2005

Readiness for Organizational Change

Susan R. Madsen, *Utah Valley University*
Duane Miller, *Utah Valley University*
Cameron John, *Utah Valley University*

Readiness for Organizational Change: Do Organizational Commitment and

Social Relationships in the Workplace Make a Difference?

Western Academy of Management, Las Vegas, 2005

Susan R. Madsen
Utah Valley State College
Business Management Department
800 West University Parkway, Mailcode 119
Orem, Utah 84058-5999
Tel: (801) 863-6176
Fax: (801) 863-7218
e-mail: madsensu@uvsc.edu

Duane Miller
Utah Valley State College
Business Management Department
800 West University Parkway, Mailcode 119
Orem, Utah 84058-5999
Tel: (801) 863-8172
Fax: (801) 863-7218
e-mail: millerdu@uvsc.edu

Cameron R. John
Utah Valley State College
Behavioral Science Department
800 West University Parkway, Mailcode 149
Orem, Utah 84058-5999
Tel: (801) 863-8809
e-mail: johnca@uvsc.edu

Keywords: Readiness for Change, Change, Organizational Commitment, Social Relationships

Readiness for Organizational Change: Do Organizational Commitment and

Social Relationships in the Workplace Make a Difference?

Abstract

Today's businesses are confronting continuous and unparalleled changes. For organizations to

assist employees in being motivated and prepared for change, it is essential that managers,

leaders, and organization development professionals understand factors that may influence

individual change readiness. The purpose of this research study was to investigate the

relationship between readiness for change and two of these possible factors: organizational

commitment and social relationships in the workplace. Four hundred and sixty-four usable

surveys were returned from full-time employees in four companies within two northern Utah

counties. The findings indicate that there are significant relationships between readiness for

change, organizational commitment, and social relationships. Relationships were also found

between readiness for change and number of children; social relationships and gender; and

organization commitment or one of its three components (i.e., identification, job involvement,

and loyalty) and employee age, length of time with organization, educational level, and gender.

Readiness for Organizational Change: Do Organizational Commitment and

Social Relationships in the Workplace Make a Difference?

Today's businesses are confronting continuous and unparalleled changes. In 1996, a study by the American Management Association reported that 84 percent of US businesses "were in the process of at least one major change initiative, while 46 percent said they had three or more change initiatives in progress" (Peak, 1996, as cited in Weber & Weber, 2001, p. 291). Yet, since that time, organizational change initiatives have continued to dramatically increase as firms have struggled through economic downturns, employee shortages, technological advancements, downsizing, mergers, and general instability. For others, ongoing change has been essential because of rapid growth, new business ventures, exciting opportunities, innovative inventions, and novel leadership and management approaches. Whatever the reason, embracing constant and continuous change is now a necessity for business success. However, to do this an organization must be in a continued state of change readiness (Rowden, 2001), and researchers (e.g., Backer, 1995; Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000) have confirmed that, for organizational readiness, individual employees must also be open, prepared, and ready for change. Bernerth (2004) explained, "researchers and practitioners have both found employee readiness to be a critical factor in successful change efforts" (p. 36). Rowden (2001) purported that for an organization to truly become a *learning organization*, employees and the organization as a whole must be in constant readiness.

Individual readiness for change research in human resource development (HRD) and management has primarily emerged in the last decade. Previously, individual readiness studies were (and continue to be) published in the health, psychology, and medical literature (e.g., Prochaska, Redding, & Evers, 1997) and are primarily focused on ceasing harmful health habits

(e.g., smoking and drugs) and starting positive ones (e.g., weight management, nutritional meals, and sunscreen use). For years, in the HRD and organizational psychology literature, many change models have included readiness components but most do not include specific depth related to this readiness component. For example, Lewin's (1951) widely known change model has an *unfreeze* readiness component; yet, it stops short of discussing the dynamic and detailed steps, elements, or influential readiness factors of this component. In fact, only during the past decade have researchers (e.g., Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993; Cunningham et al., 2002) begun to explore some of these individual readiness for organizational change factors.

For organizations to assist employees in being motivated and prepared for change, it is essential that managers, leaders, and organization development professionals understand two categories of contributing activities: 1) creating readiness for change; and 2) overcoming resistance to change (Cummings & Worley, 2005). To understand either, the influencing factors must be discovered and analyzed; only then can specific change readiness interventions be effectively designed and implemented. Hence, the purpose of this research study was to investigate the relationships between readiness for change and two possible influential factors: organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace. It was hoped that this research will provide insight into areas and potential intervention foci that could be used to help employees become and remain open and ready for current and future change requirements and opportunities. This topic is important to HRD research because of its applicability to the work of practitioners in various fields. Today change is critical, complex, and essential; yet, it can also be exciting.

<div align="center">Theoretical Framework and Literature Review</div>

To address the research hypotheses effectively, several subject areas will be reviewed and integrated: theoretical framework, readiness for change, organizational commitment, and social relationships.

Theoretical Frameworks

Numerous theories provide insight into readiness for change and the social dynamics involved in readiness interventions (Armenakis et al., 1993). Two will be offered in this paper: individual differences and five message components. First, individual difference theory argues that, because of differing cognitive structures, individuals react differently to the same change message (Armenakis et al., 1993; Armenakis & Harris, 2002). Reactions are based upon personality, previous life and work experiences, organizational culture, personal habits, mental processes, logical disposition, immediate circumstances, and more. Importantly, general change interventions may not be effective for many employees.

Secondly, Armenakis et al.'s (2002) *Five Message Components* also provides a theoretical framework for this study. This is a model with five separate but equally important readiness components and is based upon the communication of the change message:

1. *Self-efficacy:* Confidence in individual and group's ability to make the change succeed.

2. *Principle support:* Key organizational leaders support this particular change.

3. *Discrepancy:* A gap between the current state and an ideal state.

4. *Appropriateness:* The correct reaction to fix the gap identified by discrepancy.

5. *Personal valence:* Clarifies the intrinsic and extrinsic benefits of the change. (Bernerth, 2004, p. 41)

Studying and analyzing workplace readiness problems using these components can provide depth and clarity to change issues. It will also provide clarity with regard to possible

relationships between change readiness, organizational commitment, and social relationships in the workplace.

Readiness for Change

Readiness for change has been conceptualized and defined a variety of ways. Bernerth (2004) explained that "Readiness is more than understanding the change, readiness is more than believing in the change, readiness is a collection of thoughts and intentions toward the specific change effort" (p. 40). Backer (1995) explained that

Individual readiness for change is involved with people's beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and their perception of individual and organizational capacity to successfully make those changes. Readiness is a state of mind about the need. It is the cognitive precursor to behaviors of either resistance or support…readiness for change is not a fixed element of individuals or system. It may vary due to changing external or internal circumstance, the type of change being introduced, or the characteristics of potential adopters and change agents. Thus, interventions to enhance readiness are possible…change can occur under conditions of low readiness, of course, but behavioral science research indicates that the probability of success is reduced when low readiness leads to low motivation to change or to active resistance. (p. 22-24)

Therefore, an individual is ready for change when he or she understands, believes, and intends to change because of a perceived need.

Previous research has found relationships between readiness for change and a number of variables or constructs: individual contribution to the change effort, active-passive job, job change self-efficacy, job demands, and decision latitude (Cunningham et al., 2002); job

satisfaction and effective job performance (McNabb & Sepic, 1995); and job knowledge and skills, social relations in the workplace, organizational culture, and management-leadership relationships (Hanpachern, Morgan, & Griego, 1998). Most of these constructs have only been explored in one or two studies while other possible influential factors have not yet been investigated.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a multidimensional concept that is often interpreted in different ways (Mathews & Shepherd, 2002). Today, the most common method of studying this concept is through individual attitudes and feelings (perceptions) toward his or her organization. According to Mathews and Shepherd (2002), "committed employees have a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, show a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and, have a strong desire to maintain membership with the organization" (p. 369). Cook and Wall (1980) explained that organizational commitment consists of three primarily components: identification, involvement, and loyalty. *Identification* is focused on the connection and pride employees feel toward their organization. The *involvement* construct encompasses the perceived contribution an employee makes to an organization and how the employee feels about it. It also includes an employee's effort for the company (beyond personal gain) and his or her willingness to help even if it takes additional time or work. *Loyalty* to the company is determined by assessing employee intentions to leave, particularly if additional compensation were offered by another firm.

A study directly connecting organizational commitment and readiness for organizational change has not yet been reported. However, some studies have found possible indirect correlations. Eby et al. (2000) explained that when employees participate in change activities (a

possible demonstration of organizational commitment) they are more likely to have higher readiness levels. Weber and Weber (2001) concluded that employee involvement in the organization and in the change effort is related to organizational readiness for change. Researchers (e.g., Good, Page & Young, 1996; Goulet & Singh, 2002; Tompson & Werner, 1997; Yoon & Thye, 2002; Zangaro, 2001) have also discovered relationships between organizational commitment and organizational support, job satisfaction, and job involvement, and loyalty—all of which have demonstrated a possible relationship, although indirect, with readiness.

Social Relationships in the Workplace

The term *social relationships in the workplace* is primary focused on an employee's feelings, attitudes, and perceptions of workplace co-workers in general as well his or her perceptions of working closely or directly with them. In her study, Hanpachern (1997) directly measured social relations and found that it is significantly related to readiness for change and organizational culture.

Other studies have reported indirect relationships. Eby et al. (2000) found that perceived organizational support and trust in peers were related to readiness for change. Weber and Weber's (2001) research revealed that workplace improvement in support is related to organizational readiness for change. Cunningham et al. (2002) discovered a weak relationship between readiness and social support and explained that "job-related interpersonal relationships made a very limited contribution to the prediction of readiness for organizational change scores" (p. 387). They also stated, "These findings suggest that supportive colleagues may play a more important role in employee efforts to cope with the stress of organizational change" (p. 387). McNabb and Sepic (1995) found support for a model that identified the relevant factors in

determining readiness for change. Among other factors, social support and interaction were included as important elements of a positive organizational culture that leads to increased organizational readiness for change. It is important to note, however, that support, social support, organizational support, interaction, and trust are not the same as the social relationship construct but appear to have a relationship to it.

Demographics

The relationships between various demographics and both readiness for change and organizational commitment have been reported in the literature. Hanpachern (1997) discovered that readiness was significantly related to position and length of employment but not related to age, gender, education, or marital status. Cunningham et al. (2002) found no relationship between readiness for change, gender, and marital status. Kirchmeyer (1995) determined that organizational commitment was slightly related to gender (being female) and age. Weber and Weber (2001) found no relationship between readiness for change and age, organization and work experience, and education. Goulet and Singh (2002) concluded that organizational commitment was not related to age but was related to gender. Finally, Yoon and Thye (2002) found no relationship between organizational commitment and race, age, education, and gender.

<div align="center">Purpose and Hypotheses</div>

The purpose of this survey questionnaire study was to investigate the organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace constructs and their relationship to readiness for change. We wanted to determine if employees who had higher levels of organizational commitment and/or positive social workplace relationships were more open and prepared for change. If we felt that supportive findings were discovered, implications for types of change interventions would surface. In addition, the cost-benefit of designing and implementing

person-focused, small group, or large group interventions that can assist employees in increasing readiness for change may be strengthened. In addition, we were interested in discovering the implications of this research to HRD. To do this, the following hypotheses were explored:

Hypothesis 1: Organizational commitment will be positively related to perceived readiness for organizational change.

Hypothesis 2: Identification, involvement, and loyalty (the three components of organizational commitment) will be positively related to perceived readiness for organizational change.

Hypothesis 3: Perceptions of social relationships in the workplace will be positively related to readiness for organizational change.

In addition to the three hypotheses, we were also interested in exploring the various relationships between various demographics (gender, employee age, marital status, educational level, length of time with employer, and number of children) and each of the study variables (readiness for change, organizational commitment, identification, involvement, loyalty, and social relationships in the workplace).

<div align="center">Research Methods</div>

In order to determine the relationships between readiness for organizational change and the constructs discussed, a positivistic survey was used, with a questionnaire being given to a sample that included employees from four companies. It can be classified as a correlation relational study because two or more different kinds of data were gathered from the same groups of subjects to test for relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

Participants and Procedure

The population of this study was the group of individuals that conformed to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of this research study. This target population included the populations of four organizations (three for-profit and one non-profit) within the state of Utah with numbers of local employees ranging from approximately 200 to over 2,000. These organizations varied greatly in industries, products, and services (hospital, call center, technological support, and health product manufacturer). One organization distributed surveys to all employees while another distributed surveys to all employees within six predetermined departments. A third conducted a random sample of all supervisors, management, and leadership within the organization. Finally, we ran a random sample of about two-thirds of all employees for the fourth company. In addition to the actual survey, a letter of consent which had been approved through our Institutional Review Board was also given to each employee.

A key contact at each organization was used to distribute surveys. This individual had a list of the employees to be given surveys and the survey number employees should be given. We kept a list of numbers given to each organization, and we tracked returned surveys. Researchers did not have a list of employee names, and contacts did not see completed surveys so confidentiality was maintained. Survey numbers were used to identify organizations. After approximately ten days we asked the organizational contacts to provide a general reminder to all participants to return surveys. Additional copies of surveys were given to the contacts so that they could provide them to employees who may have misplaced their original copies. For three organizations, pre-addressed and stamped envelopes were provided so employees could mail surveys directly to us. One organization asked participants to seal completed surveys in envelopes provided and then to put them in large drop envelopes located in each department (this was the method used for all employee surveys for this organization). The following week a

researcher picked up the sealed envelopes. Again, before the surveys were distributed, we asked

the contacts at each organization to encourage their employees to return as many surveys as

possible so that results would be more accurate.

Measures

For this study, readiness for change served as the dependent variable, organizational

commitment, and social relations served as independent variables; and the intervening

demographic variables included gender, age, marital status, educational level, number of

children, and length of time with company. We adapted three existing scales for this research

project: readiness for change, organization commitment, and social relationships in the

workplace. In addition, we asked six demographic questions.

Readiness for change. We used Hanpachern's original 14-item RFC scale (with slight

alterations) which was based in part on McNabb and Sepic (1995) and several unpublished

studies. The stem question asked "My willingness or openness to…" and some sample items

have been included in Table 1. Participants were asked to circle one of seven numbers on a

Likert scale (1=very unlikely; 7=very likely). Hanpachern pilot tested three versions of this scale

and the Cronbach's alpha of the final 14-item scale was measured to be .82 which indicates good

internal consistency (Hanpachern, Morgan, & Griego, 1998). Our slightly adjusted instrument

also had a Cronbach's alpha of .82.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Organizational commitment. A 9-item 7-point *(strongly disagree to strongly agree)* scale

(alpha=.81) was used to measure organizational commitment. The scale was slightly adapted

from Cook and Wall's (1980) British Organizational Commitment Scale as described by

Mathews and Shepherd (2002). It included three 3-item subscales (see Table 1 for sample items): identification (alpha=.68), involvement (alpha=.59), and loyalty (alpha=.66).

Social relationships in the workplace. A 4-item 7-point (*strongly disagree to strongly agree)* scale was used to measure social relationships in the workplace. The scale was adapted from a social relationships subscale of Hanpachern's (1997) Revised Margin in Life scale which had already been modified from the original published survey by Stevenson in 1982. Our revised scale demonstrated internal consistency at .70. This adapted scale, along with the other scales mentioned, was pilot tested (n=44) to ensure internal consistency.

Demographics. The participants were asked to check the appropriate box in the demographic section of this questionnaire. Demographics included gender, age range, present marital status, highest educational level, number of children living at home, and length of time with company (see Table 1 for item choices). For each question, the first choice was given a variable code for SPSS as "1", the second choice as "2", and so forth.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Data Analysis Procedure

A number of statistical tests were used to analyze the results of this study. First, frequencies, means, and standard deviations were used to describe the sample (demographics) and general results. Pearson correlations were used to test magnitude and direction of the relationship for all three hypotheses. Although correlations also provided some data into construct relationships (and significant differences) with demographics, the primary method of analysis was a multiple analyses of variance (MANOVA). This was useful in determining the relationships between each of the constructs (readiness, organizational commitment and its

subscales, and social relationships) and the combination of applicable demographic (predictor) variables for the sample.

Results

Of the 758 distributed questionnaires, 469 were returned and 464 were deemed usable and were included in the study results for a return rate of over 61 percent. Five surveys were returned too incomplete to use. Return rates in the four organizations ranged from 51 percent to 72 percent, and 10 surveys were completed; returned but the survey numbers (used to identify companies and departments) had been removed. Selected demographic results were gather and compiled (see Table 2).

Relationships Between Readiness for Change and Organizational Commitment

Overall, employees in this study perceived themselves as generally open and ready for change with a statistical mean (M) of 5.27 on a 7-point scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). In addition, employees appeared to be fairly committed to their organizations ($M =$ 5.17) with involvement ($M = 5.83$) being the strongest contributor followed by identification ($M = 2.25$) and then loyalty ($M = 4.42$) (see Table 3).

[Insert Table 3 about here]

The first hypothesis (organizational commitment will be positively related to perceived readiness for organizational change) was analyzed using a Pearson correlation statistical test. This correlational analysis showed that organizational commitment was strongly linked ($r = .45$, $p = .001$) to readiness for organization change scores as predicted (see Table 3).

The correlational analyses for the three components of organizational commitment, hypothesis two, also showed links with readiness for change. There were significant correlations

between identification ($r = .39$), involvement ($r = .51$), and loyalty ($r = .28$) with readiness for

organizational change (see Table 3).

Relationships Between Readiness for Change and Social Relations

It appears that employees in this sample felt good about the social relationships in their

work environments ($M = 5.80$, *S.D.* $= .84$) (hypothesis 3). There also appears to be a slight

relationship between social relations and readiness for change ($r = .18$, $p = .001$). In addition,

although not a hypothesis) there are correlations between social relations and organizational

commitment ($r = .37$), identification ($r = .34$), involvement ($r = .31$), and loyalty ($r = .29$) (see

Table 3).

Demographic Relationships

A MANOVA was used to analyze the relationships between study constructs (readiness,

identification, involvement, loyalty, organizational commitment, and social relations) and the six

demographics variables (gender, age, marital status, education, length of time with employer,

and number of children) (see Table 4). Significant relationships were found between readiness

and number of children ($p = .028$), identification and age of employee ($p = .030$), identification

and length of time with employer ($p = .033$), involvement and age of employee ($p = .000$),

loyalty and gender ($p = .36$), loyalty and age of employee ($p = .024$), loyalty and education

($p=.024$), organizational commitment and age of employee ($p = .000$), organizational

commitment and educational level ($p = .048$), and social relationships and gender ($p = .002$).

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Discussion

Overall, this study found that there is a connection between readiness for organizational

change and both organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace. In these

organizations, as predicted, employees perceived higher readiness levels when they felt

committed (loyal, involved, and identified) to their organizations. This does support past

literature (e.g., Eby et al., 2000; Weber & Weber, 2001) that has indirectly inferred this

relationship. Because this study is correlational, we cannot claim causality. However, it makes

sense that organizational commitment would help facilitate a readiness for change within

individual employees. If this is the case, an increase in organizational commitment may heighten

employee readiness for change levels. This research also suggests that increases in identification,

involvement, and loyalty can also influence readiness levels. Interestingly, many companies with

major change initiatives actually take steps that reduce (often intentionally) identification,

involvement, and loyalty by decreasing communication, mandating decisions, increasing

uncertainty, and decreasing perceived employee value. This research does support the notion that

the decrease in organizational commitment during times of change can also reduce change

readiness. Ironically, when organizations need to change the most, employees are often most

resistant.

     As predicted, we found that an employee's social relationships at work are also connected

to readiness for organizational change. This means that positive feelings, attitudes, and

perceptions of workplace peers, subordinates, and even supervisors may facilitate an

environment more conducive to individual willingness/openness for organizational change

involvement and supportiveness. This finding supports Hanpachern's (1997) research as well as

the possible indirect relationships found by various researchers (e.g., Cunningham et al., 2002;

Eby et al., 2000). Our study also found that employees who had positive social relations in their

companies also felt more organizational commitment. It is unclear, however, whether

organizational commitment is a mediator in the social relations-readiness relationship.

The relationships between the study's constructs and demographics were not surprising. There was a relationship between an employee's number of children and his or her readiness for change. The more children an employee had—the more open and ready he/she was for change. Interestingly, previous literature did not study this relationship. Typically, as we become parents we learn to adjust and become more flexible (we are all parents of multiple children). Controlling children and schedules are nearly impossible with illness, sports, weather, homework, conflict, and each additional child adds more complexity to family and work issues. It stands to reason that these experiences would help employees become more ready for change at home and may spillover into workplace readiness as well. Other interesting correlations include the link between age of employee and organizational commitment (and each of its components). Older employees in this sample were more committed to their organizations when compared to younger colleagues. This corroborates Kirchmeyer's (1995) research but does not support other studies (Hanpachern, 1997; Weber & Weber, 2001; Yoon & Thye, 2002). We also found a slight relationship between organizational commitment and educational level. It appears that employees with more education have higher readiness levels. This could be related to age or position (older employees may have been in management and leadership positions and therefore are more committed to change efforts). Finally, female employees in this sample felt more positively toward their relationships with peers, supervisors, and/or subordinates (social relations).

Lastly, the two theoretical frameworks for this research were generally supported by this study as well as past literature specific to the utilized scales. It is clear that individual differences are essential to consider in readiness research. Of 464 participants, no two answered all of the items identically. It is clear that individuals react differently to the same change message. Each

employee thinks, acts, and reacts differently because of his or her past and current circumstances, abilities and skills, opportunities, and mental and physical state. In our research, even within the same organizations and departments, some employees were clearly more ready for change than others.

Each item from Hanpachern's change readiness scale appear to correspond with at least one of the message components in the *Five Message Component* model (Bernerth, 2004). Although the existing scale has shown reliability and validity for measuring change readiness, it could be improved through close analysis of this model. Items related to only three of these five components could be identified. Adapting and enhancing this scale by using this model would be beneficial and is suggested for future research. This model also provides elements that help explain some of the discovered relationships. For example, social relationships in the workplace may be linked to personal valence. An employee may consider continuing positive relationships a benefit for making needed workplace changes. In addition, organizational commitment may influence an employee's self-efficacy and perception of intervention appropriateness which may be antecedents or mediators in readiness for change. This model contributes to this work by providing a framework for scale improvements and a possible future research agenda or outline.

Suggestions for Research and Limitations

There are many areas of research that are imperative for this work to continue moving forward. In addition to the research suggestions just mentioned, five more will now be presented. First, more causal-comparative and experimental research needs to be conducted to determine causality of these constructs. Relationship directions (e.g., organizational commitment causes increased readiness) have been purported and proposed but without adequate support. Second, longitudinal studies in this research area (outside of the health, psychology, and medical fields)

are currently rare. Specific research carefully designed to look at changes throughout time can be helpful in understanding these phenomenon as well as possible interventions resulting from these and other related findings. Third, research with regard to readiness for change antecedents and/or determinants as well as mediators need to be explored and clearly reported. Fourth, specific workplace interventions focused at increasing the constructs addressed in this and other research need to be examined. Pre- and post-surveys should be used to documented changes as they relate to readiness levels. Finally, there are many possible influential factors for readiness for change that have not yet been studied. We would strongly recommend a thorough research project focused on exploration, compilation, and publication of all the HRD, management, and organizational psychology research on influential factors for readiness for change. Clear identification of these factors (along with a review of past research) and a list of possible factors that have yet to be explored would be most helpful for researchers, scholars, and practitioners.

Although the sampling methods may have limited the generalizability of these findings, participants were selected from four different organizations and included a variety of individuals with different positions and in different industries. The study was limited to 758 employees; a larger and fully randomized sample would have improved generalizability. In addition, this study was limited only to the factors that may influence change readiness. An individual's readiness for change can be influenced by variables not measured in this study.

As always, a questionnaire survey cannot accurately control many variables within an organization's culture or for an individual's situation. Estimates of these constructs were based upon employee perceptions and self-report. In addition, surveys cannot probe deeply into respondents' opinions and feelings which would be helpful in taking a more comprehensive look at change readiness, organizational commitment, and social relationships in the workplace.

Contributions and Implications for Practice

This study offers contributions to HRD, management, organizational psychology, and change literature. First, it is one of the first studies known to measure the influence that organizational commitment and social relationships may have on readiness for change. Second, it utilizes a relatively unknown instrument that may have promise for future use. Third, it supports the premise that readiness for change is a complex phenomenon and influential factors need to be explored for progress in both research and practice. Fourth, it is one of few individual readiness studies published in the HRD arena. Finally, practitioners can utilize this information to assist them in assessing, designing, and evaluating new and existing programs or initiatives.

The results of this study suggest recommendations for practitioners. First, "many organizational leaders lack a clear understanding of the necessary steps to succeed" (Bernerth, 2004, p. 49). Leadership at all levels (executives, managers, and supervisors) must be educated in motivating and preparing employees for change. If this step (readiness) is bypassed, which is often the case, the change effort often fails or is ineffective. Second, if practitioners are interested in more effective and continuous change, they should consider implementing well-designed and developed interventions geared toward increased organizational commitment and facilitating and enhancing positive social relationships in their organizations. However, these types of interventions will not be successful long-term unless the climate and culture of the organization supports them. For example, one employee party will not make a difference if the daily work environment does not invite and support friendly interactions and supportive relationships. Third, many employees perceive themselves as being open and prepared for workplace change (in general); yet, many organizational leaders struggle with successful change interventions. There is clearly a gap that leadership needs to address. More effort in preparing employees for

specific change interventions, by using frameworks such as the *Five Message Component* model, may help facilitate and produce long-term change success.

Organizational leaders who put forth resources (e.g., time, educational opportunities, and money) toward readiness efforts will see the benefits. Change, if not designed and implemented well, can be the most destructive force in an organization. On the other hand, if done well, change initiatives and interventions can also lead to positive results, excitement and exhilaration, organizational renewal, and increased employee loyalty, commitment, and retention. And, to do it well, new efforts must be focused on motivating and preparing employees so that they are constantly and continuously open and ready for change.

References

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for

    organizational change. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703.

Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational

    readiness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15*(2), 169-183.

Backer, T. E. (1995). Assessing and enhancing readiness for change: Implications for technology

    transfer. In T. E Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral*

    science knowledge base on technology transfer (pp. 21-41). Rockville, MD: National

    Institute on Drug Abuse.

Bernerth, J. (2004). Expanding our understanding of the change message. *Human Resource*

    Development Review, 3(1), 36-52.

Cook J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment

    and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53,* 39-52.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2005). *Organization Development and Change.* Madison:

    Thomson South-Western.

Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B.,

    Rosenbloom, D. & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal

    study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational*

    and Organizational Psychology, 75, 377-392.

Eby, L. T., Adams, D. M., Russel, J. E. A., & Gaby, S. H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational

    readiness for change: Factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of

    team-based selling. *Human Relations, 53*(3), 419-442.

Good, L. K., Page, T. J. & Young, C. E. (1996). Assessing Hierarchical differences in job-related attitudes and turnover among retail managers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 24*(2), 148-156.

Goulet, L. R. & Singh, P. (2002). Career commitment: A reexamination and an extension. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 73-91.

Hanpachern, C., Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V. (1998). An extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*(4), 339-350.

Hanpachern C. (1997). *The extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assessment of organizational responses. *Human Relations, 48*(5), 515-536.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York: Harper and Row.

Mathews, B. P. & Shepherd, J. L. (2002). Dimensionality of Cook and Wall's (1980) British Organizational Commitment scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 369-375.

McNabb, D. E., & Sepic, F. T. (1995). Culture, climate, and total quality management: Measuring readiness for change. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 18*(4), 369-385.

Prochaska, J. O., Redding, C. A., & Evers, K. E. (1997). The transtheoretical model and stages of change. In K. Glanz, F. M. Lewis, & B. K. Rimer (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (pp. 60-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rowden, R. W. (2001). The learning organization and strategic change. *S.A.M. Advanced*

    Management Journal, 66(3), 11-24.

Stevenson, J. S. (1982). Construction of a scale to measure load, power, and margin in life.

    Nursing Research, 31(4), 222-225.

Tompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and

    discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management, 23*(4), 583-

    602.

Weber, P. S. & Weber, J. E. (2001). Changes in employee perceptions during organizational

    change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22*(6), 291-300.

Yoon, J. & Thye, S. R. (2002). A dual process model of organizational commitment. *Work and*

    Occupations, 29(1), 97-124.

Zangaro, G. A. (2001). Organizational commitment: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum, 36*(2),

    14-22.

Table 1.

Sample Items

Scale	*Sample items*
Readiness for change	My willingness or openness to… *(very unlikely—very likely)* • work more because of the change is • find ways to make the change fail is (reversed) • support change is
Organizational commitment	Identification *(strongly disagree to strongly agree)* • I am quite proud to be able to tell people that I work for my company. Involvement • It would please me to know my work made a beneficial contribution to the organization. Loyalty • I sometimes feel like leaving this employment for good (reversed).
Social relationships in the workplace	*(strongly disagree to strongly agree)* • My interpersonal relationships with my co-workers are excellent. • Working with others is often difficult (reversed).

Table 2.

Demographic Frequencies

Demographic	Category	Frequencies
Sample	Total number	464
Gender	Male	222
	Female	229
Age range	Less than 21	10
	21-30	230
	31-40	97
	41-54	92
	55+	22
Marital status	Single	96
	Separated/Divorced	33
	Widowed	3
	Married	316
Highest educational level	High School	135
	Associate Degree	141
	Bachelor Degree	152
	Masters Degree	21
	Doctorate Degree	2
Age of children	None	180
	0-5	144
	6-11	98
	12-18	87
	Over 19	51
Length of time with company	0-6 months	53
	7-11 months	63
	1-2 years	95
	3-5 years	145
	6 or more years	95
Company	A	128
	B	145
	C	127
	D	54

*The demographics on approximately 10 surveys were not completed so totals in each demographic group do not equal 464.

Table 3. *Intercorrelations among Study Variables and Coefficient Alpha's*

Variable	*M*	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Readiness	5.27	.73	--										
2. Identification	5.25	1.27	.39***	--									
3. Involvement	5.83	.88	.51***	.53***	--								
4. Loyalty	4.42	1.44	.28***	.63***	.43***	--							
5. Organizational commitment	5.17	1.00	.45***	.88***	.72***	.87***	--						
6. Social relationships	5.80	.84	.18***	.34***	.31***	.29***	.37***	--					
7. Gender	1.51	.50	-.08	.08	.03	.13**	.11*	.14**	--				
8. Age	2.75	.97	.07	.11*	.22***	.25***	.23***	.008	.13**	--			
9. Marital status	3.21	1.27	.03	.07	.12**	.03	.08	.03	-.11*	.22***	--		
10. Education	2.14	.92	.02	-.03	-.008	-.05	-.04	-.07	-.16***	.23***	.10*	--	
11. Time with organization	3.37	1.28	-.01	-.05	.06	.05	.02	.01	.12**	.36***	.13**	.03	--
12. Number of children	1.34	1.58	.14**	.08	.16***	.13**	.14**	.01	-.13**	.38***	.39***	.19***	.19***

*p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two-tailed)

Table 4. *Demographic MANOVA*

Demographics	Readiness[a]		Identification[b]		Involvement[c]		Loyalty[d]		Organizational Commitment[e]		Social Relationships[f]	
	F	*P*	*F*	*p*	*F*	*p*	*F*	*P*	*F*	*p*	*F*	*p*
Gender	1.786	.182	3.103	.079	.053	.818	4.433	.036*	3.405	.066	9.595	.002**
Age of employee	1.255	.263	4.759	.030*	13.841	.000***	23.641	.000***	18.995	.000***	.072	.788
Marital status	.173	.677	1.010	.316	1.265	.261	.147	.701	.375	.541	.840	.360
Educational level	.186	.666	1.149	.284	2.363	.125	5.108	.024*	3.948	.048*	.987	.321
Length of time	.721	.396	4.589	.033*	.410	.522	2.180	.141	3.276	.071	.023	.880
# of children	4.832	.028*	1.143	.286	2.429	.120	2.257	.134	2.679	.102	.244	.621

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

a. R^2 = .026, ΔR^2 = .012; b. R^2 = .036, ΔR^2 = .022; c. R^2 = .065, ΔR^2 = .052; d. R^2 = .092, ΔR^2 = .080; e. R^2 = .082, ΔR^2 = .070

f. R^2 = .028, ΔR^2 = .015