lewin (1951) views change as a three-step procedure. This three-step model is associated with intentional change in the organization and change initiators may choose to use a range of strategies to implement the intended change (Branch 2002). According to Harper (2001) the three steps are unfreezing, initiating the change (moving) and refreezing. For the unfreezing step, employees break away from the way things have been done. In organizations, for effective change to occur, employees must embrace new work practices with a sense of urgency. In order to achieve this, employees are encouraged or are forced to distance themselves from comfort zones that they were accustomed to so

that they acclimatize to new work practices, even if there is uncertainty regarding their future. Similarly, Harper (2001) argued that organizations that are implementing change management should encourage employees to abide by a plan that allows for the ‘sloughing of yesterday’ because ‘it will force thinking and action ... make available men and money for new things ... create a willingness to act’. However, this process has drawbacks, like anxiety and risks associated with uncertainty that can lead to unconstructive rather than constructive behaviour on the part of employees. These behaviour patterns have been noted by Argyris (1993) who observed that employees tend to become anxious while performing new tasks, not knowing the outcomes of the change if the change is not yet initiated. In step two (initiating the change), employees engage in activities that identify and implement new ways of doing things or engage in new activities in order to bring about change.

In this respect, Harper (2001) proposed that for effective change to take place, management must ensure that all relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to be engaged in decision-making and problem solving in a collaborative manner. Whilst the latter was predominantly the role of management, the current thinking is that employees who become involved are most likely to accept change and become committed to making change a success. A better understanding of the needs and benefits of change may result in little or no resistance on the part of change recipients. In the third and final step (refreezing), the emphasis is on the reinforcing of new processes and tasks in the organization by the employer. For this step to be successful, employees must be acknowledged, as reward is an important consideration. Reward is crucial for behaviour modification. Employees should receive appropriate recognition for changes in behaviour if they embrace or accept the change. In this instance, reward serves to recognize that the new behaviour is valued and prevents previous behaviour from reoccurring (Harper 2001).

Lippitt, Watson and Westley.s Expansion of Lewin’s Change Model

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) extend Lewin’s Three-Step Change Theory. They created a seven-step theory that focuses more on the role and responsibility of the change agent than on the evolution of the change itself.

The seven steps are:

1. Diagnose the problem.
2. Assess the motivation and capacity for change.
3. Assess the resources and motivation of the change agent. This includes the change agent’s commitment to change, power, and stamina.
4. Choose progressive change objects. In this step, action plans are developed and strategies are established.
5. The role of the change agents should be selected and clearly understood by all parties so that expectations are clear. Examples of roles are: cheerleader, facilitator, and expert.
6. Maintain the change: Communication, feedback, and group coordination are essential elements in

this step of the change process.

7. Gradually terminate from the helping relationship.

The change agent should gradually withdraw from their role over time. This will occur when the change becomes part of the organization. Lippiti, Watson & Westley (1958) point out that change is more likely to be stable if it spreads to neighboring systems or to subparts of the system immediately affected. Changes are better rooted. Two examples are: the individual meets other problems in a similar way, several businesses adopt the same innovation, or the problem spreads to other departments of the same business. The more widespread imitation becomes, the more the behavior is regarded as normal.

The Contingency Model of Change - Dunphy and Stace's Model of Change

Expanding upon the three-step model as espoused by Lewin, Dunphy & Stace (1988, 1992, 1993) investigated change from an organization transformation perspective. Within this perspective, Dunphy & Stace (1993) maintained that organizations needed a model of change that was essentially a 'situational' or 'contingency model'. This model should be one that indicated how to vary change strategies to achieve 'optimum fit' with the changing environment (Dunphy & Stace 1993). Furthermore, these writers state that the contingency model to change is based on the theory that situational variables determine the structure and performance of organizations and because no two organizations are alike, they will not face the same situational variables. Invariably, this may impact upon their operations and structures (Dunphy & Stace 1993). Dunphy and Stace's (1988, 1992) model of change is more situational in design and supportive of the view that 'that the selection of appropriate types of change depends entirely on a strategic analysis of the situation' (Dunphy & Stace 1992). These authors also maintained that change does not always occur on an incremental basis, but can also occur on a discontinuous basis. They also suggested that transformational change is not only consultative but is also coercive in nature.

Organizational Interventions and Change Agents

An intervention is a set of sequenced and planned actions or events intended to help the organization increase its effectiveness.

Purpose of Intervention

Performance and productivity improvement, Improving Employee and Organizational Effectiveness, To foster open communication, trust and confidence in intra group and inter-group relationships. This may involve changing mindsets and perceptions that would come into play as group influences. To encourage participative management by increasing employee involvement and participation in the management process (Shubhadha. 2012).

Elements of Organizational Interventions

Shubhadha (2012) outlines some elements of organizational interventions, they are:

1. Change Agent(s) - The change agent is the intervener. This resource may initiate the change program or can be introduced at any point to assess the effects of a change program or to implement parts of a planned change exercise. In case internal or external consultants are involved, they may act as change agents in the process.
2. Change or Intervention Target(s) - “Who does it seek to change?”
3. Organization stakeholder(s) - The organization leader(s) and sponsor(s) involved in this OD technique as initiators and decision makers.
4. Client System - Depending on the scope of intervention this can refer to the organization hosting the intervention and more specifically, the environment in which it is held. “Where does it take place?”
5. Intervention Goal(s) - What does it achieve or accomplish?”

Types of Organizational Interventions

According to Shubhadha (2012), Interventions may be directed at the individual, group or organization level. Methods for classifying them vary, with some that are not too rigid in their definition. A popular classification is based on what type of process it targets, and another on what type of work tasks are involved. The following initiatives can be viewed as forms of intervention- team building, coaching, Large Group Interventions, mentoring, performance appraisal, downsizing, TQM, and leadership development, Training, Questionnairesm Kaizen. It can cover a lot of initiatives planned by the company including Process Improvement and Management Consulting projects, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Placement initiatives.

Classifications of Organizational Intervention Based on the Type of Process that it Targets

1. Human process intervention: These are aimed at the social processes that occur among the members of an organization. It pertains to communication, decision making, leadership and group dynamics. Within this category, there are T-Groups, Process Consultations, Third Party interventions and Team Building.
 - i. In T-Groups, psychological techniques are applied to change the attitudes and behavior of individuals. Thus members get experiential learning based on which to improve their leadership skills, interpersonal and group relationships. The method by which group members are required to have open discussions over facilitated group sessions is also known as Sensitivity Training.
 - ii. In Process Consultation- It deals with group processes including communication, functional roles, problem solving and decision making, group norms, leadership and authority. The process consultant advises the client on how to understand, perceive and act on process events in order to improve the situation.

- iii. Third Party interventions focus on preventing and resolving conflicts between individuals or groups. Conflicts can arise from substantive or interpersonal issues.
 - iv. Team Building- Companies regard this as an important tool. The intervention enables Team members to work together, building a more collaborative culture so they can work efficiently toward group goals. It may involve overcoming hurdles such as interpersonal friction, apathy or de-motivation
2. Techno-structural: This deals with work/job design and high-involvement organizational issues with emphasis on increasing efficiency and productivity. It involves making changes in the organization structure, as traditionally hierarchical structures give way to more flexible ones that can prove to be more profitable and adaptive. It can include re-organization of work groups and activities. Program types- Formal structural change, differentiation and integration, total quality management (TQM), and work design. Intervention examples are downsizing and business process re-engineering (BPR).
 3. Human resource intervention: Practices in the Human Resource Management function are involved here. It targets Processes that affect individual employees, including Performance management and evaluation, Reward systems, Employee Wellness and Career planning. Processes related to HR Management policies such as Workforce diversity can also be impacted.
 4. Strategic intervention: Such interventions deal with strategic issues, enabling the organization to gain a competitive edge in the market. Solutions can involve developing the core strengths and resources of the organization; entering into alliances, mergers & acquisitions or partnerships that can position its product or service more effectively in the external environment. But as it is always important to align internal forces with strategy, it can also involve changes in the corporate culture (Shubhadha, 2012).

Change Agent

Lunberg (2010) defines a change agent as an individual or group that undertakes the task of initiating and managing change in an organization. Change agents can be internal, such as managers or employees who are appointed to oversee the change process. In many innovative- driven companies, managers and employees alike are being trained to develop the needed skills to oversee change (Tschirky, 2011). Change agents also can be external, such as consultants from outside the firm. Lunberg (2010) believes that, for major organization-wide changes, companies frequently will hire external change agents. Because these consultants are from the outside, they are not bound by the firm's culture, politics, or traditions. Therefore, they are able to bring a different perspective to the situation and challenge the status quo. This can be a disadvantage, however, because external change agents lack an understanding of the company's history, operating procedures, and personnel. To offset their limited familiarity with the organization, external change agents usually are paired with an internal coordinator from the human resources department. These two then works together with line management. In very large firms, the

organization sometimes has its own in-house change specialist. This person replaces the external consultant and works directly with the organization's management team to facilitate change efforts.

Roles of Change Agents

There are at least three distinct roles that change agents play: consulting, training, and research (Carnall, 2008; Dawson, 2010; Stephen, 2010; and Tidd, 2010). A manager can and often does perform each of these functions. An outside change agent can perform these activities as well.

Consulting: As a consultant, the manager places employees in touch with data from outside the organization. The overall purpose is to help employees find solutions to problems through analysis of valid data.

Training: Here the change agent helps organization members learn how to use data to effect change. He also provides organization members with a new set of skills—the ability to retrieve, translate, and use new data to solve future problems.

Researcher: Finally and closely associated with the previous role, the change agent may assume the role of a researcher. He may train organization members in the skills needed for valid evaluation of the effectiveness of action plans that have been implemented. Furthermore, as part of the overall intervention strategy, he helps to will design an evaluation component that can be used in solving not only the current problem but also future problems.

Resistance to Change

Hultman (1995) maintains that some employees are predisposed to resist change, even though the change effort ultimately may be to their benefit. According to Waddell and Sohal (1998), resistance could be described as a multifaceted phenomenon because it introduces unanticipated delays, costs and instabilities into the process of a strategic change. O'Connor (1993) describes resistance as a slow motion response to meet agreements or even a complete refusal to cooperate with change. In an organization, resistance is opposition or withholding of support for specific plans or ideas. It can be intentional or unintentional, covert or overt. Hultman (1995) maintains that resistance to change that is evident in employee behaviour falls into two categories, active and passive resistance. In the case of active resistance, employees engage in behaviours associated with manipulation, ridicule, fault-finding and fear. On the other hand, passive resistance is associated with withdrawal of information, ignorance and lack of action following verbal compliance. However, resistance can be viewed as having a positive influence in the organization. Robbins (1998) states that resistance could serve to test the commitment of those initiating the change; if the resistance is based on valid viewpoints, then important truths could be heard, understood and taken into account by the change initiators if they want change is to succeed;

resistance can assist to weed out bad ideas that are have not been thoroughly vetted by the change initiators.

Why People Resist Change

People resist change because they are afraid to lose something that they value; they do not understand the change and its implications; they do not believe that the change will make sense in the organization; or they find it difficult to cope with either the level or practice of change (Zander 1950; Skoldberg 1994; Kotter 1996; Maurer 1996; Robbins 1998; Bolognese 2002; Dunn 2002; and Schuler 2003). Dent and Goldberg (1999) cited six common causes that foster employee resistance to change. Resistance occurs when the nature of the change is not made clear to the employees who are going to be influenced by the change; the change is open to a wide variety of interpretations; employees influenced feel strong forces deterring them from changing; employees influenced by the change have pressure put on them to comply instead of having an input in the nature or the direction of the change; the change is made on personal grounds; and the change ignores the already established institutions in the group. other causes of resistance by employees in organizations worthy of mention are lack of confidence in management; loss of status; loss of job security; pressure from co-workers; dysfunctional group relationships; interruption of cultural customs and traditions; personality clashes; and a lack of diplomacy and timing (Dunn (2002).

Organizational Structure for Planned Change Management Planned Change

Planned change is defined as a proactive change, initiated by the members of the organization, as well as implemented by them deliberately with a view to anticipating or responding to environmental change or to pursuing new opportunities. As stated before, it is initiated within the organization, in response to needs that appear in the environment and that affect many segments of an organization. One of the main elements of planned change is the importance of leadership. Besides initiating change, leaders get actively involved in its planning and implementation, so that the whole process is centralized.

Another view on the reason for resistance to change is given by Machiavelli (1996:19). This view appears to be comprehensive as it tends to bear political, social and psychological factors. Machiavelli presented thus”it should be borne in mind that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things, for the reformer has enemies in all those who profit by the old order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit by the new order. This lukewarmness arising partly from, fear of their adversaries who have the laws in their favour, and partly from the incredibility of mankind, who do not truly believe in anything new until they have actual experience of it”. This represents naturally most of the change circumstances experienced in organizations, that a bandwagon of those who may resist change are either ignorant or demonstrate their fear adversities from those who are against the change.

General Recipes for Change Management

Kant (2002), in his research on change management came up with the following practices and argued that if followed will ensure that change is successfully implemented:

1. **Align the Goals of a Change Effort with Organizational Strategy:** If the goals of the change effort do not support the organizational strategy then the change effort will not yield significant value to the organization. Therefore, by aligning the goals of a change effort with the business strategy of an organization, the change effort will have a greater chance of succeeding because the change effort will receive greater executive commitment than if the goals were not aligned.
2. **Acquire and Maintain Executive Commitment:** Great leadership is required for change to occur, especially if the change requires significant cultural changes. Thus, corporate leaders must provide this leadership by committing to change, communicating the corporate vision to others, and empowering people to act consistently with the behaviors of the change. To accomplish this, the organization must clearly define its structures, management systems, and guiding principles, policies, and procedures.
3. **Create and Maintain a Superior Change Team:** To create a superior change team an organization must first define a charter that identifies a task that is narrower in scope than the organization's strategy statement and states the expectations of management in terms of goals and metrics. The change team must control the goals, which must be measurable and meaningful. The change team must also define its purpose, the methods and procedures it will use, what is acceptable team behavior, and how it will resolve conflict and define team roles. A superior change team will effectively create a plan for change, identify processes to change, and acquire support for the change effort for an organization, at all levels
4. **Evaluate the Willingness of the Organization to Change:** The readiness of an organization to change is dependent on several variables, including the strength of the corporate culture and the number of prior change efforts. To achieve a successful change, a change plan must rigorously identify the objectives and milestones of the change, the impact of change on the workforce, the cultural climate, the barriers to change, methods for overcoming them, the probability of overcoming them, the communications approach, and the required training needs.
5. **Foster a Creative and Innovative Environment:** Organizations must systematically and deliberately identify new ideas and ways of doing things better. This requires organizations to challenge the basic assumptions on which its organization and industry has been built. To change these assumptions requires creativity, which is the generation of ideas and alternatives, and innovation, which is the transformation of those ideas and alternatives into useful applications that lead to change and improvement.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The plethora on the discussion, on change tends to emphasis on the most disturbing challenge in

organizational development. Organizations have assumed serious pivotal positional in task accomplishment as major world achievement are through organizational platforms. However, change is only necessary for organizational advancement, yet resistance tends to be inherent in every circumstance. It thus, means that as change is constant for advancement so, the management of resistance will remain constant by managers. This means that managers in fast moving organizations must be apt at managing resistance all the time.

However, the trends call for the institutionalization of management culture where the tendencies for resistance will be reduced as such culture evoke high employee engagement, involvement, pro-social behavior, commitment, ethicality, etc, to enhance the corporate resilience in turbulent environment characterized with perturbation.

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. (1993) *On Organizational Learning*. Cambridge: Blackwell Business.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D.A. (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolognese, A.F. (2002) *Employee Resistance to Organizational Change*. New Foundations. Online Article, retrieved from: www.newfoundations.com
- Branch, K. (2002) *Change Management*. Retrieved from <http://www.sc.doe.gov>.
- Burnes, B. (2004) *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Carnall, C. (2008) *Managing Change in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C.G. (2005) *Organization Development and Change*, Thomson, Mason, OH.
- Daft, R. (1995) *Strategic Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Daft, R. L. (1983). *Organization Theory and Design*.
- Dawson, P. M. B. (2010) *Managing Change, Creativity and Innovation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dent, E., & Goldberg, S. (1999) *Challenging 'Resistance to Change'*. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35(1), 25-41.
- Dunne, A. (2006) *Organizational Learning in the Context of a Food Industry Value Chain*. Unpublished Thesis. Toowoomba: University of Southern Queensland.
- Dunphy, D.C., & Stace, D.A. (1993) *The Strategic Management of Corporate Change*. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 905-918.
- Eketu, C.A. (2009) *Knowledge Management and Intellectual Capital Development in Nigeria Telecom Industries*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, RSU, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Golembiewski, T. Robert (1995) *Managing Diversity in Organizations*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press,

- Harper, S.C. (2001). *The Forward-Focused Organization*. New York: American Management Association.
- Harris, B. M. (1975). *Supervisory Behavior in Education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kazmi, S. (2006) *Business Policy and Strategic Management*. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996) *Leading Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lewin, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Luecke, R. (2003) *Managing Change and Transition* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press).
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2010) *Managing Change: The Role of the Change Agent*. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration* 13(1),
- Machiavelli, N. (1961) *The Prince*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Maurer, R. (1998) Is it Resistance, or isn't it?. *Manage*, 50(1), 28-29.
- Mintzberg, H., & Quinn, J. (1991) *The Strategy Process: Concepts, Contexts, Cases*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Moran, J. W. and Brightman, B. K. (2001) *Leading Organizational Change, Career Development International*, 6(2), 111—118.
- Porras, J. and Robertson, P. (1991) *Organization Development: Theory, Practice and Research in Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 3, Davies-Black Publishing.
- Pryor, M.G., Taneja, S., Humphreys, J., Anderson, D and Singleton, L (2008) *Challenges Facing Change Management Theories and Research*. *Delhi Business Review*, 9, (1)
- Pryor, M.G., White, J.C., and Toombs, L.A. (1998) *Strategic Quality Management: A Strategic, Systems Approach to Continuous Improvement*, United States: Thomson Learning.
- Rieley, J. B. & Clarkson, I. (2001) *The Impact of Change on Performance*, *Journal of Change Management*, 2(2), pp. 160—172.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998) *Organizational Behaviour* (8th Edtn.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Schuler, A.J. (2003) *Overcoming Resistance to Change: Top Ten Reasons for Change Resistance*. Online Article. Accessed from: [www.Schuler Solutions.com](http://www.SchulerSolutions.com).
- Senior, B. and Swales, S. (2010) *Organizational Change*, Pearson Education, Harlow.
- Skoldberg, K. (1994) *Tales of Change: Public Administration Reform and Narrative Mode*. *Organisation Science*, 5(2), 219-238.
- Stephen, T. (2010) *Successfully Managing Change in Organizations*. New York, NY: Industrial Press.
- Tidd, J. (2010) *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technology, Market and Organizational Change*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Zander, A.F. (1950) *Resistance to Change: Its Analysis and Prevention*. *Advanced Management*, 4(5), 9-11.